

NOTES

Introduction

1. M. Jay, 'Vision in Context: Reflections and Refractions', in *Vision in Context: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Sight*, ed. T. Brennan and M. Jay (New York: Routledge, 1996), 3. As Jay notes, the term 'optical unconscious' was first used by Walter Benjamin, and serves as the title for R. E. Krauss's recent book *The Optical Unconscious* (Cambridge, MA: MIT, 1993).
2. Jay, 'Vision in Context', 3, referring to W. J. T. Mitchell's 'The Pictorial Turn', *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995). The following titles are evidence—though by no means exhaustive—of this burgeoning interest in vision: *Languages of Visuality: Crossings between Science, Art, Politics and Literature*, ed. B. Allert (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996); *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision*, ed. D. M. Levin (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); *Sites of Vision: the Discursive Construction of Sight in the History of Philosophy*, ed. D. M. Levin (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997); *Vision and Visuality*, ed. H. Foster, DIA Art Foundation Discussions in Contemporary Culture 2 (Seattle: Bay, 1988); *Vision in Context*, ed. Brennan and Jay; *Visual Culture*, ed. C. Jencks (London: Routledge, 1995); J. Crary, *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990); M. Jay, *Downcast Eyes* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994); and V. Sobchack, *The Address of the Eye: a Phenomenology of Film Experience* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).
3. J. F. Hamburger, *Nuns as Artists: the Visual Culture of a Medieval Convent* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997). A few notable excursions into the subject are Jay's introductory comments on medieval vision in *Downcast Eyes* (of which more will be said later), and Janet Martin Soskice's essay on 'Sight and Vision in Medieval Christian Thought' in *Vision in Context*. Soskice does not, however, include medieval optics in her analysis. Suzanne Lewis goes further than most in relating medieval theories of vision and cognition to the visual culture of the late Middle Ages, while at the same time engaging with current thinking on visuality and textuality. See her *Reading Images: Narrative Discourse and Reception in the Thirteenth-Century Illuminated Apocalypse* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
4. I owe this observation to Jill Bennett.

5. U. Eco, 'Living in the New Middle Ages', *Travels in Hyperreality*, trans. W. Weaver (London: Picador, 1987), 73–85.
6. M. Camille, *The Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image-making in Medieval Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), xxvii.
7. M. A. Holly, 'Vision and Revision in the History of Art', *Theory Between the Disciplines: Authority/Vision/Politics*, ed. M. K. and M. A. Cheetham (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990), 157.
8. At the culturalist end of the spectrum, for example, Marx W. Wartofsky insists that 'human vision is itself an artefact, produced by other artefacts, namely pictures'. From 'Picturing and Representing', in *Perception and Pictorial Representation*, ed. C. F. Nodine and D. F. Fisher (New York: Praeger, 1979), quoted in Jay, *Downcast Eyes*, 5.
9. See, for example, S. Y. Edgerton, Jr, *The Renaissance Rediscovery of Linear Perspective* (New York: Basic Books, 1975) and J. White, *The Birth and Rebirth of Pictorial Space*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1987). Although neither of these works purports to be a history of vision, both authors single out Renaissance perspectivism as evidence of a change in the way people actually viewed the phenomenal world.
10. I am quoting D. M. Levin, *The Opening of Vision: Nihilism and the Postmodern Situation* (New York: Routledge, 1988), 164. His argument is discussed at greater length later in this chapter.
11. 'The life of medieval Christendom is permeated in all aspects by religious images', writes Huizinga, and as a consequence, 'everything intended to awaken a consciousness of God rigidifies into terrible banality . . .' J. Huizinga, *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*, trans. R. J. Payton and U. Mammitzsch (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 174. Hans Belting's comment about the late medieval 'need to see' provides the point of departure for Chapter 6.
12. S. Ringbom, 'Devotional Images and Imaginative Devotions: Notes on the Place of Art in Late Medieval Private Piety', *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 73 (1969): 159–66.
13. P. de Bolla, 'The Visibility of Visuality', in *Vision in Context*, ed. Brennan and Jay, 65.
14. T. Brennan, "'The Contexts of Vision" from a Specific Standpoint', *Vision in Context*, ed. Brennan and Jay, 219. See, for example, Freud's comments in 'Instincts and Their Vicissitudes', *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, ed. J. Strachey, trans. J. Strachey et al., 24 vols (London: Hogarth, 1957), 14: 109–40.
15. Brennan notes that both Freud and Lacan acknowledge an active component of sight, while maintaining a 'split' between 'psychical and physical effects'. 'Contexts of Vision', 219.
16. M. Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, ed. C. Lefort, trans. A. Lingis (Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968), in particular Chapter 4: 'The Intertwining—the Chiasm', 130–55. Lewis similarly compares Merleau-Ponty's 'ontology of embodied vision' to the medieval notion of

continuity between the phenomenal world (the visible realm) and language (the invisible), *Reading Images*, 9. While I think the comparison is illuminating (on both sides), it is important to acknowledge Merleau-Ponty's resistance to the kind of causal thinking inherent in the idea of an original (invisible) creator and a secondary (visible) creation.

17. In *Phenomenology of Perception* Merleau-Ponty makes the body the 'meaningful core' not only of the 'biological world', but also the 'the cultural world'. M. Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. C. Smith (London: Routledge, 1962), 146.
18. For these and similar metaphors, see in particular Merleau-Ponty, 'The Intertwining—the Chiasm' in *The Visible and the Invisible*.
19. The relationship between nature and culture has been taken up by a number of Australian feminists in an attempt to rethink sexual difference somewhere between the untenable positions of biological essentialism ('nature') on the one side, and radical culturalism on the other. Elizabeth Grosz, for example, has described the body as 'a hinge or threshold between nature and culture' (8). As such, the body (and the same could be said of vision, as a bodily process) cannot be regarded as an historical constant, an organism that science simply gets better at describing: 'the body is not inert or fixed. It is pliable and plastic material' (3). Grosz, 'Notes Towards a Corporeal Feminism', *Australian Feminist Studies*, 5 (Summer 1987). More recently, Sue Best has explored the 'intertwining' or 'imbrication' of feminine terms and the female body via Derrida, Irigaray and Merleau-Ponty. Best, 'Sexualising Space', in *Sexy Bodies: the Strange Carnalities of Feminism*, ed. E. Grosz and E. Probyn (London: Routledge, 1995), 181–94. Bodies and texts, actuality and discourse, can in this way be conceptualised as inextricable, without collapsing one term into the other (i.e., making nature a product of culture, or seeing culture as built upon the immemorial bedrock of nature).
20. Martin Jay has questioned the cause and effect model that dominates much of the thinking about the relation between vision and its contexts. See his 'Disciplinary Prisms: Responding to My Critics', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 38.2 (Apr. 1996): 389. Jay's point—which is equally applicable to this thesis—is that a discourse on vision cannot be read in any straightforward way as political or social commentary.
21. I have not mentioned Gothic architecture here, as it is not discussed at any length in this book. It would, however, be possible to extend my argument in Chapter 5 (on redemptive vision) through a spatial and optical analysis of ecclesiastical architecture. Otto von Simson gestures in this direction in his discussion of light in *The Gothic Cathedral: Origins of Gothic Architecture and the Medieval Concept of Order*, Bollingen Series 48, 2nd ed. (New York: Pantheon, 1962), 50–8. A broader, and more recent, survey of the relationship between medieval visuality and Gothic architecture is provided by Michael Camille in *Gothic Art: Visions and Revelations of the Medieval World* (London: Orion, 1996): 'New Visions of Space', 27–68.

22. I am quoting David d'Avray, 'Some Franciscan Ideas about the Body', *Modern Questions about Medieval Sermons: Essays on Marriage, Death, History and Sanctity*, ed. N. Bériou and D. L. d'Avray et al. (Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi Sull'Alto Medioevo, 1994), 156.
23. Jay, *Downcast Eyes*, 34–6.
24. Febvre locates the turning point at the end of the sixteenth century, Mandrou somewhat later: 'Until at least the eighteenth century, touch remained . . . the master sense.' R. Mandrou, *Introduction à la France moderne 1500–1640: Essai de Psychologie historique*, quoted by Jay, *Downcast Eyes*, 35.
25. L. Febvre, *The Problem of Unbelief in the Sixteenth Century: the Religion of Rabelais*, trans. B. Gottlieb (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982), quoted in Jay, *Downcast Eyes*, 34.
26. This conceptualisation of medieval art (symbolic, the 'Bible of the illiterate') in contrast to Renaissance art (naturalistic, emotionally appealing, grounded in direct observation) is fairly common. For example, in *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970), Panofsky writes of the 'curtain' of tradition intervening between the medieval artist/viewer and the visual world, in contrast to the Renaissance doctrine of 'experience . . . as the root of art' (321). An interesting variation on the theme is proposed by Jean Paris, who describes the passage from Byzantine icons to Renaissance painting as the 'transformation of a sacred *surface* [deflecting our transgressive look] into a profane *volume*', *Painting and Linguistics* (Pittsburgh: Carnegie-Mellon University, 1975), 69. The interpolation is Levin's (*Opening of Vision*, 114), amplifying Paris's point that prior to the Renaissance, one was 'seen' by sacred images of Christ, the Virgin and the saints, rather than 'seeing' them as objects.
27. Levin is following Samuel Edgerton in this assertion, *Opening of Vision*, 102.
28. Levin, *Opening of Vision*, 3.
29. Levin, *Opening of Vision*, 164.
30. M. Heidegger, 'The Age of the World Picture', *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, trans. W. Lovitt (New York: Harper, 1977), 131, discussed in Levin, *Opening of Vision*, 257–9.
31. Paraphrasing Heidegger, Levin writes: 'In the first age [pre-Renaissance] we are in *God's* picture: the world is a picture seen only by God. In the second age, of Renaissance and Enlightenment, we usurp *God's* place: the world is pictured, but what the picture represents is what is visible *to us*.' *Opening of Vision*, 119.
32. Levin, *Opening of Vision*, 257.
33. 'What would a vision be like', asks Levin, 'if it "remembered" its ontological beholdenness?', *Opening of Vision*, 258. Elsewhere (165–6) he makes a similar point with regard to Galen's theory of extramission.
34. Edgerton, *Renaissance Rediscovery of Linear Perspective*, 22. Edgerton does qualify this theory, stating that 'the mind . . . of the medieval European Christian . . . is not to be thought of as a mere preliminary or deficient version of the adult in modern Western society. Instead, it is a *qualitatively* different and homogeneous entity' (22). Notwithstanding this note of

- caution, however, the simple fact that the ‘rediscovery’ of linear perspective is compared to the normal development of spatial awareness in children is enough to fix perspective securely within a progressive, normative paradigm.
35. E. H. Gombrich, ‘Achievement in Mediaeval Art’ (1937), trans. M. Podro, in *Meditations on a Hobby Horse and Other Essays on the Theory of Art* (London: Phaidon, 1963), 74.
 36. Murray Krieger observes similarly that Gombrich, in contrasting Renaissance naturalism to the ‘pictographs’ or ‘conceptual images’ of medieval art, invokes a model of historical progress in which the development of illusionistic art represents ‘a gradual movement to an absolutely true (that is, more “correct”) representation, one that requires fewer codes for us to see it’. Krieger, ‘The Ambiguities of Representation and Illusion: an E. H. Gombrich Retrospective’, *Critical Inquiry*, 11.2 (Dec. 1984): 189. The text he is referring to is Gombrich’s ‘Illusion and Art’, in *Illusion in Nature and Art*, ed. R. L. Gregory and E. H. Gombrich (London: Duckworth, 1973). See also E. H. Gombrich, ‘The “What” and the “How”: Perspective Representation and the Phenomenal World’, in *Logic and Art: Essays in Honour of Nelson Goodman*, ed. R. Rudner and I. Scheffler (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1972). In this essay Gombrich contends that as well as representing *what* we see with a high degree of accuracy (i.e., the objective world), perspective pictures approximate the perceptual process itself: *how* we see. For these reasons, he argues, perspective representation is widely regarded as ‘better’ (truer, more natural) than other methods (148).
 37. U. Eco, *The Aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas*, trans. H. Bredin (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988), 138.
 38. Eco, *Aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas*, 141.
 39. Eco, *Aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas*, 141.
 40. Eco, *Aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas*, 138.
 41. Panofsky regarded this chronological gap as evidence that there was ‘a curious dichotomy between optic theory and artistic practice’ in the Middle Ages, *Renaissance and Renascences*, 138. This fairly common misconception stems from a reductive (not to mention retrospective) understanding of optical theory. My discussion of devotional images in Chapter 6 draws on a more complex analysis of medieval optics, developed in Chapters 3 and 4.
 42. Edgerton, *Renaissance Rediscovery of Linear Perspective*, 21. W. V. Dunning paraphrases this argument (without crediting Edgerton) in *Changing Images of Pictorial Space: a History of Spatial Illusion in Painting* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1991), 12–13.
 43. The inability to distinguish figure from ground—or the tendency to integrate them—has been identified as a feminine characteristic in several spatial studies. See, for example, I. M. Young, ‘Throwing Like a Girl’ in *Throwing Like a Girl and Other Essays in Feminist Philosophy and Social Theory* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990), 153. Edgerton’s conceptualisation of the medieval artist—and the ‘neurotic’ paradigm generally—could be read as implicitly feminine, by virtue of the traditional alignment of

- femininity with subjectivism and the emotions (as against male reason), and maternal non-differentiation (versus masculine individualism).
44. For Panofsky, too, focused perspective provides the perceptual and intellectual 'distance between the eye and the object' necessary for 'a total and rationalized view', *Renaissance and Renascences*, 108.
 45. Edgerton, *Renaissance Rediscovery of Linear Perspective*, 21.
 46. Brennan, 'Contexts of Vision', 224.
 47. C. Erickson, *The Medieval Vision: Essays in History and Perception* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1976), 33.
 48. Erickson claims, for instance, that 'Visions erased the shear line between the known and the unknowable', and that 'accepting a more inclusive concept of reality, [medieval subjects] saw more than we do', *Medieval Vision*, 28, 29.
 49. Erickson, *Medieval Vision*, 5.
 50. Eco, *Aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas*, 141.
 51. N. Klassen, *Chaucer on Love, Knowledge and Sight*, Chaucer Studies XXI (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 1995), 24.
 52. Jay, *Downcast Eyes*, 38.
 53. Jay, *Downcast Eyes*, 44.
 54. Klassen, *Chaucer on Love*, x, 2.
 55. Jay, *Downcast Eyes*, 34. Soskice also writes of 'a central ambivalence in Christian attitudes towards vision from the patristic through the medieval periods and beyond'. 'Sight and Vision in Medieval Christian Thought', 31.
 56. D. Boyarin, 'The Eye in the Torah: Ocular Desire in Midrashic Hermeneutic', *Critical Inquiry*, 16 (Spring 1990): 532–50.

1 Flesh

1. Alan of Lille, *The Plaint of Nature* (? 1160–75), trans. J. J. Sheridan (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980), 183–4 (13).
2. Papias the Lombard, *Elementarium Doctrinae Erudimentum* (c.1060), quoted in J. B. Friedman, *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980), 111. Pliny lists over thirty 'incredible' races in Book 7 of the *Natural History*, ed. T. E. Page et al., trans. H. Rackham, 10 vols (London: Heinemann, 1942), vol. 2.
3. From Thomas of Cantimpré's encyclopaedia *De Natura Rerum* (c.1245), quoted in Friedman, *Monstrous Races*, 183.
4. The argument is Thomas of Cantimpré's, as cited in Friedman, *Monstrous Races*, 183.
5. Friedman, *Monstrous Races*, 103.
6. Hugh of St Victor (c.1096–1141), quoted in M. C. Pouchelle, *The Body and Surgery in the Middle Ages*, trans. R. Morris (Cambridge: Polity, 1990), 118.
7. Caesarius, bishop of Arles, quoted in J. Le Goff, *The Medieval Imagination*, trans. A. Goldhammer (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 101.
8. Le Goff, *Medieval Imagination*, 101.

9. *The Opus Majus of Roger Bacon*, trans. R. B. Burke, 2 vols (New York: Russell, 1962), 2: 672 (7.3.3). Underlying such judgements was the medieval understanding of an individual as a 'psychosomatic unity—a self in which part can stand for whole and in which an imbalance between parts leads to evil'. C. W. Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity, 200–1336* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995), 328 n.38.
10. In Roman Latin *monstrum* and *portentum* were interchangeable. Although in the Middle Ages *monstrum* became associated with things *contra naturam* (against nature), the application of the term to the races of men retained something of its original meaning. Friedman, *Monstrous Races*, 108–9.
11. Of the races described by Pliny and represented in medieval literary and pictorial sources, the following exhibit displaced, deformed or unnatural sensory apparatus: the 'owl-eyed' Albanians, the Astomi (thought to sustain themselves entirely by smell), the Blemmyae, the Cyclopes or Monoculi ('one-eye'), the Epiphagi (closely related to the Blemmyae, having eyes in their shoulders), the Maritime Ethiopians (sometimes depicted with four eyes or four pupils, representing their keen sight), and the Panotti (literally 'all ears').
12. Plato, *Timaeus* in *Timaeus and Critias*, trans. D. Lee (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), 97 (38.69). Alan of Lille repeats Plato's tripartite division of the body (*Timaeus* 97–100 (38.69–72)) in his allegory of the 'perfectly organised state'. Wisdom reigns in the 'citadel of [man's] head', with the 'heart . . . in the middle of the earthly city', and the 'loins like the city's outskirts, giv[ing] the lower portions of the body wilful desires', *Plaint of Nature*, 121 (6).
13. Plato, *Timaeus*, 97 (38.69–70).
14. Henri de Mondeville (d. c.1320), quoted in Pouchelle, *Body and Surgery*, 120.
15. N. G. Siraisi, *Medieval and Early Renaissance Medicine* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 80–1, 107–9. On the primacy of the heart (as opposed to the head) in the corporeal hierarchy of Antiquity through the Middle Ages, see: E. Jager, 'The Book of the Heart: Reading and Writing the Medieval Subject', *Speculum*, 71.1 (Jan. 1996): 1–26. As Jager notes, however, Galen located perception and cognition in the brain—which may explain why schematic medical illustrations typically represent the head as *prima regio*. Examples of the latter are included in M. Camille, 'The Image and the Self: Unwriting Late Medieval Bodies', *Framing Medieval Bodies*, ed. S. Kay and M. Rubin (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994): 62–99.
16. Siraisi, *Medieval and Early Renaissance Medicine*, 106.
17. A detailed explanation of these functions is provided by Siraisi, *Medieval and Early Renaissance Medicine*, 107–8.
18. Bynum cites Clement of Alexandria (d. c. 215) and Abbot Nilus (d. 430) as representative of the patristic culture of fasting. She traces this tradition to the Pythagorean and Neoplatonic denigration of matter in general (including food), and corporeality in particular: a view amply demonstrated by Clement's pronouncement that 'Fasting empties the soul of matter and makes it, with the body, clear and light for the reception of divine truth'. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: the Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987), 36.

19. Gerald of Wales (c.1145–c.1223), *The Jewel of the Church: a Translation of Gemma Ecclesiastica by Giraldus Cambrensis*, trans. J. J. Hagen, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 2: 199 (2.19). On Gerald in general, see R. Bartlett, *Gerald of Wales*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).
20. Gerald of Wales, *Jewel of the Church*, 2: 182–3 (2.16). For Gerald, carnal vision is sexualised, and therefore a locus of sin, but it is not associated with the nutritive or reproductive functions of the lower body. Interestingly, it is in the context of anatomy and physiology (discussed in Chapter 4) that the eye is described in terms that suggest the nourishing, maternal body.
21. The long tradition of visual primacy is discussed in Chapter 3.
22. In the sense that a woman's 'head' was her husband or father, she lacked the necessary social and symbolic organs to represent the entire corporeal hierarchy. Instead, defined primarily by her reproductive function, she served as man's body, both literally and metaphorically. My analysis of Augustine and Bernard of Clairvaux later in this chapter will elaborate on the symbolic link between femininity and flesh.
23. Hostiensis (d. 1271), commentary on the fifth book of the Decretals, quoted in Camille, 'The Image and the Self', 72. In this essay, Camille looks at the multiple symbolic dimensions of the medieval (principally fourteenth-century) body, including its function as a microcosm of the universe and the 'body politic'. On the latter, see also J. Le Goff, 'Head or Heart: the Political Use of Body Metaphors in the Middle Ages', trans. P. Ranum, *Fragments for a History of the Human Body, Part III*, ed. M. Feher, R. Naddaff and N. Tazi, 3 vols (New York: Zone, 1989), 13–26; and Pouchelle, *Body and Surgery*, 117–20.
24. For a seminal anthropological formulation of the body as a 'medium of expression' see M. Douglas, 'The Two Bodies' in *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology* (London: Barrie, 1970), 93–112. Pouchelle discusses the reciprocal metaphors of body/society and body/architecture in Part II of *Body and Surgery*.
25. R. E. Latham, *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (London: Oxford University Press, 1975), 1: 497–9.
26. Hélinand of Froimont, *Verses on Death*, quoted in Le Goff, *Medieval Imagination*, 84.
27. St Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153), *On Conversion*, in *Bernard of Clairvaux, Selected Works*, trans. G. R. Evans, Classics of Western Spirituality Series (New York: Paulist Press, 1987), 89 (17.30). The relevant passage is quoted in full later in the chapter.
28. P. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (London: Faber, 1990), 434.
29. Le Goff, *Medieval Imagination*, 83.
30. Le Goff, *Medieval Imagination*, 96.
31. New Testament sources for Augustine's outer and inner man include Col. 3.9–10 and 2 Cor. 4.16.

32. St Augustine, *Eighty-three Different Questions*, trans. D. L. Mosher, Fathers of the Church, 70 (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1982), 85 (Q. 51).
33. St Augustine, *The Trinity*, trans. S. McKenna, Fathers of the Church, 45 (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1963), 315 (11.1); 343 (12.1); 355 (12.8).
34. Eleanor Commo McLaughlin, for example, refers to a 'platonized patristic anthropology that defined the human being as a soul imprisoned in the materiality of the flesh'. McLaughlin, 'Equality of Souls, Inequality of Sexes: Woman in Medieval Theology', *Religion and Sexism: Images of Woman in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*, ed. R. R. Ruether (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974), 216. Janet Coleman gives a more detailed (and more measured) account of medieval dualism in her *Ancient and Medieval Memories: Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
35. C. Bynum, 'Why All the Fuss About the Body? A Medievalist's Perspective', *Critical Inquiry*, 22 (Autumn 1995): 6. Bynum cites a number of examples of this style of historical analysis, including Le Goff's work, quoted above, 6 n. 19.
36. Bynum, 'Why All the Fuss About the Body?', 7.
37. Bynum, 'Why All the Fuss About the Body?', 7.
38. Pouchelle, *Body and Surgery*, 204.
39. Pouchelle, *Body and Surgery*, 204.
40. By contrast, d'Avray thinks that 'a great of early medieval writing could be described as dualist . . . in feeling, if not in definite thought, and negative, if not actually hostile, in its attitude to the body'. 'Some Franciscan Ideas about the Body', 161.
41. Bynum, 'Why All the Fuss About the Body?', 13.
42. Bynum, 'Why All the Fuss About the Body?', 13.
43. Bynum, 'Why All the Fuss About the Body?', 14–15.
44. Bynum, 'Why All the Fuss About the Body?', 15.
45. Bynum, 'Why All the Fuss About the Body?', 16.
46. Augustine, *Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 2: 191 (12.11.22). In addition to the tripartite division of sight into corporeal, spiritual and intellectual modes in Book 12 of *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, we find a trinity of object, attention and vision in *The Trinity* (11.2); and a trinity of memory (mental simulacra of extramental objects), will and internal vision (11.3–4). Unless otherwise indicated, I have used the following translations of these texts: St Augustine, *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, trans. and annotated by J. H. Taylor, 2 vols (New York: Newman, 1982); and McKenna's translation of *The Trinity*.
47. Augustine, *Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 2: 186 (12.7.16).
48. Augustine, *Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 2: 190, 216 (12.10.21; 12.26.54).
49. Augustine, *Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 2: 214 (12.24.51).
50. St Bonaventure (1221–74), for instance, reiterates Augustine's categories, substituting the term 'internal sense' or 'imagination' for spiritual vision.

Cited in D. L. Clark, 'Optics for Preachers: the *De Oculo Morali* by Peter of Limoges', *The Michigan Academician* (Winter 1977): 339. In this treatise on the 'moral eye' (which I discuss in later chapters) Peter of Limoges extends the tripartite Augustinian model in such a way that the intermediary imagination is retained as the internal sense, along with a demarcation between reason and contemplation. The resulting quadripartite scheme comprises: the carnal or bodily eye, the inner eye or internal sense, the mind's eye and the heart's eye (338).

51. Augustine, *Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 2: 190 (12.9.20). J. H. Taylor notes that *spiritus*, as it is used in this context, is comparable to the Neoplatonic idea of *pneuma* (2: 301 n. 13).
52. Manicheans and Platonists are named by Augustine as proponents of the theory that the body is essentially evil, and is shed by the soul in its ascent to God. *Concerning the City of God, Against the Pagans*, trans. H. Bettenson (Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics, 1984), 524–9 (13.16); 554–5 (14.5). Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations are from this translation.
53. Further examples are listed in A. C. Thiselton, 'Flesh', *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, ed. C. Brown, 3 vols (Exeter: Paternoster, 1975), 1: 672. On the relation between flesh, fallenness and redemption in the Hebrew Bible and New Testament, see also D. Welton, 'Biblical Bodies', *Body and Flesh: a Philosophical Reader*, ed. D. Welton (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998), 243–55.
54. Thiselton, 'Flesh', 1: 673.
55. Unless otherwise indicated, all Old Testament and New Testament quotations are taken from the New King James Version of the *Holy Bible* (Nashville: Nelson, 1982).
56. Insofar as "All flesh" is mankind, and to strive after evil is inherent in man (Gen. 8.21), flesh and evil are related. However, flesh is not interpreted as 'the actual cause of sin'. Thiselton, 'Flesh', 1: 673.
57. Thiselton, 'Flesh', 1: 674.
58. Thiselton, 'Flesh', 1: 674.
59. Thiselton, 'Flesh', 1: 680. Günther Bornkamm remarks similarly that for Paul, flesh 'designates man's being and attitude as opposed to and in contradiction to God and God's Spirit'. *Paul*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (London: Hodder, 1975), 133.
60. The body–tomb analogy is facilitated by the similarity of the terms *soma* and *sema*. This observation, and the quotation, are from Bornkamm, *Paul*, 130.
61. Bornkamm, *Paul*, 130–1.
62. See: Rom. 7.14, 18; 8.6–8, 12–13; Gal. 5.16, 24. Bornkamm, *Paul*, 133.
63. Latham, *Dictionary of Medieval Latin*, 284.
64. A. Souter, *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 AD* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1949), 40.
65. As Margaret Miles observes, Augustine's views on the body changed considerably during the course of his life, although they were characteristically 'inconsistent'. While his early writings preserve the Pauline distinction between body and flesh, his mature works move towards a reconciliation of flesh and

body in the concept of the *resurrectio carnis*, *Augustine on the Body* (Missoula: Scholars, 1979) 108–18. For my purposes, it is precisely Augustine's inconsistency and ambivalence, rather than the chronological development of his thought, that is of interest.

66. Human existence is divided into two cities, 'one city of men who choose to live by the standard of the flesh, another of those who choose to live by the standard of the spirit'. Augustine, *City of God*, 547 (14.1).
67. Augustine divides Paul's 'works of the flesh' (Gal. 5.19–21) into two categories: those 'concerned with sensual pleasure', and vices like jealousy, animosity, enmity and envy, which originate in the mind rather than in the body. Augustine, *City of God*, 549 (14.2).
68. Augustine, *City of God*, 574–5 (14.15).
69. Augustine, *City of God*, 551 (14.3). See also 525 (13.16).
70. Augustine, *City of God*, 479–80 (12.7).
71. Augustine, *City of God*, 511–13 (13.3).
72. Augustine, *City of God*, 522 (13.13).
73. In addition to expulsion from the garden of Eden, the punishments listed in Genesis are: toil and death, and for women, pain in childbirth and subjection to men.
74. Although Augustine does not make this point himself, it does account for his seemingly unconscious oscillation between the two terms when he is discussing the postlapsarian body: the body, that is, of his own experience. This ambiguity stands in marked contrast to his careful delineation of the terms where he reconstructs the 'pure' prelapsarian body, or writes of the glorified body of the resurrection.
75. Augustine, *City of God*, 522–4 (13.13–15).
76. Augustine, *City of God*, 576 (14.15).
77. Augustine, *City of God*, 577 (14.16). Paraphrasing Augustine, the twelfth-century theologian Peter the Chanter stated: 'In the heat of lust, the whole man is so absorbed that he can neither do nor think of anything else. . . . The pleasure of the body totally captures and enslaves the mind.' Quoted in J. W. Baldwin, 'Five Discourses on Desire: Sexuality and Gender in Northern France around 1200', *Speculum*, 66.4 (Oct. 1991): 801.
78. Augustine speculates that in the absence of sin, sexual relations between man and wife would be a tranquil affair, incurring 'no impairment of [the] body's integrity'. *City of God*, 591 (14.26).
79. For a more extensive discussion of the connection between sexuality and death, see Brown, *Body and Society*, 404–8.
80. Augustine, *Enarrations in Psalmos*, as quoted in K. Lochrie, *Margery Kempe and Translations of the Flesh* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991), 19. Because Augustine often refers to the 'marriage' of body and soul, I have given these terms in parentheses rather than Lochrie's 'flesh and spirit'. See also Peter Brown's rendering of this passage, *Body and Society*, 426. For a slightly different configuration of the same metaphor (Adam and Eve are likened to 'virile reason' and the 'soul's appetite'), see St Augustine, *On Genesis, Against the Manichees* 2.11.15, in *St Augustine on Marriage and*

- Sexuality*, ed. E. A. Clark, Selections from the Fathers of the Church 1 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996), 39–40.
81. Alan of Lille, *Plaint of Nature*, 117–18 (6).
 82. Richard of St Victor, *The Mystical Ark* (probably written between 1153 and 1162) in *The Twelve Patriarchs, The Mystical Ark, Book Three of the Trinity*, trans. G. A. Zinn, Classics of Western Spirituality Series (London: SPCK, 1979), 200 (2.17). Meister Eckhart is less optimistic about the relationship between sensuality and the ‘inner man’, preferring ‘the soul [that] draws to itself all its powers it had loaned to the five senses’. Meister Eckhart, ‘German Works’, *Meister Eckhart: the Essential Sermons, Commentaries, Treatises, and Defence*, trans. E. Colledge and B. McGinn, Classics of Western Spirituality Series (New York: Paulist Press, 1981), 290. See also ‘German Works’, 108.
 83. Alan of Lille, *Plaint of Nature*, 170 (12). As her name suggests, Bacchilatria personifies the supreme worship of wine.
 84. Lochrie, *Margery Kempe*, 20.
 85. See, for example: J. Butler, *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of ‘Sex’* (New York: Routledge, 1993); H. Cixous, ‘Sorties’, *New French Feminisms: an Anthology*, ed. E. Marks and I. de Courtivron (New York: Schocken, 1981), 90–8; P. Deutscher, ‘The Evanescence of Masculinity: Deferral in Saint Augustine’s *Confessions* and Some Thoughts on its Bearing on the Sex/Gender Debate’, *Australian Feminist Studies*, 15 (Autumn 1992): 41–56; L. Irigaray, *Speculum of the Other Woman*, in particular ‘How to Conceive (of) a Girl’ and ‘Une Mère de Glace’, trans. G. C. Gill (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), 168–79; G. Lloyd, *The Man of Reason: ‘Male’ and ‘Female’ in Western Philosophy* (London: Methuen, 1984).
 86. McLaughlin, ‘Equality of Souls’, 216.
 87. St Augustine, *The City of God*, trans. G. G. Walsh and D. J. Honan, Fathers of the Church 8 (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1954), 483 (22.24).
 88. Bynum, ‘Why All the Fuss About the Body?’, 15–16.
 89. Bynum, ‘Why All the Fuss About the Body?’, 15. Bynum’s examples of ‘deliberate misreading’ include Butler’s *Bodies That Matter* and Irigaray’s *Speculum of the Other Woman*. To clarify and extend Bynum’s rather cursory observation: strategic (mis)interpretation of a text may involve reading against the grain of the author’s intentions, identifying unspoken tensions or contradictions, or investing significance into the seemingly insignificant. In this limited sense, both Butler and Irigaray are intentionally ‘unfaithful’ to their sources.
 90. Echoing this idea, Augustine uses the agricultural metaphor of the male seed being sown in the ‘fertile soil’ of the female body. For references, and discussion of this motif, see K. E. Børresen, *Subordination and Equivalence: the Nature and Role of Woman in Augustine and Thomas Aquinas*, trans. C. H. Talbot (Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1981), 41–4.
 91. Aristotle, *Generation of Animals*, 2.4.738b. Unless otherwise indicated, I have quoted from *The Complete Works of Aristotle: the Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. J. Barnes, Bollingen Series, 2 vols (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984). On the union of female matter and male form see also: *Generation of*

- Animals*, 1.20.729a ff. The metaphor is discussed in Lloyd, *Polarity and Analogy*, 264, 369. For Aristotle's influence on medieval theories of sexuality and human physiology, see: Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference in the Middle Ages: Medicine, Science, and Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); and D. Jacquart and C. Thomasset, *Sexuality and Medicine in the Middle Ages*, trans. M. Adamson (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988).
92. 'The truth is that what desires the form is matter, as the female desires the male . . .' Aristotle, *Physics*, 1.9.192a.
 93. Jacquart and Thomasset, *Sexuality and Medicine*, 14. Tellingly, *mollities* could refer to weakness of mind, sexual immorality, luxury and effeminacy (when applied to men), in addition to softness, tenderness and pliancy.
 94. On the passivity of the body in relation to the soul, see Augustine, *De musica*, 6.5.8: 'Nullo modo igitur anima fabricatori corpori est subjecta materies'. Quoted in *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100–1600*, ed. N. Kretzmann et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 443 n.11. See also Augustine, *Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 2: 200 (12.16.33).
 95. St Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. R. S. Pine-Coffin (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961), 344 (13.32). Unless otherwise indicated, all subsequent quotations are from this translation. For additional commentary on this passage, see: Børresen, *Subordination and Equivalence*, 30–4; Deutscher, 'Evanescence of Masculinity', 45–7; and Lloyd, *Man of Reason*, 29–33. One could also trace the idea of a gendered soul through John Scotus Eriugena's *Periphyseon (The Division of Nature)*, written in c. 865. In Book 2, the Irish philosopher and theologian writes: 'the spiritual sexes are understood to exist in the soul—for *nous*, that is intellect, is a kind of male in the soul, while *aisthesis*, that is sense, is a kind of female'. Quoted in Bynum, *Resurrection of the Body*, 145.
 96. Men, by extension, are masculine by virtue of their reasoning minds, and feminine in their sensuality. For example, in *The Trinity*, 355 (12.8) Augustine likens the appetite to Eve in its ability to lead the mind (its 'spouse') astray.
 97. Isidore of Seville, quoted in Jacquart and Thomasset, *Sexuality and Medicine*, 14. The popular twelfth-century text, *De secretis mulierum*, attributed women's appetite for sex to the heat generated by the accumulation of menstrual blood. *Women's Secrets: a Translation of Pseudo-Albertus Magnus' De Secretis Mulierum with Commentaries*, trans. H. R. Lemay (New York: State University of New York Press, 1992), 122 (ch. 7).
 98. J. W. Baldwin, *The Language of Sex: Five Voices from Northern France around 1200* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 134. Baldwin's source is the *Dragmaticon* of Guillaume de Conches, written in 1146–9. See also Jacquart and Thomasset, *Sexuality and Medicine*, 81–2.
 99. Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference*, 178.
 100. Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference*, 178.
 101. Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference*, 178.
 102. As Jean Leclercq notes, this 'ability to interpret everything symbolically was greatly developed in the monastic milieu of the high middle ages, and

- doubtless also among the clerics, and, though probably to a lesser extent, among the laymen'. *Monks and Love in Twelfth-Century France: Psycho-Historical Essays* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), 34.
103. My basic comparative framework here—focusing on the concept of 'flesh' as understood by Augustine and Bernard of Clairvaux—follows the structure of Karma Lochrie's argument in *Margery Kempe*, 19–23. While my interpretation of these authors accords with Lochrie's analysis on most points, there are a number of divergences or differences of emphasis. Most notably, my reading of Augustine more clearly delineates body (as 'good' wife) from flesh (as rebellious wife). As well, Bernard's emphasis on the permeability of the flesh—in contradistinction to the chaste, enclosed body—is given an ocular twist in later chapters.
 104. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, as quoted by Lochrie, *Margery Kempe*, 21.
 105. The corporeal matter of the body is to the incorporeal soul 'a rod of fatherly correction (Prov. 29.15) and a purgation of the heart (Ps. 44.7)'. Similarly, 'where there is no body there is no possibility of action (Matt. 24.28)'. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 69 (3.4), 71 (5.6).
 106. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 89–90 (17.30). References cited in text: 2 Cor. 5.6; Rom. 7.24; Rom. 6.6; Rom. 7.23, 25. Note that where parenthetical references are given in the original text, I have listed this information after the citation details, in the order in which the references appear in the sermon.
 107. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 74 (6.10).
 108. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 74 (6.10). Cited in text: Isa. 1.6. This inventory would not appear out of place in a moralising account of the Plinian races.
 109. Lochrie, *Margery Kempe*, 4. The enclosure and extension of sight in *On Conversion* is discussed in Chapter 5 of this book.
 110. I have used the definition of 'passio' in the *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*. In subsequent chapters I will extend this definition through Roger Bacon's reference to the 'passion' of sensation, and (in Chapter 6) the devotional 'Passion portrait' of Christ.
 111. Bynum writes of the 'fear of aging and putrefaction' evident in thirteenth-century mystical and devotional texts. *Resurrection of the Body*, 331.
 112. Bynum, *Resurrection of the Body*, 174.
 113. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 89 (17.30).
 114. See also Richard of St Victor, *Mystical Ark*, 179 (2.4). The 'eye of reason', according to Richard, is 'blinded under a fog of error' and 'surrounded by a cloud of sin'.
 115. Augustine, *Eighty-three Different Questions*, 43 (Q.12). See also: Augustine, *Soliloquies* (14.24), where the fleshly body is described as a condition of darkness, and the senses as 'sticky lime;' and *Confessions*, 43 (2.2).
 116. Joseph Goering, 'The *De Dotibus* of Robert Grosseteste', *Medieval Studies*, 44 (1982): 83–109. An edition of the text is appended to Goering's article, and the date of the treatise is discussed on pages 94–5.

117. Like Augustine, Grosseteste conceives of this perfection within a hierarchy in which the soul is subject to God, and in turn exercises its rightful dominion over the body. Goering, *De Dotibus*, 97.
118. Goering, *De Dotibus*, 98.
119. Alan of Lille, *Summa* (ch. 34), quoted in Bynum, *Holy Feast*, 44.
120. *The Ancrene Riwe* (The Corpus MS *Ancrene Wisse*), trans. M. B. Salu (London: Burns, 1963), Part 3: 62.
121. Plato, *Timaeus*, 102–3 (40.74–5).
122. Plato, *Timaeus*, 103 (40.75).
123. *Ancrene Wisse*, Part 2: 41.
124. See also Umberto Eco's treatment of *claritas* in relation to scholastic theories of beauty and proportion, in *Aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas*, 102–21.
125. Robert Grosseteste, *Hexameron*, quoted in R. W. Southern, *Robert Grosseteste: the Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 219.
126. Although light exists in the order of corporeal things, it has 'greater similarity than all bodies to the forms that exist apart from matter, namely, the intelligences'. Grosseteste, *On Light*, trans. C. C. Riedl (Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 1978), 10.
127. Otto of Freising, *Chronica sive historia de duabus civitatibus*, quoted in Bynum, *Resurrection of the Body*, 182. Otto studied in Paris before joining the Cistercians in 1133. The work quoted from here was begun in the 1140s.
128. This definition of *impassibilitas* is from J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 513. See also Bynum's discussion of the dowering of the body in *Resurrection of the Body*, 121 ff. (especially 135–6).
129. A. Boureau, 'The Sacrality of One's Own Body in the Middle Ages', trans. B. Semple, *Corps Mystique, Corps Sacré: Textual Transfigurations of the Body from the Middle Ages to the Seventeenth Century*, special issue of *Yale French Studies*, 86 (1994): 7.
130. Peter [the] Lombard, *Sentences*, 4.49.4 (1157–8). Peter is borrowing from Augustine, *Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 12.35, quoted in Bynum, *Resurrection of the Body*, 132.

2 The Eye of the Flesh

1. St Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. V. J. Bourke, Fathers of the Church, 21 (New York: Fathers of the Church, 1953), 60 (3.6).
2. Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Mystical Theology in Pseudo-Dionysius: the Complete Works*, trans. C. Luibheid, Classics of Western Spirituality Series (New York: Paulist, 1987), 138 (2.1025a).
3. I am using the term 'gaze' here in its broadest sense, not as Lacan defines it: as something prior to and outside viewing subjects, and thus quite distinct from ordinary sight. J. Lacan, 'The Split Between the Eye and the Gaze', *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*, ed. J.-A. Miller, trans. A. Sheridan (New York: Norton, 1978), 67–78.

4. Gen. 3.4–7.
5. For biographical and contextual information on Peter the Chanter (d. 1197), see J. W. Baldwin, *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: the Social Views of Peter the Chanter and His Circle* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970), vol. 1: 3–16.
6. Peter the Chanter, paraphrased in Baldwin, *Language of Sex*, 118.
7. I discuss Augustine's commentary on Genesis 3 in Chapter 1.
8. The passage is quoted in full below. Gerald of Wales, *Jewel of the Church*, 2: 182 (2.16).
9. The *Ancrene Wisse* enjoyed a large lay readership in the fourteenth century, and has been the subject of a number of recent studies, including: L. Georgianna, *The Solitary Self: Individuality in the Ancrene Wisse* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981); J. Grayson, *Structure and Imagery in the Ancrene Wisse* (Hanover: published for the University of New Hampshire by the University Press of New England, 1974); and E. Robertson, 'Medieval Medical Views of Women and Female Spirituality in the *Ancrene Wisse* and Julian of Norwich's *Showings*', *Feminist Approaches to the Body in Medieval Literature*, ed. L. Lomperis and S. Stanbury (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993). I have used the translation of *The Ancrene Riwe* (The Corpus MS: *Ancrene Wisse*) by Salu for quotations.
10. *Ancrene Wisse*, Part 2: 23.
11. 'Your mother Eve leaped after her eyes had leapt . . .' *Ancrene Wisse*, Part 2: 23. Georgianna notes that 'Looking, though seemingly innocuous and certainly passive enough, can abruptly become leaping in [the] tiny but concentrated spiritual landscape [of the anchorhold]'. *Solitary Self*, 64. For reasons that will become more apparent in the course of this chapter, I would take issue with the assumption that sight is a universally (or naturally) passive phenomenon.
12. H. A. Kelly traces the tradition of the 'maiden-faced serpent' to Peter Comestor's commentary on the Book of Genesis in his *Historia Scholastica* of c. 1170, although the earliest iconographic examples date from the 1220s and 30s. 'The Metamorphoses of the Eden Serpent During the Middle Ages and Renaissance', *Viator*, 2 (1971): 308, 321. The theme is also discussed in Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 91; and J. A. Phillips, *Eve: the History of an Idea* (San Francisco: Harper, 1984), 61–2.
13. Peter Comestor, *Historia Scholastica*, 1.21, quoted in Kelly, 'Metamorphoses of the Eden Serpent', 308. Kelly notes that Peter's reference to Bede is erroneous (309).
14. Richard of St Victor, *Mystical Ark*, 200 (2.17).
15. St Thomas Aquinas (c.1225–74), *Summa Theologiae* (begun c.1265), 1a Q.81.1. I have used the Blackfriars parallel text edition for quotations (London, 1964–81). Augustine gives a number of symbolic interpretations of the serpent in *The Trinity*, 12.11–13, including 'the five-fold sense of the body', 362 (12.13.20).
16. 'Serpens gets its name because it creeps (*serpiti*) by secret approaches and not by open steps. It moves along by very small pressures of its scales.' *The Book*

- of *Beasts: Being a Translation from a Latin Bestiary of the Twelfth Century*, ed. and trans. T. H. White (New York: Dover, 1984) 165. See also Augustine, *The Trinity*, 357–8 (12.11.16).
17. Augustine, *City of God*, 522–3 (13.13). The relevant passage is quoted in Chapter 1.
 18. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 358 (12.11.16).
 19. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 1a Q.81.1.
 20. Jay, *Downcast Eyes*, 307 n.143.
 21. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 1a Q.81.1. Aquinas's theory is essentially one of Aristotelian intromission, and should be distinguished from Augustine's extramissionist understanding of sensation as an act of the soul.
 22. Bernard of Cluny, quoted in R. H. Cline, 'Heart and Eyes', *Romance Philology*, 25.2 (Nov. 1971): 288.
 23. See Cline ('Heart and Eyes', 285–6) for the relevant passages in the *Patrologia Latina*, with the exception of Gerald of Wales (discussed below) and Peter the Chanter, whose comments on Matt. 5.28, are cited in Baldwin, *Language of Sex*, 118.
 24. Peter Abelard, *Ethics*, quoted in M. Lapidge, 'The Stoic Inheritance', *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*, ed. P. Dronke (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 98. D. E. Luscombe remarks that sin, for Abelard, 'lies neither in being tempted to do nor in doing what is wrong; it lies between these two moments, in consenting to the initial temptation'. 'Peter Abelard', in the same volume, 305.
 25. Lapidge, 'Stoic Inheritance', 90.
 26. Peter Abelard, quoted in Lapidge, 'Stoic Inheritance', 98.
 27. Gerald of Wales, *Jewel of the Church*, 2: 182 (2.16).
 28. See for example Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, 1.490; 2.726f; 3.370f, 413–17; 8.324–7; 14.350f. The influence of the Ovidian theme of love at first sight on medieval literature is widely acknowledged, though Cline points out that this topos is quite distinct from that of the wounding or aggressive gaze. 'Heart and Eyes', 277, 289 ff. John Baldwin discusses the influence of Ovid on Andreas Capellanus's twelfth-century work, *De amore*, in *Language of Sex*, 137–43.
 29. *Eneas: a Twelfth-Century French Romance*, trans. J. A. Yunck (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974), 217. Cline concludes from this passage that *Eneas's* glance wounds Lavine ('Heart and Eyes', 293). This interpretation is not, however, supported by Yunck's translation, in which *Love* is named as the perpetrator of the wounding glance.
 30. As Cline notes ('Heart and Eyes', 276–7), eyes in classical Latin poetry sometimes burn with passion, and in Seneca's *Hippolytus*, Phaedra's eyes cast darts at her love-object. But the eye that wounds another's eye is absent, with the one exception of a scene in Apuleius's *Golden Ass* (10.3).
 31. In Ovid's *Ars amatoria* the narrator is 'skewered' by Love's 'bowshots', and seared by his flaming torch. Ovid, *The Art of Love*, in *The Erotic Poems*, trans. P. Green (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982), 166 (1.21, 22). Additional examples of Cupid's arts are given by Cline, 'Heart and Eyes', 276–7.

32. 'He seized me here at the window from which I was gazing at the Trojan', Lavine recounts in *Eneas*, 216.
33. *Eneas*, 215.
34. Sarah Spence makes the important observation that Lavine's complaints are 'all standard symptoms of the evil eye'. "'Lo Cop Mortal": the Evil Eye and the Origins of Courtly Love', *The Romantic Review*, 87.3 (May 1996): 315. The conclusion she draws from this is that courtly love derives from *invidia*: it serves to codify and thereby defuse envy in a culture characterised by a 'growing [visual] fascination with the world' (307). While I agree that envy and courtly love share the same pathology, it seems more likely that they are in fact two expressions of the same basic emotion: desire. As I argue later in this section, physiological explanations of the evil eye often link it to menstruation, which in turn is held responsible for women's insatiable sexual appetite. Envy, if we follow this line of reasoning, was a malevolent form of lust.
35. *Eneas*, 220.
36. J. Cerquiglini, "'Le Clerc et le Louche": Sociology of an Esthetic', *Poetics Today*, 5.3 (1984): 480, 481 n.6. Andreas Capellanus seems aware of this association between blindness and impotence when he notes that the lover who loses his eye inevitably loses his sweetheart. That is, the loss of an eye results in the loss of love. *De amore*, 2.7.15, cited in Cerquiglini, 482.
37. Cerquiglini, 'Le Clerc et le Louche', 481.
38. Albert the Great (c.1200–80), *Questions on Animals*, 15 Q.14, paraphrased and quoted in Jacquart and Thomasset, *Sexuality and Medicine*, 55–6.
39. Jacquart and Thomasset note that in 'the Middle Ages, the deterioration of the eyesight was constantly being mentioned as part of the damage caused by coitus . . .'. *Sexuality and Medicine*, 56.
40. 'Queritur quare tanta delectatio sit in coitu?' *Prose Salernitan Questions*, B 16, quoted in Jacquart and Thomasset, *Sexuality and Medicine*, 83. See also J. Baldwin's *Language of Sex* for a discussion of this question and related themes, 129 ff.
41. According to Cline, the troubadour Bernard of Ventadorn was the 'first known poet of the West to make the eye . . . an active agent in the cause of love'. 'Heart and Eyes', 289. On 'the painful vision' and related themes in Western medieval love literature, see: Klassen, *Chaucer on Love, Knowledge and Sight*, especially chapter 3: 'The Hostility of Love and Knowledge', 75–114.
42. Plato, *Timaeus*, 62 (13.45).
43. In keeping with classical Greek tradition, Plato's lovers are both male. Plato, *Phaedrus*, in *Phaedrus and the Seventh and Eighth Letters*, trans. W. Hamilton (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973), 57–8 (250–1). For a more detailed treatment of Platonic love and its relation to philosophy, see: G. R. F. Ferrari, 'Platonic Love', in *The Cambridge Companion to Plato*, ed. R. Kraut (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 248–76.
44. Plato, *Phaedrus*, 64 (255).
45. L. K. Donaldson–Evans, *Love's Fatal Glance: a study of Eye Imagery in the Poets of the Ecole Lyonnaise* (Mississippi: Romance Monographs, 1980), 11–14.

46. For examples of the mutual, interlocking gaze in medieval literature, see R. Baldwin, "'Gates Pure and Shining and Serene": Mutual Gazing as an Amatory Motif in Western Literature and Art', *Renaissance and Reformation*, 10 (1986): 23–48. Baldwin argues that the motif of mutual gazing (as distinct from the more violent topos of 'one-sided devastation') is particularly associated with conjugal and Platonic love (23, 27); and as such is found less often in amatory literature than in religious and Neoplatonic texts, as well as in Renaissance conjugal portraiture. The reciprocal gaze of Christ and the soul—identified with the bride and bridegroom of the Song of Songs—is discussed in Chapter 6 of this book.
47. References for these motifs are provided by Cline, 'Heart and Eyes', 267–8, 271–2; and Donaldson-Evans, *Love's Fatal Glance*, 14–16, 18–21.
48. The translation is from A. J. Arberry, *The Seven Odes*, and is quoted in Donaldson-Evans, 26–7.
49. Cline lists the extraordinary range of ocular feats and associated weaponry found in the *Arabian Nights*: the weapon may be 'cast by the eye (1: 177; 2: 1020; 5: 3025), or by the lid (1: 541), or by the lashes (2: 773), or by the eyebrows acting as a bow (4: 2628), and it pierces the bosom (4: 2628; 5: 3025), or heart (1: 568; 2: 782, 1081; 4: 2499, 2628), or core (2: 773, 782), or soul (1: 177), or brain (5: 3025). The eye is powerful, sending the 'dreadful sword-lunge of her look' (2: 864), and has the sharpness of a Yamáni sword (1: 568), or of a thin-ground sword (2: 773), or a keen-edged scymitar (2: 1111; 3: 1615), and it pierces deeper than swords (2: 764). This weapon, however, produces not so much a wound as sickness or death (1: 177, 541; 2: 1135). The vitals are set afire (1: 121; 3: 1615) and the body is weakened (2: 773–6).' Cline, 'Heart and Eyes', 282. All references are to R. F. Burton's translation of *The Book of the Thousand Nights and a Night* (New York: Heritage, 1962).
50. *Arabian Nights*, 2: 200. Quoted in Donaldson-Evans, *Love's Fatal Glance*, 29.
51. Donaldson-Evans, *Love's Fatal Glance*, 21, 29.
52. An introduction to the treatise is provided by D. L. Clark in 'Optics for Preachers: the *De Oculo Morali* by Peter of Limoges', *The Michigan Academician* (Winter 1977). Richard Newhauser discusses its provenance as well as Peter's methods and influences in: 'Nature's Moral Eye: Peter of Limoges' *Tractatus Moralis de Oculo*' in *Man and Nature in the Middle Ages*, ed. S. J. Ridyard and R. G. Benson (Sewanee, TN: University of the South Press, 1995).
53. The basilisk is featured in medieval bestiaries. See, for example, *The Book of Beasts*, ed. White, 168–9. The creature also makes an appearance in the *Etymologies* of Isidore of Seville (c. 560–636) and in the twelfth-century *Prose Salernitan Questions* (B 05–B 08) The earliest known mention of the basilisk is in Pliny's *Natural History* (8.33 and 29.19). Jacquart and Thomasset, *Sexuality and Medicine*, 211 n.81.
54. Peter of Limoges, *De Oculo Morali*, quoted in Clark, 'Optics for Preachers', 342.
55. Heliodorus (fl. 3rd–4th century) confuses the Galenic theory of pneumatic contagion—in which the eyes 'breathe' infected air—with the Platonic idea of libidinous effluxion in which the eyes are the primary organs of transmis-

- sion. The relevant passage from the *Ethiopian History* is quoted in Donaldson-Evans (*Love's Fatal Glance*, 22–3) and Cline ('Heart and Eyes', 274). M. W. Dickie argues that Heliodorus's account of the erotic and maleficent potency of the eye is ironic, and is drawn almost entirely from Plutarch (c. 46–120 CE), a notable exception being Heliodorus's reference to the basilisk. Dickie, 'Heliodorus and Plutarch on the Evil Eye', *Classical Philology*, 86.1 (Jan. 1991): 17–29.
56. See: Deut. 15.9; Job 16.9 ('my adversary sharpens his gaze on me'); Ps. 35.19; Prov. 6.12–14, 10.10, 16.30, 28.22.
 57. B. Kern-Ulmer points to a similar gender asymmetry with respect to the evil eye in ancient and early medieval Rabbinic Judaism. 'The Power of the Evil Eye and the Good Eye in Midrashic Literature', *Judaism*, 159.40.3 (Summer 1991): 347–51. She also cites a number of midrashic texts in which the phenomenon of the destructive female gaze is likened to the maleficent forces accompanying menstruation (350–1).
 58. In *Generation of Animals*, 2.7.747a Aristotle writes: 'For the region about the eyes is, of all the head, the most seminal part . . . The reason is that the nature of the semen is similar to that of the brain, for the material of it is watery (the heat being acquired later): Aristotle is referring here to the watery humours of the eye rather than an efflux or 'ejaculation' of visual spirit. In *On Dreams* (460a), however, he likens ocular 'menstruation' to seminal discharge, implying that both semen and menstrual blood can be emitted through the eyes.
 59. On the 'menstrual' evil eye, see: *Women's Secrets: a Translation of Pseudo-Albertus Magnus's De Secretis Mulierum with Commentaries*, trans. H. Rodniti Lemay (New York: State University of New York Press, 1992), 128–31; and for further references: Jacquart and Thomasset, *Sexuality and Medicine*, 74–5, 191, 212 n.82, 83.
 60. In *On Dreams* (459b) Aristotle claims that 'when women during their menstrual periods look into the mirror, the surface of the mirror becomes a sort of bloodshot cloud . . . The cause is . . . that the eye is not only affected by the air but also has an effect upon it and moves it . . .' Michael Camille reproduces several thirteenth-century illustrations of this phenomenon in 'The Eye in the Text: Vision in the Illuminated Manuscripts of the Latin Aristotle', *Micrologus VI: La Visione e lo Sguardo nel Medio Evo* (Sismel, Edizioni del Galluzzo, 1998), 133, 142. In *De Secretis Mulierum* the infected (menstrual) eye leaves 'a red mark like a vein' on the mirror. *Women's Secrets*, 131.
 61. References are cited in Jacquart and Thomasset, *Sexuality and Medicine*, 74, 212 n.82.
 62. In Part 2 of the *Ancrene Wisse*, for example, Dina and Bathsheba are held up as examples of women whose sin was not in looking at a man, but in allowing themselves to be looked at (23–4). Warning his readers that a woman's beauty is like a pit, the author of the *Ancrene Wisse* writes: 'You uncover this pit, you who do anything by which a man is bodily tempted by you, even though you may be unaware of it' (25).

63. Augustine, *On Genesis, Against the Manichees* (2.18): 'we cannot be tempted by the devil except through that animal part, which reveals, so to speak, the image or exemplification of the woman in the one whole man.' Quoted by Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 2a2æ Q.165.2.
64. In the *Ancrene Wisse* lust, the 'stinking whore, makes war against the lady of chastity, that is, the spouse of God'. Her weapons are the 'glances' she 'shoots . . . from her wanton eyes'. Part 2: 26.
65. *Eneas*, 216–17.
66. *Eneas*, 217.
67. *Eneas*, 216.
68. On the trope of the 'devil's gateway' and similar images of female corporeality, see P. A. Du Bois, "'The Devil's Gateway': Women's Bodies and the Earthly Paradise', *Women's Studies*, 7 (1980): 43–58.
69. Cline, 'Heart and Eyes', 286.
70. The commentary on Jer. 9.21 provided by Origen (c. 185–c. 254) is particularly explicit in this regard: 'We can take the windows as meaning the bodily senses through which life or death gains entrance to the soul; for this is what the prophet Jeremias means when, speaking of sinners, he says: *Death is come up through your windows*. How does death come up through your windows? If the eyes of a sinner should *look upon a woman to lust after her*, and because he who has thus looked upon a woman has committed adultery in his heart, then death has gained entrance to that soul through the windows of the eyes.' Origen, *The Song of Songs, Commentary and Homilies*, quoted in Cline, 'Heart and Eyes', 286.
71. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 72–3 (6.8).
72. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 75 (6.11).
73. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 72 (5.7).
74. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 71 (5.6). References cited in text: Deut. 13.17; 1 Cor 7.31; Ezek. 44.2.
75. For a survey of the literature see M. W. Bloomfield, *The Seven Deadly Sins: an Introduction to the History of a Religious Concept, with Special Reference to Medieval English Literature* (Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1952).
76. Alan of Lille, *Plaint of Nature*, 117–18 (6).
77. Alan of Lille, *Plaint of Nature*, 199 (16).
78. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne remarks that 'the body as figurative edifice [was] an image newly intense and prevalent in late twelfth- and early thirteenth-century culture'. 'Chaste Bodies: Frames and Experiences', *Framing Medieval Bodies*, ed. S. Kay and M. Rubin (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994), 28. For a detailed account of this motif, see R. D. Cornelius, *The Figurative Castle: a study in the Medieval Allegory of the Edifice with Special Reference to Religious Writings* (Pennsylvania: Bryn Mawr, 1930).
79. The text was written in Anglo-French and subsequently translated into Middle English. For a synopsis of the *Chateau d'amour*, see: *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050–1500*, ed. A. E. Hartung (New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1986), 2338–9.

80. Bloomfield, *Seven Deadly Sins*, 141. The Middle English adaptations of Grosseteste's text are listed in *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English*, 2337–8.
81. The *Roman de la Rose* was begun around 1230 by Guillaume de Lorris and completed some fifty years later by Jean de Meun. I have used the translation by F. Horgan: *The Romance of the Rose* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
82. If there is any doubt in the *Rose* that the 'window' in the edifice is really a vagina, it is dispelled in the final, climactic scene. The lover, following Venus's cue, approaches the entrance to the 'sanctuary', and 'full of agility and vigour', proceeds to thrust his 'unshod staff' into the narrow opening. Mindful of the delicate nature of the rose therein, he gently palpitates the bud and, 'prob[ing] its very depths', deposits 'a little seed'. *Romance of the Rose*, 332–4.
83. *Romance of the Rose*, 320. As Camille notes, the 'hole in the wall' metaphor comes from The Song of Songs (5.4): 'My beloved put his hand by the hole in the wall and my bowels were moved at his touch.' *Gothic Idol*, 321.
84. Valencia, Biblioteca de la Universidad, MS 1327 (*Roman de la Rose*), fol. 144r: reproduced, with commentary, in Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 321 (Fig. 172).
85. S. Stanbury, 'The Voyeur and the Private Life in *Troilus and Criseyde*', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*, ed. T. J. Heffernan, 13 (1991): 142.
86. Stanbury, 'Voyeur and the Private Life', 143.
87. *Romance of the Rose*, 26–7.
88. *Romance of the Rose*, 327.
89. This generalised application of the castle metaphor is found, for example, in the *Miserere* of Barthélemy, Recluse of Molliens. Written around 1200, the poem incorporates the five senses, with their respective vices, into the castle metaphor. Bloomfield, *Seven Deadly Sins*, 132.
90. *Ancrene Wisse*, Part 2: 26.
91. *Ancrene Wisse*, Part 2: 26. The following sentences make it clear that the bolts received 'between the eyes' are equivalent to the more conventional wounding of the eye itself. In this instance, the devil's weapons 'blind' the heart through the eyes.
92. I have taken these details from the 'General Introduction' to the *Ancrene Rivle: Introduction and Part I*, ed. and trans. R. W. Ackerman and R. Dahood (Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1984), 16.
93. *Ancrene Wisse*, Part 2: 27, 40.
94. Georgianna, *Solitary Self*, 59. Wogan-Browne argues along the same lines that 'Much of the *Guide's* account of sense experience focuses on entry and impermeability, enclosure and leakage, sealing and opening . . . The recluse's bodily experience in the cell is represented as a constant struggle for regulation of these permeabilities . . . 'Chaste Bodies', 28.
95. *Ancrene Wisse*, Part 2: 23.
96. *Ancrene Wisse*, Part 2, quoted in Georgianna, *Solitary Self*, 65.
97. Georgianna, *Solitary Self*, 72–4.
98. Georgianna, *Solitary Self*, 77.
99. E. A. Kaplan, 'Is the Gaze Male?' in *Women and Film: Both Sides of the Camera* (London: Routledge, 1983), quoted in Stanbury, 'Voyeur and the

- Private Life', 148. Stanbury's understanding of the 'gaze' is informed by the work of a number of feminist film theorists including (in addition to Kaplan): M. A. Doane, L. Mulvey and K. Silverman.
100. In Lacanian psychoanalysis, the identification of the penis (or clitoris) with the phallus is illusory: one is an organ; the other a signifier. See 'The Meaning of the Phallus' in *Feminine Sexuality: Jacques Lacan and the École Freudienne*, ed. J. Mitchell and J. Rose, trans. J. Rose (New York: Norton, 1982), in particular 79–80. There has, however, been some debate (and not a little confusion) over the supposed arbitrariness of the penis–phallus relationship in recent feminist theory. For two contrasting responses to this question, see: E. Grosz, *Jacques Lacan: a Feminist Introduction* (London: Routledge, 1990), 122–6; and E. Ragland-Sullivan, 'Jacques Lacan: Feminism and the Problem of Gender Identity', *Sub-Stance*, 36 (1982): 6–20.
 101. S. Stanbury, 'Feminist Film Theory: Seeing Chrétien's *Enide*', *Literature and Psychology*, 36.4 (1990): 52.
 102. Stanbury, 'Feminist Film Theory', 56.
 103. *Troilus and Criseyde*, 1.304–5, quoted in Stanbury, 'Voyeur and the Private Life', 145.
 104. S. Stanbury, 'The Virgin's Gaze: Spectacle and Transgression in Middle English Lyrics of the Passion', *PMLA*, 106.5 (Oct. 1991), 1084.
 105. Although she focuses on fourteenth- and fifteenth-century sources, Stanbury's argument is equally persuasive in the context of earlier devotional literature and visual art, such as the examples discussed in Chapter 6 of this book.
 106. Stanbury, 'Virgin's Gaze', 1091.
 107. Stanbury defends her use of feminist film theory on the grounds that it provides 'a context within the cultural unconscious for understanding the gaze, and one that can relate the Middle Ages with our own time . . .' 'Feminist Film Theory', 63.

3 Scientific Visions

1. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1.1.980a.
2. David Lindberg discusses the impact and dissemination of Bacon's optical theories in *Theories of Vision from Al-Kindi to Kepler* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), 116–22.
3. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 419 (5.1.1.1). The *Perspectiva*, for which this passage serves as an introduction, was disseminated both as Part 5 of Bacon's *Opus majus*, and as a separate text. There are 36 surviving manuscript copies of the text. Lindberg, *Theories of Vision*, 120.
4. See for example Jay, *Downcast Eyes*, 38, 44.
5. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 420 (5.1.1.1).
6. As with any such generalisation, the polarisation of scholastic philosophy into Augustinian and Aristotelian traditions has attracted due criticism. For an overview of the issue, see F. C. Copleston, *A History of Medieval Philosophy* (London: Methuen, 1972), 156–9.

7. H. Blumenberg, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, trans. R. M. Wallace (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983), 336.
8. Augustine, *Confessions* (Fathers of the Church 21), 311 (10.35.54). The Biblical reference is to 1 John 2.16: 'For all that is in the world—the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life—is not of the Father but is of the world.' The 'lust for experience' is also mentioned by Augustine in *The Trinity*, 357 (12.10.15).
9. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 359 (12.12.17).
10. Madeline Caviness makes a convincing case that the philosophical (specifically Aristotelian) interest in the natural world during this period flowed through into the visual arts in the form of pictorial naturalism, albeit without stylistic consistency. As she points out, Grosseteste's conviction (voiced in his Oxford lectures during the 1230s) that the study of optics could provide insight into the creation and workings of the natural world had significant implications for art as well as science. It effectively 'banished the profane from scientific observation'. M. H. Caviness, "'The Simple Perception of Matter" and the Representation of Narrative, ca. 1180–1280', *Gesta*, 30.1 (1991): 59.
11. *Omnis scientia bona est* is Thomas Aquinas's rendering of Aristotle's introduction to the *Metaphysics* (1.1.980a). The quotation is from Aquinas, *In Aristotelis librum de anima commentarium*, 1.1.3, cited in full in Blumenberg, *Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, 635 n.15.
12. Augustine's debt to Neoplatonism is evident in his privileging of transcendental Being (visible only to the 'inner' man) over the outward, bodily gaze at a world in perpetual flux: the realm of Becoming.
13. J. Owens, 'Faith, Ideas, Illumination, and Experience', *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100–1600*, ed. N. Kretzmann, et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 444. It is a testimony to the abiding influence of Augustinian and Neoplatonic thought that most medieval philosophers retained some version of Platonic Ideas and insisted on the necessary role of divine illumination for intellectual knowledge. For a survey of these theories in the later Middle Ages, see Owens.
14. Blumenberg discusses Siger of Brabant's formulation of this principle in *Legitimacy of the Modern Age*, 337–8.
15. Blumenberg illustrates the transition from early to high scholasticism through Albert the Great (c. 1200–80) and Thomas Aquinas (c. 1225–74). It is arguable, however, that Grosseteste is a more appropriate transitional figure, not least of all because his commentary on Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* predates Blumenberg's examples.
16. Lindberg, *Theories of Vision*, 94.
17. C. Burnett, 'Scientific Speculations', *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*, ed. P. Dronke (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) 154. C. Riedl identifies Grosseteste with the beginnings of 'a new tradition, characterized by the blending of philosophy with experimental science'. 'Introduction' to Grosseteste's *On Light*, 2. On Grosseteste's contribution to early modern science, see also Southern, *Robert Grosseteste*, 150; A. C.

- Crombie, *Robert Grosseteste and the Origins of Experimental Science 1100–1700* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1953), 43; and B. Eastwood, ‘Medieval Empiricism: the Case of Grosseteste’s Optics’, *Speculum*, 43 (1968), 306.
18. On James of Venice see the *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, ed. C. C. Gillispie (New York: Scribner, 1973), vol. 7: 65–7.
 19. The dating of Grosseteste’s commentary on the *Posterior Analytics* is discussed by Southern; 1220–5 is his assessment. *Robert Grosseteste*, 131–2, 150–5. See also S. P. Marrone, *William of Auvergne and Robert Grosseteste: New Ideas of Truth in the Early Thirteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983).
 20. ‘So from perception there comes memory . . . and from memory, experience . . . And from experience . . . there comes a principle of skill and of understanding . . .’ Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 2.19.100a.
 21. Grosseteste, *Commentary on the Posterior Analytics*, quoted in Crombie, *Robert Grosseteste*, 73.
 22. Grosseteste, *Commentary on the Posterior Analytics*, quoted in Crombie, *Robert Grosseteste*, 73.
 23. Grosseteste, *Commentary on the Posterior Analytics*, quoted in Crombie, *Robert Grosseteste*, 73.
 24. On the etymological equation of seeing and knowing in Indo-European languages, see S. A. Tyler, ‘The Vision Quest in the West, or What the Mind’s Eye Sees’, *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 40 (1984): 23–40. Tyler notes that in Dravidian languages, in contrast to Indo-European, words for thinking and knowing are not dominated by visual tropes, but employ a range of sensory metaphors in addition to kinaesthetic, verbal and emotive tropes (the latter including ‘desire’, ‘intention’, ‘hope’, and ‘wish’), 34–5.
 25. Whereas thinking as seeing is mimetic, Tyler maintains that an equally ancient tradition of kinetic tropes configures thinking as ‘knowing how’. Examples of the latter include the English ‘can’ and ‘know’ (from IE *gana*, ‘be able’). ‘Vision Quest in the West’, 33.
 26. See, for example, Crombie, *Robert Grosseteste*, 116; Lindberg, *Theories of Vision*, 99; and S. L. Goldman, ‘On the Interpretation of Symbols and the Christian Origins of Modern Science’, *The Journal of Religion*, 62.1 (Jan. 1982): 6.
 27. For Evelyn Fox Keller and Christine Grontkowski, Western science and epistemology have developed according to the principle that ‘Vision connects us to truth as it distances us from the corporeal.’ ‘The Mind’s Eye’, *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science*, ed. S. Harding and M. B. Hintikka (Dordrecht, Neth.: Reidel, 1983), 209. While their observation certainly holds true for the geometrical strand of medieval optics, and the theological polarisation of sight into carnal and spiritual vision, it is by no means universally applicable. Chapters 4 and 6 of this book demonstrate an intimate relationship between ‘truth’ (scientific and divine respectively), and the corporeality of vision.
 28. On the Platonic origins of this association, and its implications for modern science, see Keller and Grontkowski, ‘The Mind’s Eye’, 210–17.
 29. There is some controversy over the dating of this text. The date I have given is proposed by Southern, *Robert Grosseteste*, 137–9.

30. Grosseteste, *On Light*, 10–11. On Grosseteste's Platonic and Neoplatonic sources see Lindberg, *Theories of Vision*, 95–8.
31. Crombie, *Robert Grosseteste*, 106. This point is clarified in Grosseteste's *De motu corporali et luce*, quoted by Crombie (107): 'I hold that the first form of a body is the first corporeal mover . . . when light generates itself in one direction drawing matter with it, it produces local motion (*motus localis*); and when the light within matter is sent out and what is outside is sent in, it produces qualitative change (*alteratio*). In other words, light effects movement (as a force external to bodies), and change (when light is incorporated with matter).
32. Lindberg identifies four strands in Grosseteste's philosophy of light: an epistemology of light, a metaphysics (or cosmogony) of light, a physics of light, and a theology of light. *Theories of Vision*, 95–8.
33. In his *Hexameron*, Grosseteste develops the theological significance of the 'first corporeal form' by differentiating between the first light of Genesis (1.3) and the secondary creation (three days later) of the sun and stars (1.14–15). As Riedl explains, the same distinction seems to be denoted, in Grosseteste's *On Light* by the terms *lux* and *lumen*, where '*lux* is light in its source', and '*lumen* is reflected or radiated light'. Riedl, 'Introduction' to *On Light*, 5. It should be noted, however, that the terms *lux* and *lumen* were not used consistently by medieval writers, and that a further distinction was often made between God as light (*lux*), and corporeal light (rendered either as *lux* or *lumen*). See Crombie, *Robert Grosseteste*, 104–16, 131.
34. D. C. Lindberg, *Studies in the History of Medieval Optics* (London: Variorum Reprints, 1983) 338–9, 349–54. Pecham's *Perspectiva Communis* (probably written between 1277 and 1279) is available in a critical edition and English translation by Lindberg, *John Pecham and the Science of Optics* (Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970). Witelo's *Perspectiva* was written some time after 1270. Although the text was printed several times in the sixteenth century (as well as surviving in 19 mss copies), there is no complete modern edition. See the entry in the *Dictionary of Scientific Biography* for a bibliography of commentaries.
35. Lindberg, *Studies in the History of Medieval Optics*, 354.
36. Lindberg, *Theories of Vision*, 99.
37. Grosseteste, *De lineis, angulis, et figuris*, quoted in Crombie, *Robert Grosseteste*, 110.
38. Goldman, 'Interpretation of Symbols', 1. Goldman points out that the equation of mathematical models with natural phenomena remained largely unchallenged until the scientific relativism associated with quantum mechanics.
39. P. A. Heelan, *Space-Perception and the Philosophy of Science* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), 157. In applying Heelan's schema to Grosseteste's philosophy of light, I am tacitly disagreeing with his assessment that modern science has its origins in fifteenth-century perspectivism (158).
40. Barthes claims that the 'reality effect' is pervasive in contemporary Western culture, citing as examples: the realist novel, the diary, the documentary, news

media, historical discourse and photography. The effect, he explains, is based on a confusion of meaning or interpretation (the signified) and the referent, so that the signifier seems to be a direct representation of the Real. R. Barthes, 'Historical Discourse' (1967) in *Introduction to Structuralism*, ed. M. Lane (New York: Basic, 1970), 154. Although he is concerned here with verbal and pictorial signifiers, Barthes's analysis of the reality principle is equally applicable to mathematical languages.

41. Barthes, 'Historical Discourse', 154.
42. See, for example, Bacon, *Opus majus*, 1: 232 (4.4.16).
43. Goldman contrasts this tendency to interpret metaphors and symbols ontologically with the 'intensely aniconic, deliberately nonpictorial, and consequently positivistic attitude toward metaphors and symbols in the contemporary [medieval and Renaissance] Judaic thought'. 'Interpretation of Symbols', 2.
44. Goldman, 'Interpretation of Symbols', 10.
45. Goldman notes the correlation between Panofsky's reading of Renaissance perspective as 'symbolic form' and the mathematical 'symbolism' of medieval optics. 'Interpretation of Symbols', 9.
46. Lindberg, *Theories of Vision*, 94.
47. *De lineis, angulis, et figuris*, quoted in Crombie, *Robert Grosseteste*, 110.
48. Crombie, *Robert Grosseteste*, 115.
49. For standard formulations of the nobility of sight (and a critique of Vasco Ronchi's contention that vision was regarded with deep suspicion in the Middle Ages), see: D. Lindberg and N. H. Steneck, 'The Sense of Vision and the Origins of Modern Science', *Studies in the History of Medieval Optics*, 29–45. Pouchelle discusses the nobility of the eye (and other 'noble' organs, including the lips and penis) in relation to the social metaphor of the body's 'offices'. *Body and Surgery*, 119.
50. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 316 (11.1.1). Augustine is not referring to the scientific value of sight, but rather to the fact that the Creator is visible (by analogy) in the creation. Note, however, that the expression 'spiritual vision' in this passage is synonymous with 'intellectual' vision or the sight of the mind.
51. Grosseteste, *On Light*, 10.
52. Grosseteste, *On Light*, 16.
53. D. E. Sharp, *Franciscan Philosophy at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century* (New York: Russell, 1964), 28. Sharp likens this mediating function of *lux* in Grosseteste's work to the modern concept of ether (22–3); as well as the *pneuma* (fiery 'breath' or spirit) of the Neoplatonists, and the medical theory of 'animal spirits' (28).
54. Aristotle uses the sailor–ship analogy in *On the Soul*, 2.1.413a to illustrate the relationship between the soul (the sailor) and the body.
55. Grosseteste, *De iride*, quoted in Lindberg, *Theories of Vision*, 100. In the same text Grosseteste repeats Aristotle's analogy of water issuing from a pipe to describe the operation of vision, hearing and smell (101). However, as Lindberg points out, Grosseteste's appeal to Aristotle in defence of the theory of ex-transmission is based on a mistranslation (250, n.79).

56. Lindberg includes Grosseteste's subsequent remarks on the extramission–intromission controversy, observing that while Grosseteste defends the Platonic theory of fiery 'visual species', he does not reject the doctrine of intromission which he regards as incomplete rather than wrong. *Theories of Vision*, 100–1.
57. *Sollertia* generally refers to intellectual dexterity: cleverness, acumen, skill, ingenuity. Interestingly, the term is synonymous with *subtilitas*, one of the gifts Grosseteste ascribed to the bodies of the blessed (see Chapter 1).
58. Grosseteste, *Commentary on the Posterior Analytics*, quoted in Southern, *Robert Grosseteste*, 168.
59. John Wyclif (c.1328–84), *Sermones*, quoted in H. Phillips, 'John Wyclif and the Optics of the Eucharist', *From Ockham to Wyclif*, ed. A. Hudson and M. Wilks (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987), 247. Wyclif would have been familiar with the optical writings of Alhazen and Witelo from his studies at Oxford; and Phillips considers Roger Bacon a likely source for the text I have quoted from.
60. M. J. Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: a Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 27.
61. Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, 78, 94.
62. Thomas Bradwardine (d. 1349, shortly after becoming Archbishop of Canterbury). 'De Memoria Artificiali', trans. and quoted by Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, Appendix C, 281.
63. K. H. Tachau, *Vision and Certitude in the Age of Ockham: Optics, Epistemology and the Foundations of Semantics 1250–1345* (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 25–6.
64. As Lindberg observes, Bacon 'lifts Grosseteste's physics of light . . . out of its metaphysical and cosmogonical context and develops it into a comprehensive doctrine of physical causation'. D. C. Lindberg, *Roger Bacon's Philosophy of Nature: a Critical Edition, with English Translation, Introduction, and Notes, of De multiplicatione specierum and De speculis comburentibus* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983), liv.
65. Like Grosseteste, Bacon studied at Oxford and Paris, and joined the Franciscan Order upon returning to Oxford, probably in 1257. Unlike his predecessor, whose career was furthered by his religious association, Bacon suffered censorship by the Order, and may eventually have been imprisoned on the grounds of propagating 'suspected novelties'. Lindberg, *Roger Bacon's Philosophy of Nature*, xvi–xxvi.
66. On thirteenth-century optical sources generally, and their incorporation into the Baconian synthesis, see Lindberg, 'The Optical Synthesis of the Thirteenth Century', *Theories of Vision*, 104–21.
67. On Alhazen's life, works and extensive influence on the development of optics in the West, see: Lindberg, 'Alhazen and the New Intromission Theory of Vision', *Theories of Vision*, 58–86. Bacon's debt to Alhazen is covered in Chapter 6 of the same volume, pages 109–16.
68. Epicurus, 'Letter to Herodotus' in Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, trans. R. D. Hicks, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 2: 577–9 (10.48–9).

69. Lindberg, *Studies in the History of Medieval Optics*, 340. For Aristotle's theory of vision, see: *On the Soul*, 2.5.418a–2.7.419a; and *Sense and Sensibilia*, 1.437a–3.439b.
70. Lindberg, *Studies in the History of Medieval Optics*, 340.
71. On Bacon's sources, see: Lindberg, *Theories of Vision*, 104–16; and Lindberg, *Roger Bacon's Philosophy of Nature*, xxxv–liv.
72. Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 2.19.99b.
73. Lindberg (citing Pierre Michaud-Quantin), *Roger Bacon's Philosophy of Nature*, liv.
74. 'For the species of the body, which is perceived, produces the species which arises in the sense of the percipient; this latter gives rise to the species in the memory; finally, the species in the memory produces the species which arises in the gaze of thought.' Augustine, *The Trinity*, 11.9.16, quoted in Lindberg, *Roger Bacon's Philosophy of Nature*, lv. Lindberg observes, however, that Augustine's understanding of species is primarily psychological: there is no attempt to account for sensation and thought in terms of physical causation.
75. Augustine, *Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 2: 199 (12.16).
76. Lindberg, *Roger Bacon's Philosophy of Nature*, lv.
77. The synonyms omitted from my list are: 'intention', 'passion' (discussed in Chapter 4), and the 'shadow of the philosophers'. The latter refers to the fact that species are not generally visible in the medium; thus although species conform to the properties of light, they are figurative 'shadows' whose operation can be discerned only by 'skilful philosophers'. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 3–5 (1.1).
78. As Heelan notes, perspectivism (artistic or scientific) rests on precisely this premise that 'reality is pictorial'. *Space-Perception*, 102.
79. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 179 (3.1)
80. See *On the Soul*, 2.5.418a–2.7.419a; *Sense and Sensibilia*, 2.438b.
81. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 490 (5.1.9.4).
82. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 45 (1.3). On the seal and wax metaphor, see Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, 16–32, 55–7.
83. Bacon, *De signis*, quoted in T. S. Maloney, 'The Semiotics of Roger Bacon', *Mediaeval Studies*, 45 (1983): 142. Bacon makes a further basic distinction between natural signs that signify by rational inference, connotation or analogy, and signs that so resemble their significates that they are immediately recognised. The latter group include 'images, pictures, likenesses, things that are similar, and the species of colors, tastes, sounds, and all substances and accidents' (Bacon, quoted in Maloney, 134). While words are generally natural signs by *inference*, because their meaning is inferred from the species of things, the species themselves are signs by *resemblance*. This applies not only to sense impressions but to concepts derived from extramental objects (130–6).
84. Tachau, *Vision and Certitude*, 18.
85. 'Mathematics is an abstractive science considering things [forms] existing in matter, but without the matter.' Domingo Gundisalvo (or Gundissalinus)

- (fl. 1140), 'Classification of the Sciences', trans. M. Clagett and E. Grant, in *A Source Book in Medieval Science*, ed. E. Grant (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974), 65. Hugh of St Victor (d. 1141) writes similarly that mathematics 'is the branch of theoretical knowledge "which considers abstract quantity. Now quantity is called abstract when, intellectually separating it from matter or from other accidents, we treat of it as equal, unequal, and the like, in our reasoning alone"—a separation which it receives only in the domain of mathematics and not in nature.' He is quoting here from Cassiodorus's *Introduction to Divine and Human Readings*. Hugh of St Victor's 'Classification of the Sciences', trans. J. Taylor, in *A Source Book in Medieval Science*, 55.
86. Gundisalvo, 'Classification of the Sciences', 66.
 87. Gundisalvo, 'Classification of the Sciences', 65.
 88. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 93 (2.1).
 89. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 93–5 (2.1). A full account of these 'paths' is given on pages 97–103 (2.2). That species are able to deviate from these principles of direct radiation, reflection and refraction according to the 'soul's needs' refers to the transmission of species along the 'twisting path' of the nervous system. 103 (2.2); Bacon, *Opus majus*, 1: 136 (4.2.2).
 90. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 1: 136–8 (4.2.3).
 91. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 454–5 (5.1.6.1).
 92. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 454 (5.1.6.1).
 93. Magnitude, Bacon explains, is discerned from the angle of the visual pyramid at its apex, in addition to a judgement of the pyramid's depth from the scale of intervening objects. The perception of distance is thus aided by memory and association. *Opus majus*, 2: 530–2 (5.2.3.5). Peter of John Olivi, who probably met Bacon in Paris in the late 1260s, rejected this account of distance perception. His critique of Bacon's perspectivism is discussed in Tachau, *Vision and Certitude*, 39ff. On the infinite divisibility of quantity, and hence the eye's ability to apprehend very large objects, see *Opus majus*, 2: 455–6 (5.1.6.1).
 94. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 456–8 (5.1.6.2).
 95. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 471 (5.1.7.4).
 96. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 471 (5.1.7.4).
 97. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 471 (5.1.7.4).
 98. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 471 (5.1.7.4).
 99. Tachau, *Vision and Certitude*, 130.
 100. William of Ockham, *Opera Theologica*, 5, quoted in Tachau, *Vision and Certitude*, 130.
 101. The continuing currency of causal, physical models of sight is evidenced in Bartholomæus Anglicus's Latin encyclopedia, *De proprietatibus rerum* (On the Properties of Things), compiled in c.1230–c.1240. By the end of the fourteenth century the text had been translated into French and English. John Trevisa's translation (extant in eight manuscripts) has been edited by M. C. Seymour et al. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1975). See Book 3.17: 'De sensu visus', 108–13.

102. K. H. Tachau, 'The Problem of the *Species in Medio* at Oxford in the Generation after Ockham', *Mediaeval Studies*, 44 (1982): 395.
103. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 103 (2.2).
104. In his effort to synthesise a number of sources, Bacon's description is not particularly clear. Immediately after this account he notes that some authors differentiate between six coats (posterior and anterior of three membranes), then settles on tripartite division consisting of the consolidativa, the cornea, and the uvea, thus treating the retina merely as the other side of the uvea and not as a separate membrane. *Opus majus*, 2: 434 (5.1.2.2). I have used his initial schema because it is closer to the modern anatomy of the eye.
105. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 432–5 (5.1.2.2–3).
106. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 436 (5.1.3.1).
107. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 440–1 (5.1.3.3).
108. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 103 (2.2).
109. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 103 (2.2).
110. On the significance of this conception of space, see E. Grant, *Much Ado About Nothing: Theories of Space and Vacuum from the Middle Ages to the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), especially chapter 4: 'Nature's Abhorrence of a Vacuum', 67–100.
111. Bacon qualifies this point, insisting that the 'marrow-like substance of the brain' is only 'the container and storehouse of the sensitive faculties, containing slender nerves in which sense and sensible forms are located'. *Opus majus*, 2: 428 (5.1.1.5). While this would seem to be an attempt to minimise the materiality of the internal senses, Bacon's use of humoral theory to account for the receptive and retentive functions of these senses suggests that the brain was not merely a series of hollow cavities, but a potent receptacle. It will be argued in the next chapter that this conception of the brain as a receptacle is analogous to the medieval understanding of the womb as both the container and material substance for the foetus.
112. In assigning cognitive functions to the internal senses as well as to the intellect, Bacon is following a precedent set by Aristotle and Avicenna. Tachau, *Vision and Certitude*, 10.
113. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 421 (5.1.1.2).
114. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 422 (5.1.1.2).
115. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 422 (5.1.1.2).
116. Bacon lists the following general properties in addition to the 'special properties' perceived by the individual senses: distance, position, figure, magnitude, continuity, discreteness or separation, number, motion, rest, roughness, smoothness, transparency, thickness, shadow, darkness, beauty, ugliness, similarity and difference. *Opus majus*, 2: 423 (5.1.1.3).
117. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 425 (5.1.1.3).
118. Thomas Aquinas, *Commentary on Aristotle's De anima*, trans. K. Foster and S. Humphries (London: Routledge, 1951), Lectio 14 on Bk II, par. 417.
119. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 426 (5.1.1.3).
120. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 426 (5.1.1.3).
121. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 426 (5.1.1.3).

122. Tachau, *Vision and Certitude*, 34, n.20. On the historical specificity of the mind–body question, see also: W. I. Matson, ‘Why Isn’t the Mind–Body Problem Ancient?’ *Mind, Matter and Method: Essays in Philosophy and Science in Honor of Herbert Feigl*, ed. P. K. Feyerabend and G. Maxwell (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966) 92–102; and H. Putnam, ‘How Old is the Mind?’ *Words and Life*, ed. J. Conant (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 3–21.
123. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 1: 43–5 (2.5). Z. Kuksewicz outlines the major positions on this issue, including the variations within Bacon’s writings, in ‘The Potential and the Agent Intellect’, *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100–1600*, ed. N. Kretzmann et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 595–601.
124. ‘. . . species causes every action in this world; for it acts on sense, on intellect, and all the matter in the world for the production of things, because one and the same thing is done by a natural agent on whatsoever it acts, because it has no freedom of choice . . .’ Bacon, *Opus majus*, 1: 130 (4.2.1).
125. Olivi raised this issue of free will in his critique of perspectivism. Tachau, *Vision and Certitude*, 40.
126. Kuksewicz notes that Bacon’s treatment of the intellect can be divided into three distinct phases. The last, of which the *Opus majus* is representative, forms the basis of this discussion. ‘Potential and Agent Intellect’, 599–600.
127. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 1: 45 (2.5).
128. Bacon comments that the active intellect ‘knows all things’. *Opus majus*, 1: 44 (2.5).
129. Owens, ‘Faith, Ideas, Illumination and Experience’, 449.

4 The Optical Body

1. Plotinus, *Enneads*, 4.3.8, quoted in M. Miles, ‘Vision: the Eye of the Body and the Eye of the Mind in Saint Augustine’s *De Trinitate* and *Confessions*’, *The Journal of Religion*, 63.2 (Apr. 1983), 129 n.14.
2. I am using the term ‘objective’ here in the sense that both extramental objects and their sensory and mental simulacra were assumed to have real (and material) existence independent of the operations of an immaterial intellect.
3. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 468 (5.1.7.2): ‘It is clear . . . that a species is produced by vision just as by other things, because accidental qualities and substances inferior to vision are able to produce their own forces; much more therefore has vision this power.’
4. Bacon also describes this visual force as the ‘species of the eye’, and in more Platonic language, as ‘visual rays’. *Opus majus*, 2: 468 (5.1.7.2).
5. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 470 (5.1.7.3).
6. Much of Merleau–Ponty’s argument in the *Phenomenology of Perception* takes the form of a dialectical interrogation of intellectualism and empiricism. His version of a synthesis is most fully worked out in *The Visible and the Invisible*.
7. Merleau–Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, 15.

8. Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, 40.
9. Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, 29. Lacan comments similarly on the ‘disconcerting’ awareness that ‘. . . I see outside, that perception is not in me, that it is on the objects that it apprehends’. Yet at the same time, ‘as soon as I perceive, my representations belong to me’. ‘Anamorphosis’, *Four Fundamental Concepts*, 80–1.
10. ‘Perceptual faith’ is Merleau-Ponty’s expression. See *The Visible and the Invisible*, especially pages 3–14.
11. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 468, 470 (5.1.7.2–3); *De multiplicatione specierum*, 33 (1.2).
12. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 470 (5.1.7.4). For Plato’s theory of vision, see: Plato, *The Republic*, trans. H. D. P. Lee (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1955), 272–3 (7.5.508–9); and *Timaeus*, 62–4 (13).
13. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 471 (5.1.7.4).
14. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 471 (5.1.7.4). He adds that ‘the species of the eye is the species of an animate substance, in which the force of the soul holds sway, and therefore it bears no comparison to the species of an inanimate thing . . .’ (472). Presumably when one sees a reflected image of one’s own eyes, their visible species (light and colour) are of the same inanimate category as any other object. In contrast, the species of *vision*, which passes *through* the pupil and not from the eye as a whole, is not itself visible.
15. Jay, *Downcast Eyes*, 30. Gadamer’s comments refer specifically to the Greek concept of *theoria*. Jay suggests that ‘Residues of such reciprocity in the notion of theory may well in fact have persisted until the late Middle Ages, when belief in extramission was finally laid to rest.’ *Downcast Eyes*, 31.
16. For Lacan, the incident with the sardine can (*‘You see that can? Do you see it? Well, it doesn’t see you.’*) suggested an impersonal, disembodied power of vision, entirely external to the subject: what he calls the ‘gaze’. ‘The Line and the Light’, *Four Fundamental Concepts*, 95–6.
17. Brennan, ‘Contexts of Vision’, 219.
18. Brennan, ‘Contexts of Vision’, 219–24. It is important to stress, however, that the dominant late medieval understanding of vision—represented here by Bacon—held (however contradictorily) that sight was both active and passive, and both in a physical sense. I would therefore disagree with Brennan’s claim that the proponents of extramission regarded sight as purely active (223). Certainly, the eye is both vulnerable/receptive and aggressive/penetrating in the literature of courtly love.
19. Brennan, ‘Contexts of Vision’, 219. A notable exception is Merleau-Ponty’s attempt re-think this division through the ‘elemental’ (as opposed to psychological or physical) medium of ‘flesh’. The result is a carnal/perceptual ‘intertwining’ of self and world that resists resolution into the traditional binaries of active and passive, subject and object, mind (or intellect) and body. *The Visible and the Invisible*, in particular Chapter 4: ‘The Intertwining—the Chiasm’, 130–55.
20. Crombie, *Robert Grosseteste*, 152.

21. I noted in Chapter 3 that the 'mind-body' problem is a modern one. For Bacon and his contemporaries the mind and soul were embodied, a point I will return to later in this chapter.
22. For another critique of this widespread assumption, see Margaret Miles's commentary on Augustine's theory of vision in 'Vision'. She points out that for Augustine, physical contact and emotional engagement were standard features of vision: 'The ray theory of vision specifically insisted on the connection and essential continuity of viewer and object in the act of vision' (127).
23. Grosz, *Jacques Lacan*, 38. Grosz makes this observation in the context of a discussion of Lacan's 'mirror stage'. The recurrence of this theme in contemporary French thought is treated at length by Martin Jay in *Downcast Eyes*.
24. Jay discusses a number of such interpretations of perspectivism in *Downcast Eyes*, 53ff.
25. To cite just one example, in 'Mind's Eye' (221) Keller and Grontkowski speculate about forms of knowledge based on auditory or tactile metaphors rather than visual ones. In order to underscore the need to re-think the metaphorical foundations of modern epistemology, they quote G. N. A. Vesey's definition of 'vision' from *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (8: 252): 'We can imagine a disembodied mind having visual experiences but not tactile ones. Sight does not require our being part of the material world in the way in which feeling by touching does.' Bacon would surely disagree, as I argue later in this chapter.
26. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 471 (5.1.7.4).
27. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 474 (5.1.8.1).
28. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 474 (5.1.8.1). Bacon's source here is Aristotle's *On the Soul*, 2.11.423a-424a.
29. Such a distinction between sight and touch leads Irigaray to argue that Western ocularcentrism and phallogentrism are inter-implicated, and as such that 'the predominance of the visual, and of the discrimination and individualization of form, is particularly foreign to female eroticism'. 'Woman', she concludes, 'takes pleasure more from touching than from looking . . .' L. Irigaray, *This Sex Which Is Not One*, trans. C. Porter and C. Burke (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), 25-6.
30. Roger Caillois, for example, described psychosis as an inability to remain comfortably 'inside' one's skin: 'the body separates itself from thought, the individual breaks the boundary of his skin and occupies the other side of his senses.' Quoted in E. Grosz, *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism* (Sydney: Allen, 1994), 47. Grosz also discusses more familiar blurrings of the body's borders on pages 79ff. Julia Kristeva's treatment of the skin as 'the essential if not initial boundary of biological and psychic individuation' similarly emphasises permeability rather than the delineation of a fixed and impregnable border. *Powers of Horror: an Essay on Abjection*, trans. L. S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982), 101. See also pages 69-70.

31. G. Didi-Huberman, 'The Figurative Incarnation of the Sentence (Notes on the "Autographic" Skin)', *Journal, The Los Angeles Institute of Contemporary Art* (Spring 1987), 68.
32. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 474 (5.1.8.1).
33. Aristotle, *On the Soul*, 2.11.423a. Aristotle does go on to say that touch and taste are peculiar in that the organ of sense and the medium are not clearly delineated, whereas in vision, hearing and smell they are distinct. His comparison of tactility and sight, however, suggests that the distinction is not so clear after all. For our purposes, Bacon's separation of the senses retains this ambiguity.
34. Galen, *On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato*, ed. and trans. P. de Lacy, 2nd ed., 2 vols (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1984), 2: 461 (7.5.32–41). For a commentary on Galen's theory of sight, see R. E. Siegel, *Galen on Sense Perception* (Basel: Karger, 1970).
35. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 471 (5.1.7.4). See also 'Moral Philosophy', *Opus majus*, 2: 756 (7.3.18): 'When the mind following its senses has with their aid extended itself to external objects, it should be master of them and of itself.'
36. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 449 (5.1.5.1).
37. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 440 (5.1.3.3); 2: 468 (5.1.7.2).
38. Plotinus (working from an extramissionist position) observes that in 'any perception we attain by sight, the object is grasped there where it lies in the direct line of vision; it is there that we attack it; there, then, that the perception is formed; *the mind looks outward . . .*' (emphasis added). Plotinus, *The Enneads*, trans. Stephen MacKenna, 4th ed. (London: Faber, 1969), 338 (4.6.1).
39. Keller and Grontkowski, 'Mind's Eye', 209.
40. Keller and Grontkowski, 'Mind's Eye', 209.
41. Keller and Grontkowski, 'Mind's Eye', 220.
42. Keller and Grontkowski, 'Mind's Eye', 209–13.
43. Grosseteste, for example, likens the species emitted by the eye to the sun's rays. The relevant passage is quoted and discussed in Chapter 3.
44. Keller and Grontkowski, 'Mind's Eye', 212.
45. Keller and Grontkowski, 'Mind's Eye', 220.
46. Keller and Grontkowski, 'Mind's Eye', 220.
47. Keller and Grontkowski, 'Mind's Eye', 220.
48. 'In Plato's understanding incorporeality and communion were not in conflict.' Keller and Grontkowski, 'Mind's Eye', 213.
49. Keller and Grontkowski, 'Mind's Eye', 213.
50. Vesey, quoted in Keller and Grontkowski, 'Mind's Eye', 221.
51. This chronological leap from Plato to the seventeenth century is made on page 213.
52. For Lacan's account of the mirror stage, see Jacques Lacan, 'The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the *I* as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience' (1949), *Écrits: a Selection*, trans. A. Sheridan (London: Tavistock, 1977), 1–7. In addition to this source, my synopsis and discussion draw on: J. Gallop, *Reading Lacan* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), especially chapter 3; E. Grosz, *Jacques Lacan*; and M. Jay, *Downcast Eyes* (chapter 6).

53. As Gallop notes, Lacan's mirror stage is not an empirical account of early childhood. It is, rather, a retroactive 'phantasy'. Concurring with Laplanche and Pontalis (*The Language of Psychoanalysis*), she argues: 'What appears to precede the mirror stage is simply a projection or a reflection. There is nothing on the other side of the mirror.' *Reading Lacan*, 80.
54. Lacan, 'Mirror Stage', 1.
55. Lacan, 'Mirror Stage', 2, 4.
56. Thus, 'the specular image is a totalized, complete, external image—a *gestalt*—of the subject, the subject as seen from outside; the visual *gestalt* is in conflict with the child's fragmentary, disorganized felt reality . . .' Grosz, *Jacques Lacan*, 48. See Lacan, 'Mirror Stage', 2.
57. Grosz, *Jacques Lacan*, 37, 42.
58. Grosz, *Jacques Lacan*, 42.
59. Grosz is referring here to Jean-Paul Sartre's comments on vision in *Being and Nothingness*. Grosz, *Jacques Lacan*, 38.
60. Lacan, 'Mirror Stage', 2–3.
61. Similarly, Grosz distinguishes between the child's 'psychic' and 'neuro-physiological' images of self, others and world. It is through the internalisation of its *visible* 'self' that the child gains a (psychic) 'self-image' as well as an 'understanding of space, distance, and position'. *Jacques Lacan*, 32. Lacan's comments on the relationship between the gaze, the eye and light are too complicated to go into here. See chapters 6–9 of *Four Fundamental Concepts*; and for a commentary on these seminars: Jay, *Downcast Eyes*, 357–70; and K. Silverman, 'Fassbinder and Lacan: a Reconsideration of Gaze, Look and Image', *Camera Obscura*, 19 (Jan. 1989): 54–85.
62. Tachau, 'Species in Medio', 443.
63. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 445–6 (5.1.4.2).
64. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 7 (1.1).
65. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 19–21 (1.1). His source is Aristotle, *On the Soul*, 2.2.413b.
66. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 322 (11.2.5). Augustine claims that 'numerous examples' of this phenomenon can be found in nature, and recalls the story (Gen. 30.37–41) in which Jacob places wooden rods of different hues in his watering troughs so that the offspring of his sheep and goats will be coloured accordingly.
67. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 7 (1.1). For Aristotle's explanation of this process, see: *On the Soul*, 2.5.416b, 418a.
68. H. Putnam and M. C. Nussbaum, 'Changing Aristotle's Mind', *Words and Life*, ed. J. Conant (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), 32–42. For Aristotle's theory of perception and emotion as bodily functions, see: *On the Soul*, 403a25–b27; 427a27.
69. Aristotle, *On the Soul*, 1.1.403a25: 'the affections of the soul are enmattered accounts [or proportions]'. Bacon is working on the same principle when he says 'there must be something more active and productive of change in the sentient body than light and color, because it not only causes apprehension

- but also a state of fear or love or flight or delay.' Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 425 (5.1.1.4).
70. Aristotle, *On the Soul*, 2.4.415b.
 71. Thomas Slakey argues that in *On the Soul* Aristotle presents perception as 'simply the movement which occurs in the sense-organs, not some psychic process in addition to the movement in the organs'. In other words, Aristotle understands perception as a bodily process, not as a mental 'interpretation' of a physiological alteration of the sense organ. 'Aristotle on Sense-perception', *Aristotle's De Anima in Focus*, ed. M. Durrant (London: Routledge, 1993), 77.
 72. Aristotle, *On the Soul*, 2.5.418a.
 73. Aristotle, *On the Soul*, 2.5.417a.
 74. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 191 (3.2). See also 47 (1.3) in the same text.
 75. Aristotle, *Physics*, 1.9.192a. Klassen mentions this metaphor in relation to Aquinas's theory of understanding. *Chaucer on Love*, 30–4.
 76. Plotinus, *Enneads*, 337 (4.5.8).
 77. Plotinus rejects Aristotle's claim that the medium performs a necessary, causal function in vision. *Enneads*, 328–38 (4.5). For a commentary on the text, see: E. K. Emilsson, *Plotinus on Sense-Perception: a Philosophical Study* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), especially chapters 3 and 4: 'The relation between the eye and the object of vision' and 'Sensory affection'.
 78. This is Emilsson's interpretation of Plotinus's concept of *sympatheia*, *Plotinus on Sense-Perception*, 59.
 79. Lacan, 'Mirror Stage', 5.
 80. I would therefore disagree with Pouchelle's emphasis on corporeal, architectural and symbolic closure. In her view, 'All "spaces"—the cosmos, Paradise, syllogistic reasoning, the body—were at that time [in the Middle Ages] closed.' *Body and Surgery*, 125 She does, however, mention the symbolic significance of the senses, as 'breaks in the wholeness of the body' (149).
 81. Lacan, 'Mirror Stage', 5.
 82. Gallop, *Reading Lacan*, 60–1.
 83. See the entries for 'Imaginary' and 'Symbolic' in J. Laplanche and J.-B. Pontalis, *The Language of Psycho-Analysis*, trans. D. Nicholson-Smith (London: Hogarth/Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1973), 210, 439–40.
 84. Chapters 5 and 6 will elaborate on the redemptive role of bodily sight as the conduit between humanity and divinity; and the flesh of Christ as the focus of redemptive vision.
 85. Olivi, commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sentences* (written 1287–8), quoted in Tachau, *Vision and Certitude*, 50.
 86. Olivi, quoted in Tachau, *Vision and Certitude*, 50.
 87. Olivi (b. 1247/8) was a student in Paris from 1266–8, and probably met Bacon and Pecham there. His critique of perspectivism is discussed by Tachau, *Vision and Certitude*, 39–54.

88. Putnam and Nussbaum, 'Changing Aristotle's Mind', 24–5.
89. Putnam and Nussbaum, 'Changing Aristotle's Mind', 25.
90. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 6.10.1035b32.
91. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 432 (5.1.2.2).
92. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 433–5 (5.1.2.2–3).
93. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 433 (5.1.2.2). Of relevance here is a comment made by Leo Steinberg in relation to Filippo Lippi's London *Annunciation* (painted in c.1449–60). Steinberg argues that the painting depicts 'Mary's womb . . . impregnated by light as the eye is by sights received . . . [reflecting] a theory, widely held in medieval and Renaissance speculation, concerning the nature of visual perception'. Steinberg, "How Shall This Be?" Reflections on Filippo Lippi's *Annunciation* in London, Part 1', *Artibus et historiae*, 8.16 (1987): 39.
94. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 434–5 (5.1.2.3).
95. Meister Eckhart (c.1260–1327) uses Gen. 2.24—"They were two in one flesh"—to elucidate the relationship between matter and form, or 'the sense faculty and the sense object'. Meister Eckhart, 'Latin Works' in *Meister Eckhart: the Essential Sermons, Commentaries, Treatises, and Defence*, trans. E. Colledge and B. McGinn (New York: Paulist, 1981), 105.
96. T. Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990), 35, 59.
97. The idea of perceptual transformation (and its associated 'passion') is exploited in medieval devotional practices, most notably as a means of identifying *bodily* with Christ's suffering. I expand on this theme in Chapter 6.
98. Merleau-Ponty, *The Visible and the Invisible*, 32. The context of this statement is a critique of objective science and philosophical reflection, but Merleau-Ponty's reproductive metaphors serve more generally to confound binary thinking.
99. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 2: 419 (5.1.1.1), quoted in full in Chapter 3 of this book.
100. Bacon, 'Moral Philosophy', *Opus majus*, 2: 680 (7.3.5).
101. See Aristotle, *On the Soul*, 3.13.435a–b; *Sense and Sensibilia*, 1.436b–437a.
102. Bacon, 'The Application of Mathematics to Sacred Subjects', *Opus majus*, 1: 241.
103. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 1: 241. Here too, however, Bacon's example pertains to sight and hearing more than touch or taste. When receiving the confession of a woman, he says, it is crucial to avoid 'short pyramids' and direct, perpendicular angles of reception so as to minimise the effect of her species (242).
104. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 1: 234.
105. Aristotle, *On the Soul*, 2.2.413b.
106. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1.1.980a.
107. Plato, *Phaedo*, ed. and trans. David Gallop (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 36 (83d).
108. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 318 (11.2.2), emphasis added.
109. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 316 (11.2.2).
110. Miles, 'Vision'.

111. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 322 (11.3.6).
112. Bacon, *Opus majus*, 1: 232.
113. Bacon, 'Moral Philosophy', *Opus majus*, 2: 654 (7.1).

5 The Custody of the Eyes

1. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs* (28.10), quoted in B. McGinn, *The Growth of Mysticism*, vol. 2 of *The Presence of God: a History of Western Christian Mysticism*, 4 vols (New York: Crossroad, 1994), 187.
2. Boethius (c. 480–c. 525), *De institutione arithmetica*, quoted in Winthrop Wetherbee, 'Philosophy, Cosmology, and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance', *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*, ed. Dronke, 30. Wetherbee notes that the passage was 'much quoted in the twelfth century'.
3. Blindness is one of the most widely exploited metaphors for the postlapsarian corruption of the bodily senses by the flesh. To give just a few examples: Roger Bacon remarks that sensual pleasure 'blindfolds the eyes of the mind' in 'Moral Philosophy', *Opus majus*, 2: 679 (7.3.5). The same logic lies behind Augustine's erotically charged image of the mind paralysed by sensation; Alan of Lille's description of the flesh as a 'fog' or 'shadow' clouding the eye of the mind like a cataract; and Richard of St Victor's reference to the 'fog of error' and 'cloud of sin' that dulls the eye of reason with the 'darkness of ignorance'. See Chapter 1 for details.
4. Plato, for example, had condemned the body as contagion, asserting that knowledge is 'achieved most purely by one who approaches each object with his intellect alone . . . neither applying sight in his thinking, nor dragging in any other sense to accompany his reasoning . . .' *Phaedo*, 11. Similarly, painting and poetry are condemned in *The Republic* as appealing to 'a low element in the mind', namely that concerned with sensation and emotion. He who 'stirs up and encourages and strengthens' these inferior faculties, does so 'at the expense of reason'. 382 (10.2).
5. G. E. R. Lloyd, *Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argumentation in Early Greek Thought* (Bristol: Bristol Classics, 1987), 436.
6. Jon Whitman argues this point from the Neoplatonic perspective of Bernard Silvestris (c. 1100–c. 1160). Because the material world is conceived as a divergence from the One, the awareness of humanity's 'otherness' is coupled with the desire for reunion. As Whitman says of Bernard's use of allegory: 'for all the evil he associates with the material world . . . he seeks to resolve its ambiguous condition not by escaping it, but by engaging it . . . In the end, he suggests that the very process of exploiting the diversities of a divided world and a divided language leads toward an integrity beyond them.' *Allegory: the Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987), 249–50.
7. For example, citing 'the exploitation of eroticisation from sun-tan products to pornographic films', Foucault argues that corporeal control and surveillance function paradoxically to *stimulate* one's 'desire, for, in and over [one's]

- body'. M. Foucault, 'Body/Power', *Power/Knowledge*, trans. C. Gordon, et al. (Brighton: Harvester, 1980), 57. The relationship between power, desire and its repression is explored in greater detail by Foucault in *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*, trans. R. Hurley (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978).
8. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 85 (13.25).
 9. Coleman, *Ancient and Medieval Memories*, 195.
 10. Coleman, *Ancient and Medieval Memories*, 198.
 11. G. R. Evans notes that the 'term *conversio* at this date had, most commonly, the sense of "deciding to enter a religious order"', although Bernard was also referring to a conversion of the heart. Introduction to Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 65.
 12. Quoted in J. F. Hamburger, 'Art, Enclosure and the *Cura Monialium*: Prolegomena in the Guise of a Postscript', *Gesta*, 31.2 (1992): 109.
 13. *Ancrene Wisse*, Part 2: 27, 40.
 14. Peter of Celle (d. 1183), *Selected Works*, trans. H. Feiss (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1987), 79, quoted in M. Camille, *Image on the Edge: the Margins of Medieval Art* (London: Reaktion, 1992), 56.
 15. In the *Ancrene Wisse*, for example, the anchoress's heightened spiritual sense is not achieved by mortifying the flesh, by dulling her sensations and desires; rather, her enclosure and identification with Christ ensure that her flesh is 'more living', more 'sensitive' than that of ordinary people. *Ancrene Wisse*, Part 2: 50–1.
 16. Hence Guillaume Durand's observation: 'by the windows the senses of the body are signified . . .'. *The Symbolism of Churches and Church Ornaments*, trans. J. M. Neale and B. Webb (Leeds: Green, 1843), 29 (1.24). See Chapter 2 for further examples.
 17. S. F. Kruger's reading of *Piers Plowman* traces a similar narrative and redemptive trajectory 'inward . . . outward and upward'. 'Mirrors and the Trajectory of Vision in *Piers Plowman*', *Speculum*, 66.1 (1991): 74–95.
 18. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 66 (1.1).
 19. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 67 (1.2).
 20. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 68 (2.35).
 21. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 68 (2.35).
 22. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 68 (2.35). References cited in text: Ps. 49.21; Rom. 2.15.
 23. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 69 (3.4). It hardly needs pointing out that the memory and its contents were conceived in bodily terms by Bernard and his contemporaries. On the neuropsychology of memory from a medieval point of view, see Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, 46–56.
 24. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 71 (5.6). References cited in text: Deut. 13.17.
 25. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 73 (6.8).
 26. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 73 (6.8).
 27. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 74 (6.10).

28. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 75 (6.11). References cited in text: Jer. 9.21.
29. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 80 (9.18). References cited in text: Heb. 4.12.
30. This reference to the flesh as a 'corruptible garment' is just one of many metaphors used by Bernard in *On Conversion*, 69 (3.4).
31. This is the section heading for Part 9. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 80 (9.18).
32. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 83 (9.23). References cited in text: Ps. 118.136; Prov. 6.4; Acts 22.11.
33. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 84 (12.24). Durand similarly uses the figure of windows in this double sense: 'by the windows', he writes, 'the senses of the body are signified: which ought to be shut to the vanities of this world, and open to receive with all freedom spiritual gifts. *Symbolism of Churches*, 29 (1.24). References cited in text: Song 2.9; Matt. 2.1.
34. Part 12 is entitled: 'After Grief Comes Comfort and the Kindling of the Desire to Contemplate Heavenly Things.' Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 84 (12.24).
35. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 84 (12.24). References cited in text: Matt. 28.6; John 20.4–8; 14.23.
36. Bernard describes this inner paradise as 'an enclosed garden', invoking the lovers' garden of Canticles (Song 4.12). *On Conversion*, 85 (13.25).
37. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 84 (13.25). References cited in text: Gen. 2.8. Bernard's sermons on the Song of Songs similarly emphasise the non-corporeal nature of the bride's delights in the garden of love. Commenting on the verse 'Your cheeks are beautiful as the turtle-dove's', he cautions: 'You must not give an earth bound meaning to this coloring of the corruptible flesh, to this gathering of blood-red liquid that spreads evenly beneath the surface of her pearly skin, quietly mingling with it to enhance her physical beauty by the pink and white loveliness of her cheeks. For the substance of the soul is incorporeal and invisible . . .' Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs*, trans. J. Leclercq and K. Walsh, Cistercian Fathers Series 40, 4 vols (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1976), 2: 199 (Sermon 40).
38. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 87 (15.28).
39. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 85 (13.25). References cited in text: Eph. 1.18; Ps. 50.10; Gen. 27.27; Song 2.14.
40. Bernard wrote 86 sermons on the Song of Songs between 1135 and his death in 1153.
41. A. W. Astell, *The Song of Songs in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 17.
42. I have borrowed Janet Coleman's translation here because it lends greater resonance to the more familiar terms 'purged', 'cleansed' or 'purified'. *Ancient and Medieval Memories*, 185.
43. Augustine (whose discourse on memory in the *Confessions* pervades much of Bernard's writing on the same subject) uses a great many metaphors for this

- faculty. It is like 'a great field or a spacious palace'. Each sensation is 'retained in the great storehouse of the memory, which in some indescribable way secretes them in its folds'. In 'the vast cloisters of my memory . . . are the sky, the earth, and the sea . . .' *Confessions*, 214–15 (10.8). The memory is also 'a sort of stomach for the mind', 220 (10.14), and the 'wide plains' of the memory contain 'innumerable caverns and hollows . . . full beyond compute of countless things . . .' *Confessions*, 224 (10.17).
44. Coleman, *Ancient and Medieval Memories*, 176, 191. On the medieval *ars memorativa*, see also: M. J. Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: a Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Lewis, *Reading Images*, 242–59; and F. A. Yates, *The Art of Memory* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969), 63–113 (chapters 3 and 4).
 45. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 87 (15.28).
 46. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 87 (15.28). Carruthers notes that the idea of memory as a surface that is written on or imprinted (and then read as a text) is 'so ancient and so persistent in all Western cultures' that it functions as a 'cognitive archetype'. *Book of Memory*, 16.
 47. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 87 (15.28).
 48. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 87 (15.28).
 49. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 87 (15.28).
 50. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 88 (15.28).
 51. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 88 (15.28).
 52. Alan of Lille's remark that the five senses 'guard' the body like sentries is consistent with this idea. *Plaint of Nature*, 117 (6).
 53. Augustine, *Confessions*, 243 (10.35).
 54. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 318 (11.2.3).
 55. 'For before the vision arose there already was a will which directed the sense to the body in order that it might be formed by seeing it . . .' Augustine, *The Trinity*, 328 (11.5.9).
 56. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 318 (11.2.2–3).
 57. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 336 (11.8.15).
 58. Margaret Miles also makes this point, arguing that 'Augustine does not advocate that the bodily eye be "cleansed" of sensible objects'. He is concerned, instead, with the 'cleansing' and 'strengthening' of the eye of the mind. Miles, 'Vision', 131–2.
 59. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 322 (11.3.6).
 60. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 325 (11.4.7).
 61. In *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 199 (12.15), Augustine remarks that 'Chaste people while awake curb and restrain these [sexual] motions, though in their sleep they are unable to do so because they cannot control the appearance of those corporeal images that are indistinguishable from bodies.'
 62. Augustine, *The Trinity*, 336 (11.8.15).
 63. Bernard of Clairvaux, *Song of Songs*, 1: 150 (Sermon 20.3).
 64. Bernard's source is Augustine's definition of lust (in its generic sense) as a fault in the 'soul which *perversely* delights in sensual pleasures' (my emphasis). St Augustine, *City of God*, 481 (12.8). Sin, in other words, results when one's

- attention and desire are oriented towards the world, rather than towards the ultimate—and ‘far more beautiful’—realities of the spirit (481).
65. Peter of Limoges, *De Oculo Morali*, quoted in Clark, ‘Optics for Preachers’, 333.
 66. Peter of Limoges, *De Oculo Morali*, quoted in Clark, ‘Optics for Preachers’, 333.
 67. It is evident that Peter has consulted contemporary works on optics such as Bacon’s *Perspectiva*. According to Clark (330), he would probably have met Roger Bacon, a fellow Franciscan, at the University of Paris during the 1260s. On Peter’s sources, see: Clark, ‘Optics for Preachers’; and Newhauser, ‘Nature’s Moral Eye’, 127–8, 133.
 68. Newhauser, ‘Nature’s Moral Eye’, 131.
 69. Paraphrasing Peter of Limoges, Clark writes that ‘the brain contains an internal sense that can censor sensory stimuli being received through the eye, filter out immoral stimulation, and enable desirable sensations to effect the will’. ‘Optics for Preachers’, 333.
 70. Clark, ‘Optics for Preachers’, 334. See also H. A. Wolfson, ‘The Internal Senses in Latin, Arabic, and Hebrew Philosophical Texts’, *Studies in the History of Philosophy and Religion*, 2 vols (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973), 1: 250–314.
 71. The work’s popularity is attested by the large number of surviving manuscripts: see M. W. Bloomfield et al., *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices, 1100–1500 AD* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979), 475–6, no. 5332, where 103 mss are listed. Clark comments on the popularity of the text through to the fifteenth century. ‘Optics for Preachers’, 329–30.
 72. Peter of Limoges, *De Oculo Morali*, quoted in Clark, ‘Optics for Preachers’, 339–40.
 73. Clark, ‘Optics for Preachers’, 338.
 74. Bacon, ‘Moral Philosophy’, *Opus majus*, 2: 654 (7.1).
 75. Peter of Limoges, *De Oculo Morali*, quoted in Clark, ‘Optics for Preachers’, 338.
 76. Bacon’s use of the term *passio* (passion) to denote the alteration of the sense organ in perception is discussed in Chapter 4.
 77. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 1a Q.35.1. For Augustine’s formulation of the same idea, see *The Trinity*, 6.2.
 78. William of Auxerre, *Summa Aurea*, ed. J. Ribailier, 4 vols in 7 parts, *Spicilegium Bonaventurianum* 16–20 (Paris and Grottaferrata, 1980–7). Cited in Phillips, ‘John Wyclif’, 251–2.
 79. John Wyclif, *De Benedicta Incarnacione* (c. 1371), quoted in Phillips, ‘John Wyclif’, 251. Phillips thinks it likely that Bacon’s *Opus majus* provided Wyclif with a model for the allegorical interpretation of optics (249). Given the dissemination of Peter of Limoges’s *Tractatus* as a preaching aid, Wyclif’s exposure to the theological and moral application of optics may have been broader still.
 80. John Scotus Eriugena (c. 810–c. 877), *De Divisione Naturae* (5.3), quoted in Eco, *Thomas Aquinas*, 139.

81. It has been argued that 'the whole structure of language and the whole utility of signs, marks, symbols, pictures, and representations of various kinds, rest upon analogy'. W. S. Jevons, quoted in Lloyd, *Polarity and Analogy*, 172. For the purposes of this chapter, however, I will focus on the relationship between visible signifiers and spiritual, moral or intellectual signifieds; that is, between material things and immaterial ideas.
82. Coleman sees both strategies as an attempt to negotiate the rift between reason and sensation produced by dualistic habits of thought. *Ancient and Medieval Memories*, 218–19. Bonaventure (1221–74), for example, writes of 'this universe of things' as 'a ladder whereby we may ascend to God'. *The Journey of the Mind to God*, in *Late Medieval Mysticism*, ed. R. C. Petry, Library of Christian Classics, 13 (London: SCM, 1957), 133 (1.2). Elsewhere in the same work mirror and ladder images are integrated, the 'sensible world' as mirror forming the 'first step' of Jacob's ladder: 135 (1.9).
83. On Thomas Aquinas's analysis of these interpretive modes, and their application to religious art, see Eco, *Thomas Aquinas*, 148–58. For a reconsideration of later medieval attitudes towards pictorial naturalism in relation to these levels of perception, see Caviness, 'Simple Perception of Matter'.
84. Durand is referring specifically to the interpretation of Scripture. *Symbolism of Churches*, 8 (Proeme 9–10).
85. Durand, *Symbolism of Churches*, 9 (Proeme 10).
86. Durand, *Symbolism of Churches*, 10 (Proeme 12). 'Et dicitur allegoria ab ἄλλο, Graece quod est alienum, et γορο, quod est sensus, quasi alienus sensus . . . Αὐαρογή, dicitur ab ἄνω, quod est sursum et ἄγω, quod est duco, quasi sursum ductio. Unde sensus anagogicus dicitur, qui a visibilibus ad invisibilia ducit, ut lux prima die.' G. Durand, *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, Proemium (Venice, 1589), fol. 2r.
87. On Suger, abbot of St Denis from 1122 until his death in 1151, see: E. Panofsky, *Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of St-Denis and its Art Treasures* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1946); and *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, Chapter 3: 'Abbot Suger of St-Denis', 139–80.
88. Suger, quoted in Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, 162.
89. Both Eco and Panofsky contrast Suger's attitude towards ecclesiastical decoration to Bernard of Clairvaux's more austere, iconophobic stance. Eco, *Thomas Aquinas*, 13–15; Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, 149 ff.
90. *Integumenta* is translated as 'figurative language' by Wetherbee, who observes that the term usually referred to classical or mythological texts which were read for their hidden, Christian meaning. Less frequently, the same metaphor was used in relation to the etymological investigation of particular words. Wetherbee, 'Philosophy, Cosmology, and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance', 36. See also T. Gregory, 'The Platonic Inheritance', *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*, ed. P. Dronke, 58 n.13, 59.
91. Peter Abelard, *Theologia 'Summi boni'*, paraphrased in Luscombe, 'Peter Abelard', 297.
92. Abelard uses the term *translationes*, as cited in Luscombe, 'Peter Abelard', 297. 'Transposition' (Luscombe's rendering)—from the Latin *ponere*, 'put'—

- conveys an idea of movement in keeping with the 'transports' of analogy and the notion of 'ascending' a perceptual hierarchy. For a discussion of this principle in the work of Fra Angelico, see G. Didi-Huberman, *Fra Angelico: Dissemblance and Figuration*, trans. J. M. Todd (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); especially 'The Four Senses of Scripture' and 'The Dialectic of Dissemblance', 34–60.
93. M. de Certeau, 'Mysticism', *Diacritics*, 22.2 (Summer 1992): 16–17. The article was first published in 1968, as an entry in the *Encyclopaedia Universalis*.
 94. de Certeau, 'Mysticism', 16.
 95. 'Allegoria enim animae longe e deo positae quasi quandam machinam facit, ut per illam leuetur ad deum', Gregory the Great (c. 540–604), *Expositio in Canticum Cantorum*, quoted in E. A. Matter, *The Voice of My Beloved: the Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990), 55, 79 n.26. Astell also refers to Gregory's machine metaphor, and its reiteration by Pseudo-Richard of St Victor: *Song of Songs*, 20.
 96. On Bonaventure's concept of analogy, see E. Gilson, *The Philosophy of St Bonaventure*, trans. I. Trethowan and F. J. Sheed (London: Sheed, 1938), chapter 7: 'Universal Analogy', 204–37.
 97. Bonaventure, *Journey of the Mind to God*, 138–9 (7.1).
 98. Bonaventure, *Journey of the Mind to God*, 133 (1.4).
 99. Bonaventure, *Journey of the Mind to God*, 133 (1.4).
 100. Richard of St Victor, *The Twelve Patriarchs*, in *The Twelve Patriarchs, The Mystical Ark, Book Three of the Trinity*, trans. G. A. Zinn (London: SPCK, 1979), 131 (74); and *Mystical Ark*, 156 (1.3).
 101. Astell, *Song of Songs*, 89, 92–4.
 102. Astell, *Song of Songs*, 94–9.
 103. Astell does not, however, define 'sublimation', and her use of the term is somewhat ambiguous. The comment quoted above follows a comparison of Bernard and Origen in which she maintains that while '... Origen sought to sublimate eros by suppressing the carnality of the Song, the twelfth-century exegetes, impressed by the unitary nature of love, aimed at an organic transference of the *affectus* by joining the literal image of the Bridegroom to its Christological tenor ...' Astell, *Song of Songs*, 19.
 104. Astell, *Song of Songs*, 19.
 105. According to Laplanche and Pontalis, the 'lack of a coherent theory of sublimation remains one of the lacunae in psycho-analytic thought'. 'Sublimation', *Language of Psycho-Analysis*, 433. Attempts to address this lacuna include: H. W. Loewald, *Sublimation: Inquiries into Theoretical Psychoanalysis* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988); and J. Whitebook, 'Sublimation: a Frontier Concept' in *Perversion and Utopia: a Study in Psychoanalysis and Critical Theory* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995), 217–46.
 106. S. Freud, 'Anxiety and Instinctual Life', *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*, trans. and ed. J. Strachey (New York: Norton, 1965), 86.
 107. Freud, 'Anxiety and Instinctual Life', 86.

108. Laplanche and Pontalis make the point that the 'domain of sublimated activities is badly demarcated' in Freud's discussions of the subject. It is unclear, for instance, whether all thought is the product of sublimated, 'desexualised' energy, or 'merely certain types of intellectual production'. *Language of Psycho-Analysis*, 432.
109. 'Sublimation of instinct', writes Freud, 'is an especially conspicuous feature of cultural development; it is what makes it possible for higher psychical activities, scientific, artistic or ideological, to play such an important part in civilized life'. From *Civilization and its Discontents*, quoted in Loewald, *Sublimation*, 6.
110. W. W. Skeat notes that the Latin term *sublimis* probably comes from *sub* and *limen*: literally 'up to the lintel', an etymology that sheds some light on the vertical mobility associated with sublimation, as well as the connection between the terms liminal and sublime, designating experiences that occur at the threshold (lintel) or margins of ordinary perception. *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* (New York: Capricorn, 1963), 527.
111. Loewald, quoting the *Oxford English Dictionary* definition of 'sublimation', *Sublimation*, 12.
112. Chaucer, 'The Canon's Yeoman's Tale', cited in Loewald, *Sublimation*, 12.
113. Bonaventure, *Journey of the Mind to God*, 140 (7.4–5). Richard of St Victor also describes the apex of human understanding as 'sublime with regard to sublime things'. *Mystical Ark*, 323 (5.9).
114. This emphasis on de-materialisation extends to chemical sublimation: the conversion of 'a substance from the solid state directly to its vapour by heat'. *Concise Oxford Dictionary*.
115. 'Carnal overflow' is Kristeva's description. *Powers of Horror*, 124.
116. 'We may call it a border; abjection is above all ambiguity.' Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 9.
117. Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 8.
118. Loewald makes the point that, through sublimation, the "lowest" and "highest" are enveloped as one within an original unitary experience; one is the other', and further: 'in sublimation the experience of unity is restored, or at least evoked, in the form of symbolic language'. *Sublimation*, 13, 45.
119. Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 8–9.
120. Kristeva does not tease out the paradoxical nature of this relationship between sublimation and sublime, instead running the two together almost without pause: 'In the symptom [disgust, nausea] the abject permeates me, I become abject. Through sublimation, I keep it under control. The abject is edged with the sublime.' *Powers of Horror*, 11.
121. Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 9.
122. Richard of St Victor, *Mystical Ark*, 323 (5.9). The same spatialised image of mind is evoked in Kristeva's observation that 'As soon as I perceive it, as soon as I name it, the sublime triggers—it has always already triggered—a spree of perceptions and words that expands memory boundlessly' (my emphasis). *Powers of Horror*, 11.
123. Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*, 9.

124. Augustine observes that in a state of ecstasy, 'the attention of the mind is completely carried off and turned away from the senses of the body' as is the case when the 'whole soul is intent upon images of bodies present to spiritual vision or upon incorporeal realities present to intellectual vision . . .' *Literal Meaning of Genesis*, 194 (12.25). Medieval discussions of ecstasy and rapture tend to follow this basic idea of a displacement or transferral of attention from outer, corporeal to inner, spiritual senses. Thus, Meister Eckhart maintains that a 'man is called senseless and rapt' when 'the soul draws to itself all its powers it had loaned to the five senses'. *On Detachment in Meister Eckhart: the Essential Sermons, Commentaries, Treatises, and Defence*, trans. E. Colledge and B. McGinn (New York: Paulist, 1981), 290.
125. Bonaventure, *Journey of the Mind to God*, 140 (7.4).
126. Bonaventure, *Journey of the Mind to God*, 141 (7.4).
127. For Kristeva, the sublime transcends neither perception nor language: it is, she writes, 'Not at all short of but always with and through perception and words . . .' *Powers of Horror*, 12.
128. Richard of St Victor, *Twelve Patriarchs*, 130 (72).
129. Richard of St Victor, *Twelve Patriarchs*, 130 (72).
130. Richard also exploits extramissionist metaphors. The gaze of meditation strives to 'grasp any lofty things . . . to break through obstructions, to penetrate into hidden things'. Richard of St Victor, *Mystical Ark*, 157 (1.4). The mutuality of redemptive vision will be discussed at length in the next chapter.

6 Ocular Communion

1. The observation is made by (amongst others): H. Belting, *The Image and its Public in the Middle Ages: Form and Function of Early Paintings of the Passion*, trans. M. Bartusis and R. Meyer (New Rochelle, NY: Caratzas, 1990), 7; M. Camille, *Gothic Art*, 12, and *Gothic Idol*, 203–20; Caviness, 'Simple Perception of Matter', Lewis, *Reading Images*, 264; and M. R. Miles, *Image as Insight: Visual Understanding in Western Christianity and Secular Culture* (Boston: Beacon, 1985), 65–6 (on fourteenth-century visual culture).
2. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 80. Although Belting notes that this 'need to see' has been 'much discussed', he does not pursue the point any further, remarking only that the phenomenon 'has not yet been sufficiently elucidated sociologically'.
3. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 82.
4. I am paraphrasing Belting here. *Image and its Public*, 82.
5. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 16, 83.
6. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 3, 58.
7. Richard of St Victor, *Mystical Ark*, 323 (5.9). The passage is quoted in full in Chapter 5.
8. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 58.
9. A. Neumeyer, quoted in Belting, *Image and its Public*, 57.

10. Belting's paradigm is one of verbal and affective 'communication'. *Devotio*, for example, is defined as a 'religious dialogue' (*Image and its Public*, 3, 58, 65); the new images have a 'communicative quality' (16); they 'speak' (80); and exhibit the same 'rhetorical' features as the relic ostensory (83).
11. The 'body of optics' is the subject of Chapter 4.
12. A number of excellent historical and iconographic studies have focused on this particular representation of Christ, and I do not propose to add to these accounts. The seminal iconographic study is Erwin Panofsky's "Imago Pietatis": Ein Beitrag zur Typengeschichte des "Schmerzensmanns" und der "Maria Mediatrix", *Festschrift für Max J. Friedländer zum 60. Geburtstag* (Leipzig: Seemann, 1927): 261–308. Major studies of the Man of Sorrows include: H. Belting, *Image and its Public*; L. M. La Favia, *The Man of Sorrows: Its Origin and Development in Trecento Florentine Painting* (Rome: 'Sanguis', 1980); and S. Ringbom, *Icon to Narrative: the Rise of the Dramatic Close-up in Fifteenth-Century Devotional Painting*, 2nd ed. (Doornspijk, Neth.: Davaco, 1984). The iconographic development and regional variations of the Man of Sorrows are documented in G. Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, trans. J. Seligman, 2 vols (London: Humphries, 1972), 2: 197–229.
13. While consistent with this general trend, the concept of the 'period eye' goes some of the way towards reconciling art history with the historical permutations of vision. See, for example: M. Baxandall, *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 'The Period Eye', 29–108; and Michael Camille, who approaches 'Gothic art as the embodiment of medieval visual experience' (*Gothic Art*, 12). Because Camille's use of thirteenth-century optics is limited to the intromissionist, perspectivist model, the conclusions he draws about 'visual experience' differ substantially from those proposed in this book.
14. Julian of Norwich, *Showings*, trans. E. Colledge and J. Walsh, Classics of Western Spirituality Series (New York: Paulist, 1978), 178 (ch. 2, long text).
15. Julian of Norwich, *Showings*, 180 (ch. 3, long text).
16. Gal. 2.20.
17. For example, in Chapter 5 'spiritual sight' comes after Julian's corporeal vision of the Passion. She makes it clear that this secondary, interior 'sight'—seen by 'the eye of my understanding'—is a received interpretation ('understanding') of the preceding, 'real' vision. In other words, her bodily revelation is followed by 'insight' into it. Julian of Norwich, *Showings*, 183.
18. It is argued in Chapter 1 that both body and flesh are feminised, each performing a different discursive function in relation to the masculine soul or mind.
19. In his study of Florentine religious life during the Renaissance, Richard Trexler points out that sacred images were addressed as persons (for example, 'Nostra Donna' rather than 'the image of Our Lady') and worshipped—or violated—accordingly. The holy person's presence in their likeness is further evinced by the attribution of sensitive faculties to images (one image of the Virgin was said to have closed her eyes when confronted with an offensive scene in the street below). R. C. Trexler, *Church and Community 1200–1600*:

- Studies in the History of Florence and New Spain* (Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1987), 50–1; and *Public Life in Renaissance Florence* (New York: Academic Press, 1980), 68–9.
20. Trexler, *Church and Community*, 39ff.
 21. Surveys of medieval attitudes to images include: Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 203–20; T. A. Heslop, 'Attitudes to the Visual Arts: the Evidence of Written Sources', *The Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England 1200–1400*, ed. J. Alexander and P. Binski (London: Weidenfeld with Royal Academy of Arts, 1987), 26–32; W. R. Jones, 'Art and Christian Piety: Iconoclasm in Medieval Europe', *The Image and the Word: Confrontations in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, ed. J. Gutmann (Missoula: Scholars, 1977); and Ringbom, 'Devotional Images'. For primary sources, see: C. Davis-Weyer, *Early Medieval Art 300–1150: Sources and Documents* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971); and in the same series, T. G. Frisch, *Gothic Art 1140–c.1450* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971).
 22. Trexler, *Church and Community*, 40. Hamburger approaches the convergence of bodily and spiritual vision from a rather different perspective in his work on devotional images and their female viewers. In his most recent study he argues that bodily sight can be 'both the means and the end of the devotional act', for 'to look is to love, and to love is to look'. Hamburger, *Nuns as Artists*, 129.
 23. These sources, which were disseminated by mendicant preachers, include Peter the Venerable's *De mira-miraculis* (1135–44), Herbert of Clairvaux's *De miraculis* (1178), Gerald of Wales's *Gemma Ecclesiastica* (c.1215) and Caesarius of Heisterbach's *Dialogus miraculorum* (c.1220). Other examples are provided by Ringbom, 'Devotional Images', 160.
 24. Miles, *Image as Insight*, 64–5.
 25. Miles, quoting R. Fawtier, *Image as Insight*, 65. It has been observed by a number of commentators that female saints outnumbered their male contemporaries in accounts of visionary experiences involving image devotion. Women were also more often associated with somatic phenomena like stigmatisation and mysterious illnesses: female stigmatics, for example, outnumber men by roughly eight to one according to *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, ed. C. G. Herbermann et al., 15 vols (New York: The Encyclopedia Press, 1913), 14: 295. On the possible reasons for this gender asymmetry, see: Bynum, *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (New York: Zone, 1991).
 26. J. F. Hamburger, *The Rothschild Canticles* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 165.
 27. Angela of Foligno's *Memorial*, ed. C. Mazzoni, trans. J. Cirignano, Library of Medieval Women series (Cambridge: Brewer, 1999), 32. Christine Mazzoni notes that 'Inordinately powerful effects of holy images on one's physical constitution were . . . common among women mystics of Angela's time', 35 n.25.
 28. Angela of Foligno's *Memorial*, 43.
 29. Angela of Foligno's *Memorial*, 44.

30. D. L. Jeffrey, 'Franciscan Spirituality and the Growth of Vernacular Culture' in *By Things Seen: Reference and Recognition in Medieval Thought*, ed. D. L. Jeffrey (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1979), 151.
31. See for example: Hamburger, 'Art, Enclosure and the *Cura Monialium*', 120ff., and *Rothschild Canticles*, 162–7; Miles, *Image as Insight*, 65; Ringbom, 'Devotional Images', 160–2.
32. Julian of Norwich, *Showings*, 193 (ch. 10, long text).
33. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 7 (1.1). The relevant passage is quoted in Chapter 4.
34. This process is discussed in detail by D. Despres in *Ghostly Sights: Visual Meditation in Late-Medieval Literature* (Norman, OK: Pilgrim, 1989). See in particular Chapter 2: 'Franciscan Meditation: Historical and Literary Contexts', 19–54.
35. I have used *Nicholas Love's Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ*, ed. M. G. Sargent (New York: Garland, 1992), an early fifteenth-century English translation of the *Meditationes Vitae Christi*. Quotes are cross-referenced with Isa Ragusa's widely available modern translation: *Meditations on the Life of Christ* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1961).
36. *Nicholas Love's Mirror*, 176.10. *Meditations on the Life of Christ*, 333.
37. *Nicholas Love's Mirror*, 162.16. *Meditations on the Life of Christ*, 317.
38. Angela of Foligno's *Memorial*, 27, 29, 60.
39. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 83.
40. Sicard of Cremona (d. 1215), *Mitrare Liber III*, quoted in Belting, *Image and its Public*, 6.
41. See Chapter 4 for a more extensive discussion of this idea.
42. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 45 (1.3): discussed in Chapter 3.
43. Bacon, *De multiplicatione specierum*, 191 (3.2).
44. Jacopone da Todì (d. 1307), *Laudi, trattato e detti*, cited in N. J. Perella, *The Kiss Sacred and Profane: an Interpretative History of Kiss Symbolism and Related Religio-Erotic Themes* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), 68.
45. I am thinking in particular of Giotto's paintings of St Francis receiving the stigmata, including the Louvre panel (*Stigmatisation of St Francis, with Three Scenes from his Life*, tempera, c.1310–15), and the slightly earlier fresco in the upper church of San Francesco in Assisi.
46. Camille reproduces a stained glass image of the Stigmatisation of St Francis (1235–45) from Barfüsser-kirche, Erfurt, commenting that the medium itself conveys the 'idea of the transforming power of light'. *Gothic Art*, 108, Fig. 75.
47. I have used the translation by E. Gurney Salter: *The Life of Saint Francis by Saint Bonaventura* (London: J. M. Dent, 1904), Chapter 13: 'Of the Sacred Stigmata'.
48. *The Life of Saint Francis*, 142.
49. *The Life of Saint Francis*, 139–40.
50. *The Life of Saint Francis*, 155.
51. *The Life of Saint Francis*, 141.
52. Carruthers discusses both models of representation, but argues that medieval writers understood memory 'images' as signifiers that were more like words

(written and read) than pictures. *Book of Memory*, 22–3. I am not entirely convinced by her emphasis on the verbal paradigm, given the pictorial logic of medieval optics and the mimetic desire expressed in image devotion. It seems likely, rather, that these metaphors—and practices inflected by them—coexisted in the later Middle Ages.

53. Jill Bennett has shown that bodily memory was central to late medieval (specifically Franciscan) image devotion: see her article on ‘Stigmata and Sense Memory: St Francis and the Affective Image’, *Art History*, 24.1 (Feb. 2001): 1–17.
54. Miri Rubin points out that the regulations surrounding the eucharist functioned as a means of social control. Communion could be received only in the parish in which the communicant resided; it required the appropriate payment of tithes; it was to be taken in a ‘state of purity’ (thereby excluding menstruating women and imposing restrictions on sexual intercourse). Finally, communicants were required to be in a ‘state of charity’—the concept of reconciliation being extended to one’s neighbours. M. Rubin, *Corpus Christi: the Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 148–50.
55. Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 148.
56. Rubin describes the practice as ‘sacramental viewing’, *Corpus Christi*, 63. The importance of vision in eucharistic devotion is also noted by J. Ash, ‘The Discursive Construction of Christ’s Body in the Later Middle Ages: Resistance and Autonomy’, *Feminine, Masculine and Representation*, ed. T. Threadgold and A. Cranny-Francis (Sydney: Allen, 1990), 81; Bynum, *Fragmentation and Redemption*, 45; Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 217; Lewis, *Reading Images*, 263–5; and Trexler, *Church and Community*, 67.
57. This interpretation of the fall is discussed in Chapter 2.
58. John 6.54–5.
59. Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 12.
60. Unlike the sacraments of baptism, marriage and extreme unction, the eucharist could only be administered by a priest. Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 36.
61. Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 13.
62. Rubin speaks of an ‘economy of the sacred’ within which the eucharist served as ‘sacramental currency’. *Corpus Christi*, 14.
63. Bishop Quivil of Exeter (writing in 1287), quoted in Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 57.
64. Unlike the earlier antependium, which was located below the altar, the altarpiece or retable was placed on or behind it (as shown in Fig. 6.1). Henk van Os describes the altarpiece as ‘a physical framework for the ritual’, observing that it serves to focus the congregation’s attention, and to demarcate the sacred space of the host’s consecration and elevation. *Sieneese Altarpieces 1215–1460*, vol. 1: *Form, Content, Function 1215–1344*, 2 vols (Groningen, Neth.: Forsten, 1988), 13.
65. van Os, *Sieneese Altarpieces*, 1: 12–13.
66. William of Auxerre, writing of the heightened visual appeal of the eucharist in his *Summa Aurea*, quoted in Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 217.

67. This is Rubin's description, *Corpus Christi*, 63.
68. Cited in Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 152.
69. Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 152.
70. Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 64.
71. Alexander of Hales, *Sentences*, quoted in Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 64.
72. By the fourteenth century the consecrated host was available for viewing outside of the mass. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 81–2.
73. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 81.
74. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 82.
75. Schiller, *Iconography*, 2: 9–10.
76. Belting makes a general distinction between Mediterranean paintings of the *Imago Pietatis*, in which the figure is consistently corpse-like, though upright; and the more 'lively' transalpine type, often depicting Christ gesturing towards his side wound. Whereas the former tend to provoke pity and remorse, the transalpine type emphasises reciprocity and dialogue. *Image and its Public*, 32–3.
77. L. Steinberg, 'Animadversions: Michelangelo's Florentine *Pietà*: the Missing Leg Twenty Years After', *The Art Bulletin*, 71 (1989): 489.
78. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 36, 72. The legend of St Gregory's mass is also discussed by Schiller, *Iconography*, 2: 199–200.
79. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 36, 38.
80. This is Belting's date, *Image and its Public*, 3. Schiller argues for a slightly earlier introduction of the image, *Iconography*, 2: 199.
81. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 41 ff.
82. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 53–4.
83. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 54.
84. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 53–4.
85. Hamburger makes a similar point with regard to the late medieval drawings produced in the convent of St Walburg. 'Anything but naturalistic in manner', he argues, 'the drawings nevertheless cultivate an aggressive immediacy of affect closely geared to their devotional context.' *Nuns as Artists*, 215.
86. Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, 321.
87. Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, 321.
88. See for example J. Marrow's 'Symbol and Meaning in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance', *Simiolus*, 16 (1986): 150–69. Marrow contends that thirteenth- and fourteenth-century devotional images 'espoused compassion only conceptually or by inference' (157). Fifteenth-century naturalism, in contrast, is seen as heralding a new role for the work of art: that of 'stimulating and directing viewers' emotional responses . . .' (158). This change, for Marrow, marks the transition from a medieval outlook to 'a modern or at least a post-medieval representation of the world' (158). In *Icon to Narrative*, Ringbom similarly construes fifteenth-century naturalism (specifically the 'expressive close-up') as the perfection of earlier 'conceptual' or 'symbolic' modes of painting. See, for example, *Icon to Narrative*, 57–8, 141. Belting's position (which is closer to my own) allows for

- the coexistence of symbolic/cultic, didactic/conceptual and affective functions.
89. Paradoxically, this opposition undermines the equally common identification of Renaissance classicism with reason and other manly virtues. It does so by placing naturalism on the side of emotion and sensuality, in opposition to the more 'conceptual' or 'abstract' art of the Middle Ages. It is interesting to note that Michael Camille effectively reverses these terms, describing the transition from the 'dynamic and interactive' Gothic image to Renaissance illusionism as a shift from the 'seen' to the 'scene'. *Gothic Art*, 183. See also Hamburger's response to Norman Bryson's comments on the 'textual' function of medieval art: *Nuns as Artists*, 217.
 90. Hamburger's analysis of devotional imagery also turns on the 'reciprocal presence' of Christ and the viewer; their 'mutual regard' and (in the context of nuptial mysticism) the 'reciprocal penetration of lover and beloved'. *Nuns as Artists*, 117, 215.
 91. To illustrate this visual dynamic, Belting quotes a passage from a History of Dominicans written before 1269: 'In their cells they had before their eyes images of her [the Virgin] and of her crucified Son so that while reading, praying, and sleeping, they could look upon them and be looked upon by them [the images], with the eyes of compassion' (my emphasis). *Image and its Public*, 57.
 92. Schiller, *Iconography*, 2: 197.
 93. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 173. The German term for the Man of Sorrows—'Erbärmdebild' ('image of pity')—is similarly reciprocal. Schiller, *Iconography*, 2: 197.
 94. Belting, *Image and its Public*, 58.
 95. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs*, 2: 12 (2.6).
 96. The question of how Christ could be born into humanity, yet remain untainted by sin was raised by Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury (d. 1109) in his treatise *On the Virginal Conception and on Original Sin*. Cited in J. Pelikan, *The Growth of Medieval Theology (600–1300)*, vol. 3 of *The Christian Tradition: a History of the Development of Doctrine*, 5 vols (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 160. The question was not settled until 1854, when the immaculate conception of Mary became dogma, confirming that the Virgin's flesh (and therefore Christ's) was without the hereditary stain of original sin (3: 171–2).
 97. See Chapter 1 for a more detailed discussion of the Augustinian origins of medieval flesh, and Bernard's treatment of flesh in *On Conversion*.
 98. Peter Damian (d. 1072), *Hymns (Carmina)*, quoted in Pelikan, *Growth of Medieval Theology*, 136.
 99. Pelikan, *Growth of Medieval Theology*, 138.
 100. Pelikan is quoting here from Peter Damian's *Sermons*, *Growth of Medieval Theology*, 138.
 101. V. W. Turner, 'Betwixt and Between: the Liminal Period in *Rites de Passage*' (originally published in 1964), *Reader in Comparative Religion: an Anthropological Approach*, ed. W. A. Lessa and E. Z. Vogt, 4th ed. (New York: Harper,

- 1979), 234–43; Kristeva, *Powers of Horror*. The potent combination of the holy and the transgressive in medieval religious life has featured in a number of recent studies. Lochrie's work on female mystics locates both sin and redemption in the flesh (*Margery Kempe*, 37–47; *Language of Transgression*, 128–40); while Rubin notes that the eucharist brought together 'the most holy with the most aberrant/abhorrent': cannibalism (*Corpus Christi*, 360).
102. Bynum has argued that Turner's concept of liminality is an accurate description of the religious experiences of men, but does not account for the spirituality of medieval women. 'Women', she argues, 'are fully liminal only to men.' Bynum, 'Women's Stories, Women's Symbols: a Critique of Victor Turner's Theory of Liminality', *Fragmentation and Redemption*, 49. While it has been beyond the scope of this chapter to look at redemptive vision as a gendered practice, Bynum's observation that femininity functioned (albeit predominantly for men) as a space of liminality has some bearing on the feminisation of Christ as Man of Sorrows. I explore this association further via Kristeva.
 103. Turner, 'Betwixt and Between', 236–7.
 104. Turner, 'Betwixt and Between', 236.
 105. This type of *Pietà* was popular in the Low Countries during the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. J. E. Ziegler, *Sculpture of Compassion: the Pietà and the Beguines in the Southern Low Countries c.1300–c.1600* (Brussels: Institut Historique Belge de Rome, 1992), 141.
 106. Turner, 'Betwixt and Between', 237.
 107. Turner, 'Betwixt and Between', 237.
 108. In her discussion of the Biblical taboo on corpses, Kristeva contends that 'the corpse represents fundamental pollution . . . if the corpse is waste, transitional matter, mixture, it is above all the opposite of the spiritual, of the symbolic, and of divine law.' *Powers of Horror*, 109. See also pages 3–4.
 109. Guerric, abbot of Igny (d. c.1157), quoted in Bynum, *Fragmentation and Redemption*, 159.
 110. L. Steinberg, *The Sexuality of Christ in Renaissance Art and in Modern Oblivion* (New York: October/Pantheon, 1983), 1.
 111. Steinberg, *Sexuality of Christ*, 23.
 112. Steinberg, *Sexuality of Christ*, 13, 45 ff. The link between original sin, concupiscence and death is central to Augustine's understanding of the fall, discussed in Chapter 1.
 113. Hildegard of Bingen (1098–1179), quoted in Bynum, 'The Body of Christ in the Later Middle Ages: a Reply to Leo Steinberg', *Fragmentation and Redemption*, 98.
 114. Bynum, *Fragmentation and Redemption*, 82.
 115. Bynum presents textual and iconographic evidence for widespread devotion to Jesus as Mother in her critique of Steinberg. Her written sources date from the twelfth century, while the earliest visual example cited is an illumination in a French Moralized Bible of c.1240, in which a crucified but 'lively' Christ is shown giving birth to the Church (in anthropomorphic form). *Fragmentation and Redemption*, 93–108 (Fig. 3.6).

116. See Bynum, *Fragmentation and Redemption*, 108–9, 114, 218–22. Laqueur maintains that prior to the Enlightenment, ‘Culture . . . suffused and changed the body that to the modern sensibility seems so closed, autarchic, and outside the realm of meaning.’ *Making Sex*, 7.
117. Laqueur, *Making Sex*, 25. Bynum draws on Laqueur, amongst others, in her critique of Steinberg (*Fragmentation and Redemption*, 109).
118. Laqueur, *Making Sex*, 29, 43.
119. Laqueur, *Making Sex*, 25–8. Galen implies that the female reproductive organs remain as they were *in utero*, just like the partially formed eyes of the mole. Quoted in Laqueur, 28.
120. Blood, semen, milk, fat and sweat were more or less interchangeable (depending on the amount of heat in one’s body) within ‘a physiology of fungible fluids and corporeal flux’. Laqueur, *Making Sex*, 35.
121. Laqueur, *Making Sex*, 36–8.
122. Laqueur, *Making Sex*, 123–8.
123. On male lactation and pregnancy see Laqueur, *Making Sex*, 106. Both lactation and pregnancy are ascribed to the maternal Christ. For late medieval visual and textual sources, see Bynum, *Fragmentation and Redemption*, 93–7, 106–8, 205–6.
124. Gaspard Bauhin, *Theatrum anatomicum* (1605), quoted in Laqueur, *Making Sex*, 127. Although this is a seventeenth-century work, Laqueur points out (128) that accounts of female to male sex change had been in circulation at least since Pliny.
125. Laqueur, *Making Sex*, 106.
126. Laqueur, *Making Sex*, 8.
127. Albertus Magnus, *Quaestiones de animalibus*, book XV, q.II, quoted in Cadden, *Meanings of Sex Difference*, 185.
128. Cadden makes this point in *Meanings of Sex Difference*, 209.
129. White, *Book of Beasts*, 31–2.
130. For Laqueur, the one-sex body serves either as ‘the microcosmic screen for a macrocosmic, hierarchic order’, or ‘the more or less stable sign for an intensely gendered social order’. *Making Sex*, 115.
131. This passage (from Vision 7) is quoted in Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast*, 156. Bynum dates Hadewijch’s poetry to the period between 1220 and 1240. Her writings have been translated into English by C. Hart: *Hadewijch: the Complete Works* (New York: Paulist, 1980).
132. I am thinking in particular of Augustine’s distinction between the passive, subordinate body and the insubordinate, transgressive flesh: both models of femininity are discussed in Chapter 1.
133. J. Kristeva, ‘Stabat Mater’, *The Female Body in Western Culture: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. S. R. Suleiman (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985), 108.
134. On the doctrine of the virgin birth, see Pelikan, *Growth of Medieval Theology*, 163–7.
135. Guibert of Nogent (d. 1124), *On Virginité*, quoted in Pelikan, *Growth of Medieval Theology*, 164.

136. Marguerite of Oingt, quoted in Bynum, *Fragmentation and Redemption*, 162–3. In the same volume (99, Fig. 3.6), Bynum reproduces an image of Christ giving birth from a mid thirteenth-century French Moralized Bible (MS 270b, fol. 6r, Bodleian Library, Oxford). The notion of spiritual ‘pregnancy’ also occurs in reverse, in the sense that God is enclosed in the individual heart/womb. See Hamburger, *Nuns as Artists*, 171; and on the phenomenon of ‘mystical pregnancy’, see Bynum, *Fragmentation and Redemption*, 146, 187, 354 n.108.
137. Both Steinberg and Bynum evade this question of eroticism. While Steinberg does not discuss the distinction between sexuality and eroticism, he clearly does not regard the exhibition of Christ’s genitals as having been of erotic interest to the Renaissance artist or viewer. Bynum (who misreads Steinberg on this point) argues more explicitly that we (in the twentieth century) ‘tend to eroticise the body’, medieval people did not. It is notable, however, that her comments are confined to ‘breasts and penises’ (*Fragmentation and Redemption*, 85). My reading of the crucified body as erotic departs significantly from both accounts. If vision can be an articulation of love or lust, and if one can be aroused or seduced by another’s gaze, then ‘eroticism’ surely cannot be tied to the visible markers of biological sex.
138. Mechtild of Hackeborn (1240–c.1298), cited in Hamburger, *Rothschild Canticles*, 76. On Mechtild and her contemporaries at Helfta, see Bynum, ‘Women Mystics in the Thirteenth Century: the Case of the Nuns of Helfta’, *Jesus as Mother*, 170–262.
139. Hamburger’s work has focused on the role of images in the female monastic context. In addition to his study of the *Rothschild Canticles* and his recent book on the visual culture of a late medieval Benedictine convent, *Nuns as Artists*, the following essays have informed my discussion of image devotion: ‘Art, Enclosure and the *Cura Monialium*’; ‘The Use of Images in the Pastoral Care of Nuns: the Case of Heinrich Suso and the Dominicans’, *The Art Bulletin*, 71.1 (Mar. 1989): 20–46; and ‘The Visual and the Visionary: the Image in Late Medieval Monastic Devotions’, *Viator*, 20 (1989): 161–82.
140. Hamburger, *Rothschild Canticles*, 3, 8.
141. Hamburger argues that the verbal and visual images comprising the manuscript are neither prescriptive nor descriptive. Rather, they ‘occupy a middle ground between theory and practice, example and experience’. *Rothschild Canticles*, 2.
142. Hamburger, *Rothschild Canticles*, 87. Not all the illuminations function in this way. Hamburger makes a distinction between Part I of the original manuscript, in which texts and full-page miniatures form a series of diptychs, and the layout of the text is often determined by the images; and the continuous, visually embellished text of Part II. *Rothschild Canticles*, 9.
143. The *Arma Christi* include: the cross, crown of thorns, lance, scourge, rod with sponge, nails and hammer. For a more detailed inventory and further discussion, see Schiller, *Iconography*, 2: 184–97.
144. Hamburger argues similarly that the ‘gap between the figures heightens rather than diminishes the drama’. *Rothschild Canticles*, 72.

145. Bernard of Clairvaux, *On Conversion*, 84 (12.24). Bernard's use of the imagery of the Song of Songs is discussed in Chapter 5.
146. Hamburger, *Rothschild Canticles*, 75–6, 84, 85–6. The Ovidian version of this theme—in which Amor inflicts the wounds of love with his arrows—is represented in devotional handbooks of the period, as well as in secular literature and ivories. See Camille, *Gothic Idol*, 315–16 (Fig. 169). Further iconographic examples of Christ wounded by Caritas or the Virtues are reproduced in Schiller, *Iconography*, 2: figs 446–54.
147. Although this version of the text falls well beyond our period, it is thought that an earlier manuscript provided the model. These verses are quoted in Hamburger, *Rothschild Canticles*, 84.
148. I have used the Vulgate term 'wounded' here, rather than 'ravished'—the expression used in the Septuagint. On the wounding eye topos in the Song of Songs, see Cline, 'Heart and Eyes', 273. Bernard McGinn notes that Song 4.9 was 'a favourite text' amongst Cistercians, including Bernard of Clairvaux, William of St Thierry and Gilbert of Hoyland, as well as appearing in the work of Bernard's contemporary, Peter of Celle. *The Growth of Mysticism*, vol. 2 of *The Presence of God: a History of Western Christian Mysticism* (New York: Crossroad, 1994), 180, 233, 303, 345.
149. Hamburger comments briefly on the correspondence between Canticles 4.9 (quoted on folio 17v of the *Rothschild Canticles*) and the scene discussed here (folio 18v). *Rothschild Canticles*, 72. He does not, however, make any connection between the theme of the wounding eye and its widespread occurrence in amatory literature from the twelfth century onwards.
150. See, for example, 'The Medieval Love Lyric' in Perella, *Kiss*, 84–123.
151. Hamburger, *Rothschild Canticles*, 76.
152. Bonaventure, *De perfectione vitae ad sorores*, quoted in Hamburger, *Rothschild Canticles*, 72–3. Other examples of reciprocal wounding are discussed by Hamburger in *Nuns as Artists*, 117–18; and by McGinn, *Growth of Mysticism*, 303, 306.
153. This is Hamburger's translation, *Rothschild Canticles*, 72.
154. Hamburger, *Rothschild Canticles*, 72.
155. Elsewhere in the *Rothschild Canticles* (75) the same gesture appears as an illustration of Psalm 26, 'The Lord is my light.'
156. Peter of Limoges, *De Oculo Morali*, quoted in Clark, 'Optics for Preachers', 343.
157. Examples of this motif are given in Chapter 2.
158. For example, an indulgenced prayer of 1330—intended for use during communion—reads: 'Hide me between your wounds / And do not let me be separated from you.' Quoted in Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, 157.
159. The text is based on the writings of John of Fécamp, as quoted in Hamburger, *Rothschild Canticles*, 74.
160. '[T]ransfix my heart with the dart of your love . . . so much that from this wound would flow the most copious tears, night and day.' From the *Liber meditationum*, quoted in Hamburger, *Rothschild Canticles*, 74.

161. *Oculus cordis* is the term used by Peter of Limoges for the 'eye of the heart': the fourth and ultimate stage of moral perception. Clark 'Optics for Preachers', 338.
162. St Gertrude (the Great) of Helfta (1241–c.1300), *Revelations* (also known as *The Herald of Divine Love*), 2.5, from E. Petroff, *Medieval Women's Visionary Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), 226. On Gertrude's life and writings, see Bynum, *Jesus as Mother*, 186–209. Angela of Foligno reports a similar vision in which Love appears in the form of a sickle (a variation on theme of Love's arrow or lance), leaving her 'languishing with the desire to feel and see God'. Angela of Foligno's *Memorial*, 60.
163. Grosseteste, *On Light*, 16. Grosseteste's theory of light is covered in Chapter 3.
164. Gertrude, *Revelations*, 227 (2.6).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Historical sources

- Alan of Lille. *The Plaint of Nature*. Trans. J. J. Sheridan. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1980.
- The Ancrene Riwele (The Corpus MS: Ancrene Wisse)*. Trans. M. B. Salu. London: Burns, 1963.
- Ancrene Riwele: Introduction and Part I*. Ed. and trans. R. W. Ackerman and R. Dahood. Binghamton, NY: Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 1984.
- Andreas Capellanus. *The Art of Courtly Love*. Trans. J. J. Parry. New York: Ungar, 1959.
- [Angela of Foligno]. Angela of Foligno's *Memorial*. Ed. C. Mazzoni. Trans. J. Cirignano. Library of Medieval Women series. Cambridge: Brewer, 1999.
- Aquinas, St Thomas. *Commentary on Aristotle's De anima*. Trans. K. Foster and S. Humphries. London: Routledge, 1951.
- *Summa Theologiae*. Latin text and English translation. 61 vols. London: Blackfriars, 1964–81.
- [Aristotle]. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: the Revised Oxford Translation*. Ed. J. Barnes. Bollingen Series. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Augustine, St. *Concerning the City of God, Against the Pagans*. Trans. H. Bettenson. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1984.
- *Confessions*. Trans. V. J. Bourke. Fathers of the Church 21. New York: Fathers of the Church, 1953.
- *Confessions*. Trans. R. S. Pine-Coffin. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961.
- *Eighty-three Different Questions*. Trans. D. L. Mosher. Fathers of the Church 70. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1982.
- *The Literal Meaning of Genesis*. Trans. J. H. Taylor. 2 vols. New York: Newman Press, 1982.
- *On Genesis: Two Books on Genesis Against the Manichees and On the Literal Interpretation of Genesis: an Unfinished Book*. Trans. R. J. Teske. Fathers of the Church 84. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1991.
- *Soliloquies and Immortality of the Soul*. Trans. G. Watson. Classical Texts Series. Warminster, Eng.: Aris, 1990.
- *St Augustine on Marriage and Sexuality*. Ed. and trans. E. A. Clark. Selections from the Fathers of the Church 1. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1996.

- *The Trinity*. Trans. S. McKenna. Fathers of the Church 45. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1963.
- Bacon, Roger. *The Opus Majus of Roger Bacon*. Trans. R. B. Burke. 2 vols. New York: Russell, 1962.
- [—] D. C. Lindberg. *Roger Bacon's Philosophy of Nature: a Critical Edition with English Translation, Introduction, and Notes, of De multiplicatione specierum and De speculis comburentibus*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983.
- [Bartholomæus Anglicus]. *On the Properties of Things: John Trevisa's Translation of Bartholomæus Anglicus De Proprietatibus Rerum: a Critical Text*. Ed. M. C. Seymour et al. Oxford: Clarendon, 1975.
- Bernard of Clairvaux. *On Conversion. Bernard of Clairvaux, Selected Works*. Trans. G. R. Evans. Classics of Western Spirituality Series. New York: Paulist, 1987. 65–97.
- *On the Song of Songs*. Trans. J. Leclercq and K. Walsh. Cistercian Fathers Series. 4 vols. Shannon: Irish University Press and Kalamazoo: Cistercian, 1971–80.
- Bonaventure. *The Journey of the Mind to God. Late Medieval Mysticism*. Ed. R. C. Petry. Library of Christian Classics 13. London: SCM, 1957. 132–41.
- *The Life of Saint Francis by Saint Bonaventura*. Trans. E. Gurney Salter. London: J. M. Dent, 1904.
- The Book of Beasts: Being a Translation from a Latin Bestiary of the Twelfth Century*. Ed. and trans. T. H. White. New York: Dover, 1984.
- The Book of the Thousand Nights and a Night*. Trans. R. F. Burton. New York: Heritage, 1962.
- Davis-Weyer, C. *Early Medieval Art 300–1150: Sources and Documents*. Sources and Documents in the History of Art Series. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Trans. R. D. Hicks. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Durandus, William. *The Symbolism of Churches and Church Ornaments*. Trans. J. M. Neale and B. Webb. Leeds: Green, 1843.
- [Eckhart, Johannes, called Meister Eckhart]. *Meister Eckhart: the Essential Sermons, Commentaries, Treatises, and Defence*. Trans. E. Colledge and B. McGinn. Classics of Western Spirituality Series. New York: Paulist, 1981.
- Eneas: a Twelfth-Century French Romance*. Trans. J. A. Yunck. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974.
- Frisch, T. G. *Gothic Art 1140–c.1450*. Sources and Documents in the History of Art Series. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- Galen. *On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato*. Ed. and trans. P. de Lacy. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1984.
- Gerald of Wales. *The Jewel of the Church: a Translation of Gemma Ecclesiastica by Giraldus Cambrensis*. Trans. J. J. Hagen. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
- Grosseteste, Robert. *On Light*. Trans. C. C. Riedl. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 1978.
- Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meun. *The Romance of the Rose*. Trans. F. Horgan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.

- Gundisalvo, Domingo. 'Classification of the Sciences'. Trans. M. Clagett and E. Grant. *A Source Book in Medieval Science*. Ed. E. Grant. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974. 59–76.
- Hadewijch: the Complete Works*. Trans. C. Hart. Classics of Western Spirituality Series. New York: Paulist, 1980.
- Hartung, A. E., ed. *A Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050–1500*. New Haven: Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1986.
- Hugh of St Victor. 'Classification of the Sciences'. Trans. J. Taylor. *A Source Book in Medieval Science*. Ed. E. Grant. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974. 54–9.
- [John Pecham]. *John Pecham and the Science of Optics. Perspectiva Communis*. Ed. and trans. D. C. Lindberg. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1970.
- Julian of Norwich. *Showings*. Trans. E. Colledge and J. Walsh. Classics of Western Spirituality Series. New York: Paulist, 1978.
- Meditations on the Life of Christ*. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Ital. 115. Trans. I. Ragusa. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Meister Eckhart. *Meister Eckhart: the Essential Sermons, Commentaries, Treatises, and Defence*. Trans. E. Colledge and B. McGinn. Classics of Western Spirituality Series. New York: Paulist, 1981.
- Nicholas Love's Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ: a Critical Edition Based on Cambridge University Library Add. MSS 6578 and 6686*. Ed. M. G. Sargent. Garland Medieval Texts 18. New York: Garland, 1992.
- Ovid. *The Art of Love. The Erotic Poems*. Trans. P. Green. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982.
- *Metamorphoses*. Trans. M. M. Innes. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1955.
- Peter of Celle. *Selected Works*. Trans. H. Feiss. Cistercian Studies Series 100. Kalamazoo: Cistercian, 1987.
- Petroff, E. *Medieval Women's Visionary Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Plato. *Phaedo*. Ed. and trans. D. Gallop. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- *Phaedrus and The Seventh and Eighth Letters*. Trans. W. Hamilton. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1973.
- *The Republic*. Trans. H. D. P. Lee. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1955.
- *Timaeus and Critias*. Trans. D. Lee. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971.
- Pliny. *Natural History*. Ed. T. E. Page, et al. Trans. H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. 10 vols. London: Heinemann, 1942.
- Plotinus. *The Enneads*. Trans. S. MacKenna. 4th ed. London: Faber, 1969.
- [Pseudo-Albertus Magnus]. *Women's Secrets: a Translation of Pseudo-Albertus Magnus's De Secretis Mulierum with Commentaries*. Trans. H. R. Lemay. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.
- Pseudo-Dionysius. *Pseudo-Dionysius: the Complete Works*. Trans. C. Luibheid. Classics of Western Spirituality Series. New York: Paulist, 1987.
- Richard of St Victor. *The Twelve Patriarchs, The Mystical Ark, Book Three of the Trinity*. Trans. G. A. Zinn. Classics of Western Spirituality Series. London: SPCK, 1979.

- [Suger, Abbot of St-Denis]. *Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of St-Denis and its Art Treasures*. Ed. and trans. E. Panofsky. 2nd ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.
- William of Auxerre. *Summa Aurea*. Ed. J. Ribailier. 4 vols in 7 parts. Spicilegium Bonaventurianum 16–20. Paris and Grottaferrata, 1980–7.

General sources

- Ackerman, R. W. 'The Debate of the Body and Soul and Parochial Christianity'. *Speculum*, 37 (Oct. 1962): 541–65.
- Allert, B., ed. *Languages of Visuality: Crossings between Science, Art, Politics and Literature*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1996.
- Amos, T. L., E. A. Green and B. M. Kienzle, eds. *De Ore Domini: Preacher and Word in the Middle Ages*. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, 1989.
- Ash, J. 'The Discursive Construction of Christ's Body in the Later Middle Ages: Resistance and Autonomy'. *Feminine, Masculine and Representation*. Ed. T. Threadgold and A. Cranny-Francis. Sydney: Allen, 1990. 75–105.
- Astell, A. W. *The Song of Songs in the Middle Ages*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Baldwin, J. W. 'Five Discourses on Desire: Sexuality and Gender in Northern France around 1200'. *Speculum*, 66.4 (Oct. 1991): 797–819.
- *The Language of Sex: Five Voices from Northern France around 1200*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: the Social Views of Peter the Chanter and His Circle*. 2 vols. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1970.
- Baldwin, R. "'Gates Pure and Shining and Serene": Mutual Gazing as an Amatory Motif in Western Literature and Art'. *Renaissance and Reformation*, 10 (1986): 23–48.
- Bardoel, A. A. 'The Psychology of Vision in Hadewijch'. *Mystics Quarterly*, 17.2 (June 1991): 79–93.
- Barratt, A. 'The Five Wits and their Structural Significance in Part II of *Ancrene Wisse*'. *Medium Aevum*, 56.1 (1987): 12–24.
- Barthes, R. 'Historical Discourse'. *Introduction to Structuralism*. Ed. M. Lane. New York: Basic, 1970. 145–55.
- Bartlett, R. *Gerald of Wales, 1145–1223*. Oxford Historical Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
- Baxandall, M. *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Beckwith, S. *Christ's Body: Identity, Culture and Society in Late Medieval Writings*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- 'A Very Material Mysticism: the Medieval Mysticism of Margery Kempe'. *Medieval Literature: Criticism, Ideology and History*. Ed. D. Aers. New York: St Martin's, 1986. 34–57.
- Belting, H. *The Image and its Public in the Middle Ages: Form and Function of Early Paintings of the Passion*. Trans. M. Bartusis and R. Meyer. New Rochelle, NY: Caratzas, 1990.

- Bennett, J. 'Stigmata and Sense Memory: St Francis and the Affective Image'. *Art History*, 24.1 (Feb. 2001): 1–17.
- Bensimon, M. 'The Significance of Eye Imagery in the Renaissance from Bosch to Montaigne'. *Image and Symbol in the Renaissance*. Special issue of *Yale French Studies*, 47 (1972): 266–90.
- Benson, R. L. and G. Constable, eds. *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Best, S. 'Sexualising Space'. *Sexy Bodies: the Strange Carnalities of Feminism*. Ed. E. Grosz and Elspeth Probyn. London: Routledge, 1995. 181–94.
- Bloomfield, M. W. et al. *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices, 1100–1500 AD*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Bloomfield, M. W. *The Seven Deadly Sins: an Introduction to the History of a Religious Concept, with Special Reference to Medieval English Literature*. Michigan: Michigan State University Press, 1952.
- Blumenberg, H. *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age*. Trans. R. M. Wallace. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983.
- 'Light as a Metaphor for Truth: At the Preliminary Stage of Philosophical Concept Formation'. *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision*. Ed. D. M. Levin. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993. 30–62.
- Blumenfeld-Kosinski, R. and T. Szell, eds. *Images of Sainthood in Medieval Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Bornkamm, G. *Paul*. Trans. D. M. G. Stalker. London: Hodder, 1975.
- Børresen, K. E. *Subordination and Equivalence: the Nature and Role of Woman in Augustine and Thomas Aquinas*. Trans. C. H. Talbot. Washington, DC: University Press of America, 1981.
- Bureau, A. 'The Sacrality of One's Own Body in the Middle Ages'. Trans. B. Semple. *Corps Mystique, Corps Sacré: Textual Transfigurations of the Body from the Middle Ages to the Seventeenth Century*. Special issue of *Yale French Studies*, 86 (1994): 5–17.
- Boyarin, D. 'The Eye in the Torah: Ocular Desire in Midrashic Hermeneutic'. *Critical Inquiry*, 16 (Spring 1990): 532–50.
- Brennan, T. "'The Contexts of Vision" from a Specific Standpoint'. *Vision in Context: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Sight*. Ed. T. Brennan and M. Jay. New York: Routledge, 1996. 219–30.
- Brennan, T. and M. Jay, eds. *Vision in Context: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Sight*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Brown, C., ed. *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. 3 vols. Exeter: Paternoster, 1975.
- Brown, J. V. 'Abstraction and the Object of the Human Intellect According to Henry of Ghent'. *Vivarium*, 11 (1973): 80–104.
- Brown, P. *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. London: Faber, 1991.
- Bryson, N. *Vision and Painting: the Logic of the Gaze*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Bunim, M. S. *Space in Medieval Painting and the Forerunners of Perspective*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.

- Burnett, C. 'Scientific Speculations'. *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*. Ed. P. Dronke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. 151–76.
- Butler, J. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Bynum, C. W. *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion*. New York: Zone, 1991.
- *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: the Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
- *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity 200–1336*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1995.
- 'Why All the Fuss About the Body? A Medievalist's Perspective'. *Critical Inquiry*, 22.1 (Autumn 1995): 1–33.
- Cadden, J. *Meanings of Sex Difference in the Middle Ages: Medicine, Science, and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Camille, M. 'The Eye in the Text: Vision in the Illuminated Manuscripts of the Latin Aristotle'. *Micrologus VI: La Visione e lo Sguardo nel Medio Evo*. Sismel: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 1998. 129–45.
- *Gothic Art: Visions and Revelations of the Medieval World*. The Everyman Art Library. London: Orion, 1996.
- *The Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image-making in Medieval Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- *Image on the Edge: the Margins of Medieval Art*. London: Reaktion, 1992.
- 'The Image and the Self: Unwriting Late Medieval Bodies'. *Framing Medieval Bodies*. Ed. S. Kay and M. Rubin. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994. 62–99.
- 'Seeing and Reading: Some Visual Implications of Medieval Literacy and Illiteracy'. *Art History*, 8.1 (Mar. 1985): 26–49.
- Carruthers, M. J. *The Book of Memory: a Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Ed. C. G. Herbermann et al. 15 vols. New York: Encyclopedia, 1913.
- Caviness, M. H. 'Images of Divine Order and the Third Mode of Seeing'. *Gesta*, 22 (1983): 99–120.
- "'The Simple Perception of Matter" and the Representation of Narrative, ca. 1180–1280'. *Gesta*, 30.1 (1991): 48–64.
- Cerquiglini, J. "'Le Clerc et le Louche": Sociology of an Esthetic'. *Poetics Today*, 5.3 (1984): 479–91.
- Chidester, D. *Word and Light: Seeing, Hearing, and Religious Discourse*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992.
- Cixous, H. 'Sorties'. Trans. A. Liddle. *New French Feminisms: an Anthology*. Ed. E. Marks and I. de Courtivron. New York: Schocken, 1981. 90–8.
- Clark, D. L. 'Optics for Preachers: the *De Oculo Morali* by Peter of Limoges'. *The Michigan Academician* (Winter 1977): 329–43.
- Classen, C. 'Engendering Perception: Gender Ideologies and Sensory Hierarchies in Western History'. *Body and Society*, 3.2 (1997): 1–19.
- Cline, R. H. 'Heart and Eyes'. *Romance Philology*, 25.2 (Nov. 1971): 263–97.

- Coleman, J. *Ancient and Medieval Memories: Studies in the Reconstruction of the Past*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Copleston, F. C. *A History of Medieval Philosophy*. London: Methuen, 1972.
- Cornelius, R. D. *The Figurative Castle: a Study in the Medieval Allegory of the Edifice with Special Reference to Religious Writings*. Pennsylvania: Bryn Mawr, 1930.
- Crary, J. *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990.
- Crombie, A. C. *Robert Grosseteste and the Origins of Experimental Science 1100–1700*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1953.
- *Science, Art and Nature in Medieval and Modern Thought*. London: Hambledon, 1996.
- Damisch, H. *The Origin of Perspective*. Trans. J. Goodman. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1994.
- Davies, O. *God Within: the Mystical Tradition of Northern Europe*. Classics of Western Spirituality Series. New York: Paulist, 1988.
- d'Avray, D. L. 'Some Franciscan Ideas about the Body'. *Modern Questions about Medieval Sermons: Essays on Marriage, Death, History and Sanctity*. Ed. N. Bériou and D. L. d'Avray et al. Spoleto: Centro Italiano di Studi Sull'Alto Medioevo, 1994. 155–74.
- de Bolla, P. 'The Visibility of Visuality'. *Vision in Context: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Sight*. Ed. T. Brennan and M. Jay. New York: Routledge, 1996. 65–81.
- Despres, D. *Ghostly Sights: Visual Meditation in Late-Medieval Literature*. Norman, OK: Pilgrim, 1989.
- Deutscher, P. 'The Evanescence of Masculinity: Deferral in Saint Augustine's *Confessions* and Some Thoughts on its Bearing on the Sex/Gender Debate'. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 15 (Autumn 1992): 41–56.
- Dickie, M. W. 'Heliodorus and Plutarch on the Evil Eye'. *Classical Philology*, 86.1 (Jan. 1991): 17–29.
- Didi-Huberman, G. 'The Figurative Incarnation of the Sentence (Notes on the "Autographic" Skin)'. *Journal*. The Los Angeles Institute of Contemporary Art (Spring 1987): 67–70.
- Doane, M. A. 'Film and the Masquerade: Theorising the Female Spectator'. *Screen*, 23.3–4 (Sep./Oct. 1982): 74–87.
- Donaldson-Evans, L. K. *Love's Fatal Glance: a Study of Eye Imagery in the Poets of the École Lyonnaise*. Mississippi: Romance Monographs, 1980.
- Douglas, M. 'The Two Bodies'. *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*. London: Barrie, 1970. 93–112.
- Du Bois, P. A. "'The Devil's Gateway': Women's Bodies and the Earthly Paradise". *Women's Studies*, 7 (1980): 43–58.
- Dunning, W. V. *Changing Images of Pictorial Space: a History of Spatial Illusion in Painting*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1991.
- Eastwood, B. 'Medieval Empiricism: the Case of Grosseteste's Optics'. *Speculum*, 43 (1968): 306–21.
- Eco, U. *The Aesthetics of Thomas Aquinas*. Trans. H. Bredin. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1988.

- *Art and Beauty in the Middle Ages*. Trans. H. Bredin. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.
- 'Living in the New Middle Ages'. *Travels in Hyperreality*. Trans. W. Weaver. London: Picador, 1987. 73–85.
- Edgerton, S. Y., Jr. 'Observations on Art and Science'. *Art and Science*. Special issue of *Daedalus*, 115.3 (Summer 1986): 182–6.
- *The Renaissance Rediscovery of Linear Perspective*. New York: Basic, 1975.
- Emilsson, E. K. *Plotinus on Sense-Perception: a Philosophical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Erickson, C. *The Medieval Vision: Essays in History and Perception*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1976.
- Febvre, L. *The Problem of Unbelief in the Sixteenth Century: the Religion of Rabelais*. Trans. B. Gottlieb. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Ferrari, G. R. F. 'Platonic Love'. *The Cambridge Companion to Plato*. Ed. R. Kraut. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992. 248–76.
- Foster, H. *Vision and Visuality*. DIA Art Foundation Discussions in Contemporary Culture 2. Seattle: Bay, 1988.
- Foucault, M. 'Body/Power'. *Power/Knowledge*. Trans. C. Gordon et al. Brighton: Harvester, 1980. 55–62.
- *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: an Introduction*. Trans. R. Hurley. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978.
- Freedberg, D. *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Freud, S. 'Anxiety and Instinctual Life'. *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*. Trans. and ed. J. Strachey. New York: Norton, 1965. 72–98.
- *Civilization and its Discontents*. Trans. J. Riviere. Revised and ed. J. Strachey. International Psycho-Analytical Library 17. London: Hogarth/Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1973.
- 'Instincts and their Vicissitudes'. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Ed. J. Strachey. Trans. J. Strachey et al. 24 vols. London: Hogarth, 1957. 14: 109–40.
- Friedman, J. B. *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Funkenstein, A. *Theology and the Scientific Imagination from the Middle Ages to the Seventeenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Gallop, J. *Reading Lacan*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- Gatens, M. 'A Critique of the Sex/Gender Distinction'. *Beyond Marxism? Interventions After Marx*. Ed. P. Patton and J. Allen. Sydney: Intervention, 1983. 143–61.
- Georgianna, L. *The Solitary Self: Individuality in the Ancrene Wisse*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Gillispie, C. C., ed. *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*. New York: Scribner, 1970–.
- Gilson, E. *The Philosophy of St Bonaventure*. Trans. I. Trethowan and F. J. Sheed. London: Sheed, 1938.
- Goering, J. 'The *De Dotibus* of Robert Grosseteste'. *Mediaeval Studies*, 44 (1982): 83–109.

- Gold, B. K., P. A. Miller and C. Platter, eds. *Sex and Gender in Medieval and Renaissance Latin Texts: the Latin Tradition*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997.
- Goldman, S. L. 'On the Interpretation of Symbols and the Christian Origins of Modern Science'. *The Journal of Religion*, 62.1 (Jan. 1982): 1–20.
- Gombrich, E. H. 'Achievement in Mediaeval Art'. 1937. Trans. M. Podro. *Meditations on a Hobby Horse and Other Essays on the Theory of Art*. London: Phaidon, 1963. 70–7.
- 'The "What" and the "How": Perspective Representation and the Phenomenal World'. *Logic and Art: Essays in Honour of Nelson Goodman*. Ed. R. Rudner and I. Scheffler. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1972. 129–49.
- Gombrich, E. H. and R. L. Gregory, eds. *Illusion in Nature and Art*. London: Duckworth, 1973.
- Grant, E. 'The Condemnation of 1277, God's Absolute Power, and Physical Thought in the Late Middle Ages'. *Viator*, 10 (1979): 211–44.
- *Much Ado About Nothing: Theories of Space and Vacuum from the Middle Ages to the Scientific Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Grayson, J. *Structure and Imagery in the Ancrene Wisse*. Hanover: published for the University of New Hampshire by the University Press of New England, 1974.
- Gregory, T. 'The Platonic Inheritance'. *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*. Ed. P. Dronke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. 54–80.
- Grosz, E. *Jacques Lacan: a Feminist Introduction*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- 'Notes Towards a Corporeal Feminism'. *Australian Feminist Studies*, 5 (Summer 1987): 1–15.
- *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism*. Sydney: Allen, 1994.
- Hahn, C. 'Purification, Sacred Action and the Vision of God: Viewing Medieval Narratives'. *Word and Image*, 5.1 (Jan.–Mar. 1989): 71–84.
- Hamburger, J. F. 'Art, Enclosure and the *Cura Monialium*: Prolegomena in the Guise of a Postscript'. *Gesta*, 31.2 (1992): 108–34.
- Nuns as Artists: *the Visual Culture of a Medieval Convent*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.
- *The Rothschild Canticles*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- 'The Use of Images in the Pastoral Care of Nuns: the Case of Heinrich Suso and the Dominicans'. *The Art Bulletin*, 71.1 (Mar. 1989): 20–46.
- 'The Visual and the Visionary: the Image in Late Medieval Monastic Devotions'. *Viator*, 20 (1989): 161–82.
- Harbison, C. 'Visions and Meditations in Early Flemish Painting'. *Simiolus*, 15 (1985): 87–118.
- Heelan, P. A. *Space-Perception and the Philosophy of Science*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Heidegger, M. 'The Age of the World Picture'. *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*. Trans. W. Lovitt. New York: Harper, 1977. 115–54.
- Heslop, T. A. 'Attitudes to the Visual Arts: the Evidence of Written Sources'. *The Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England 1200–1400*. Ed. J. Alexander and P. Binski. London: Weidenfeld with Royal Academy of Arts, 1987. 26–32.
- Holly, M. A. 'Past Looking'. *Critical Inquiry*, 16 (Winter 1990): 371–95.

- 'Vision and Revision in the History of Art'. *Theory Between the Disciplines: Authority/Vision/Politics*. Ed. M. Kreiswirth and M. A. Cheetham. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1990. 151–65.
- Hubel, D. H. *Eye, Brain and Vision*. New York: Scientific American Library, 1988.
- Huizinga, J. *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*. Trans. R. J. Payton and U. Mammitzsch. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Irigaray, L. *Speculum of the Other Woman*. Trans. G. C. Gill. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- *This Sex Which Is Not One*. Trans. C. Porter and C. Burke. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985.
- Ivins, W. M., Jr. *Art and Geometry: a Study in Space Intuitions*. New York: Dover, 1946.
- *On the Rationalization of Sight, with an Examination of Three Renaissance Texts on Perspective*. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1938.
- Jacquart, D. and C. Thomasset. *Sexuality and Medicine in the Middle Ages*. Trans. M. Adamson. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Jager, E. 'The Book of the Heart: Reading and Writing the Medieval Subject'. *Speculum*, 71.1 (Jan. 1996): 1–26.
- Jay, M. 'Disciplinary Prisms: Responding to My Critics'. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 38.2 (Apr. 1996): 370–94.
- *Downcast Eyes*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.
- 'Vision in Context: Reflections and Refractions'. *Vision in Context: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Sight*. Ed. T. Brennan and M. Jay. New York: Routledge, 1996. 3–12.
- Jeffrey, D. L. 'Franciscan Spirituality and the Growth of Vernacular Culture'. *By Things Seen: Reference and Recognition in Medieval Thought*. Ed. D. L. Jeffrey. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1979. 143–60.
- Jencks, C., ed. *Visual Culture*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Jonas, H. 'The Nobility of Sight: a Study in the Phenomenology of the Senses'. *The Phenomenon of Life: Towards a Philosophical Biology*. New York: Harper, 1966. 135–56.
- Jones, W. R. 'Art and Christian Piety: Iconoclasm in Medieval Europe'. *The Image and the Word: Confrontations in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. Ed. J. Gutmann. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1977. 75–105.
- Kaplan, E. A. 'Is the Gaze Male?' *Women and Film: Both Sides of the Camera*. London: Routledge, 1983. 23–35.
- Kay, S. 'Women's Body of Knowledge: Epistemology and Misogyny in the *Romance of the Rose*'. *Framing Medieval Bodies*. Ed. S. Kay and M. Rubin. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994. 211–35.
- Keller, E. F. and C. R. Grontkowski. 'The Mind's Eye'. *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science*. Ed. S. Harding and M. B. Hintikka. Dordrecht, Neth.: Reidel, 1983. 207–24.
- Kelly, H. A. 'The Metamorphoses of the Eden Serpent During the Middle Ages and Renaissance'. *Viator*, 2 (1971): 301–27.
- Kern-Ulmer, B. 'The Power of the Evil Eye and the Good Eye in Midrashic Literature'. *Judaism*, 159.40.3 (Summer 1991): 344–53.

- Kessler, H. L. "‘Facies Bibliothecae Revelata’": Carolingian Art as Spiritual Seeing'. *Testo e Immagine nell'Alto Medioevo*. Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo 41 (15–21 Apr. 1993). 2 vols. Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1994. 2: 534–94.
- Kieckhefer, R. *Unquiet Souls: Fourteenth-Century Saints and their Religious Milieu*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Klassen, N. *Chaucer on Love, Knowledge and Sight*. Chaucer Studies 21. Cambridge: Brewer, 1995.
- Krauss, R. E. *The Optical Unconscious*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1993.
- Kretzmann, N. et al. eds. *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100–1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Krieger, M. 'The Ambiguities of Representation and Illusion: an E. H. Gombrich Retrospective'. *Critical Inquiry*, 11.2 (Dec. 1984): 181–94.
- Kristeva, J. *Powers of Horror: an Essay on Abjection*. Trans. L. S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- 'Stabat Mater'. *The Female Body in Western Culture: Contemporary Perspectives*. Ed. S. R. Suleiman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985. 99–118.
- Kruger, S. F. 'Mirrors and the Trajectory of Vision in *Piers Plowman*'. *Speculum*, 66.1 (1991): 74–95.
- Kubovy, M. *The Psychology of Perspective and Renaissance Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- Kuksewicz, Z. 'The Potential and the Agent Intellect'. *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100–1600*. Ed. N. Kretzmann et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982. 595–601.
- Lacan, J. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. Ed. J.-A. Miller. Trans. A. Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1978.
- 'The Meaning of the Phallus'. *Feminine Sexuality: Jacques Lacan and the École Freudienne*. Ed. J. Mitchell and J. Rose. Trans. J. Rose. New York: Norton, 1982. 74–85.
- 'The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the *I* as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience'. *Écrits: a Selection*. Trans. A. Sheridan. London: Tavistock, 1977. 1–7.
- La Favia, L. M. *The Man of Sorrows: Its Origin and Development in Trecento Florentine Painting*. Rome: 'Sanguis', 1980.
- Lapidge, M. 'The Stoic Inheritance'. *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*. Ed. P. Dronke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. 81–112.
- Laplanche, J. and J.-B. Pontalis. *The Language of Psycho-Analysis*. Trans. D. Nicholson-Smith. London: Hogarth/Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1973.
- Laqueur, T. *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Latham, R. E. *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*. London: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Leclercq, J. *Monks and Love in Twelfth-Century France: Psycho-Historical Essays*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.

- Leclercq, J., F. Vanderbroucke and L. Bouyer. *The Spirituality of the Middle Ages*. Tunbridge Wells: Burns, 1968.
- Le Goff, J. 'Head or Heart: the Political Use of Body Metaphors in the Middle Ages'. Trans. P. Ranum. *Fragments for a History of the Human Body, Part III*. Ed. M. Feher, R. Naddaff and N. Tazi. 3 vols. New York: Zone, 1989. 13–27.
- *The Medieval Imagination*. Trans. A. Goldhammer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Lewis, S. *Reading Images: Narrative Discourse and Reception in the Thirteenth-Century Illuminated Apocalypse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Levin, D. M. *The Opening of Vision: Nihilism and the Postmodern Situation*. New York: Routledge, 1988.
- Levin, D. M., ed. *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- *Sites of Vision: the Discursive Construction of Sight in the History of Philosophy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997.
- Lindberg, D. C. *Roger Bacon's Philosophy of Nature: a Critical Edition with English Translation, Introduction, and Notes, of De multiplicatione specierum and De speculis comburentibus*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1983.
- *Studies in the History of Medieval Optics*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1983.
- *Theories of Vision from Al-Kindi to Kepler*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Lindberg, D. C. and N. H. Steneck. 'The Sense of Vision and the Origins of Modern Science'. *Studies in the History of Medieval Optics*. London: Variorum Reprints, 1983. 29–45.
- Lloyd, G. *The Man of Reason: 'Male' and 'Female' in Western Philosophy*. London: Methuen, 1984.
- Lloyd, G. E. R. *Polarity and Analogy: Two Types of Argumentation in Early Greek Thought*. Bristol: Bristol Classics, 1987.
- Lochrie, K. 'Desiring Foucault'. *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 27.1 (Winter 1997): 3–16.
- 'The Language of Transgression: Body, Flesh, and Word in Mystical Discourse'. *Speaking Two Languages: Traditional Disciplines and Contemporary Theory in Medieval Studies*. Ed. A. J. Frantzen. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991. 115–40.
- *Margery Kempe and Translations of the Flesh*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991.
- Loewald, H. W. *Sublimation: Inquiries into Theoretical Psychoanalysis*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Lomperis, L. and S. Stanbury, eds. *Feminist Approaches to the Body in Medieval Literature*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.
- Luscombe, D. E. 'Peter Abelard'. *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*. Ed. P. Dronke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. 279–307.
- Maloney, T. S. 'The Semiotics of Roger Bacon'. *Mediaeval Studies*, 45 (1983): 120–54.
- Marrone, S. P. *William of Auvergne and Robert Grosseteste: New Ideas of Truth in the Early Thirteenth Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

- Marrow, J. H. *Passion Iconography in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages and Early Renaissance: a Study of the Transformation of Sacred Metaphor into Descriptive Narrative*. Kortrijk, Belg.: Van Ghemert, 1979.
- 'Symbol and Meaning in Northern European Art of the Late Middle Ages and the Early Renaissance'. *Simiolus*, 16 (1986): 150–69.
- Matson, W. I. 'Why Isn't the Mind-Body Problem Ancient?' *Mind, Matter and Method: Essays in Philosophy and Science in Honor of Herbert Feigl*. Ed. P. K. Feyerabend and G. Maxwell. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1966. 92–102.
- Matter, E. A. *The Voice of My Beloved: the Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.
- McEvoy, J. *The Philosophy of Robert Grosseteste*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
- McGinn, B. 'The Changing Shape of Late Medieval Mysticism'. *Church History*, 65.2 (Jun. 1996): 197–219.
- *The Growth of Mysticism*. Vol. 2 of *The Presence of God: a History of Western Christian Mysticism*. 4 vols. New York: Crossroad, 1994.
- McLaughlin, E. C. 'Equality of Souls, Inequality of Sexes: Woman in Medieval Theology'. *Religion and Sexism: Images of Woman in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Ed. R. R. Ruether. New York: Simon, 1974. 213–65.
- McMullin, E., ed. *The Concept of Matter in Greek and Medieval Philosophy*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1963.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Trans. C. Smith. London: Routledge, 1962.
- *The Visible and the Invisible*. Ed. C. Lefort. Trans. A. Lingis. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1968.
- Meskimmon, M. 'Visuality: the New, New Art History?' Review article. *Art History*, 20.2 (Jun. 1997): 331–3.
- Miles, M. *Augustine on the Body*. American Academy of Religion Dissertation Series 31. Missoula: Scholars, 1979.
- *Image as Insight: Visual Understanding in Western Christianity and Secular Culture*. Boston: Beacon, 1985.
- 'Vision: the Eye of the Body and the Eye of the Mind in Saint Augustine's *De Trinitate and Confessions*'. *The Journal of Religion*, 63.2 (April 1983): 125–42.
- Mitchell, W. J. T. *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Morrison, K. F. *'I Am You': the Hermeneutics of Empathy in Western Literature, Theology, and Art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988.
- Mulvey, L. 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema'. *Screen*, 16.3 (1975): 6–18.
- Newhauser, R. 'Nature's Moral Eye: Peter of Limoges' *Tractatus Moralís de Oculo*'. *Man and Nature in the Middle Ages*. Ed. S. J. Ridyard and R. G. Benson. Sewanee, TN: University of the South Press, 1995. 125–36.
- Niermeyer, J. F. *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Nolan, B. *The Gothic Visionary Perspective*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- 'The *Vita Nuova* and Richard of St Victor's Phenomenology of Vision'. *Dante Studies*. Ed. A. L. Pellegrini. 92 (1974): 35–52.

- Owens, J. 'Faith, Ideas, Illumination, and Experience'. *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Disintegration of Scholasticism 1100–1600*. Ed. N. Kretzmann et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982. 440–59.
- Panofsky, E. *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*. New York: Meridian, 1957.
- "‘Imago Pietatis’: Ein Beitrag zur Typengeschichte des ‘Schmerzensmanns’ und der ‘Maria Mediatrix.’" *Festschrift für Max J. Friedländer zum 60. Geburtstag*. Leipzig: Seemann, 1927. 261–308.
- *Meaning in the Visual Arts*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970.
- *Perspective as Symbolic Form*. Trans. C. S. Wood. New York: Zone, 1991.
- *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art*. London: Paladin, 1970.
- Paris, J. *Painting and Linguistics*. Pittsburgh: Carnegie-Mellon University, 1975.
- Pavlis-Baig, B. 'Vision and Visualization: Optics and Light Metaphysics in the Imagery and Poetic Form of Twelfth and Thirteenth Century Secular Allegory, with Special Attention to the *Roman de la Rose*'. Diss. University of California, Berkeley, 1982.
- Pelikan, J. *The Growth of Medieval Theology (600–1300)*. Vol. 3 of *The Christian Tradition: a History of the Development of Doctrine*. 5 vols. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978.
- Perella, N. J. *The Kiss Sacred and Profane: an Interpretative History of Kiss Symbolism and Related Religio-Erotic Themes*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
- Phillips, H. 'John Wyclif and the Optics of the Eucharist'. *From Ockham to Wyclif*. Ed. A. Hudson and M. Wilks. Studies in Church History 5. Oxford: Blackwell, 1987. 245–58.
- Phillips, J. A. *Eve: the History of an Idea*. San Francisco: Harper, 1984.
- Pouchelle, M. C. *The Body and Surgery in the Middle Ages*. Trans. R. Morris. Cambridge: Polity, 1990.
- Putnam, H. 'How Old is the Mind?' *Words and Life*. Ed. J. Conant. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994. 3–21.
- Putnam, H. and M. C. Nussbaum. 'Changing Aristotle's Mind'. *Words and Life*. Ed. J. Conant. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994. 22–61
- Ragland-Sullivan, E. 'Jacques Lacan: Feminism and the Problem of Gender Identity'. *Sub-Stance*, 36 (1982): 6–20.
- Riehle, W. 'The Experience of God as a Spiritual Sense Perception'. *The Middle English Mystics*. Trans. B. Standring. London: Routledge, 1977. 104–27.
- Ringbom, S. 'Devotional Images and Imaginative Devotions: Notes on the Place of Art in Late Medieval Private Piety'. *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 73 (1969): 159–70.
- *Icon to Narrative: the Rise of the Dramatic Close-up in Fifteenth-Century Devotional Painting*. 2nd ed. Doornspijk, Neth.: Davaco, 1984.
- Robertson, E. 'Medieval Medical Views of Women and Female Spirituality in the *Ancrene Wisse* and Julian of Norwich's *Showings*'. *Feminist Approaches to the Body in Medieval Literature*. Ed. L. Lomperis and S. Stanbury. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993. 142–67.

- Ronchi, V. *Optics: the Science of Vision*. Trans. E. Rosen. New York: New York University Press, 1957.
- Rubin, M. *Corpus Christi: the Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- 'Medieval Bodies: Why Now, and How?' *The Work of Jacques Le Goff and the Challenges of Medieval History*. Ed. M. Rubin. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1997. 209–19.
- Salisbury, J. E. *Medieval Sexuality: a Research Guide*. New York: Garland, 1990.
- Schiller, G. *Iconography of Christian Art*. Trans. J. Seligman. 2 vols. London: Humphries, 1972.
- Sharp, D. E. *Franciscan Philosophy at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century*. New York: Russell, 1964.
- Siegel, R. E. *Galen on Sense Perception*. Basel: Karger, 1970.
- Silverman, K. 'Fassbinder and Lacan: a Reconsideration of Gaze, Look and Image'. *Camera Obscura*, 19 (Jan. 1989): 54–85.
- Simons, P. 'Women in Frames: the Gaze, the Eye, the Profile in Renaissance Portraiture'. *The Expanding Discourse: Feminism and Art History*. Ed. N. Broude and M. D. Garrard. New York: Icon, 1992. 39–57.
- Siraisi, N. G. *Medieval and Early Renaissance Medicine*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Skeat, W. W. *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. New York: Capricorn, 1963.
- Slakey, T. J. 'Aristotle on Sense-perception'. *Aristotle's De Anima in Focus*. Ed. M. Durrant. London: Routledge, 1993. 75–89.
- Sobchack, V. *The Address of the Eye: a Phenomenology of Film Experience*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Soskice, J. M. 'Sight and Vision in Medieval Christian Thought'. *Vision in Context: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Sight*. Ed. T. Brennan and M. Jay. New York: Routledge, 1996. 31–43.
- Souter, A. *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 AD*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1949.
- Southern, R. W. *Robert Grosseteste: the Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.
- Spearing, A. C. *The Medieval Poet as Voyeur: Looking and Listening in Medieval Love-Narratives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Spence, S. "'Lo Cop Mortal": the Evil Eye and the Origins of Courtly Love'. *The Romantic Review*, 87.3 (May 1996): 307–18.
- Stanbury, S. 'Feminist Film Theory: Seeing Chrétien's Enide'. *Literature and Psychology*, 36.4 (1990): 47–66.
- 'In God's Sight: Vision and Sacred History in Purity'. *Text and Matter: New Critical Perspectives of the Pearl-Poet*. Ed. R. J. Blanch, M. Y. Miller and J. N. Wasserman. Troy, NY: Whitston, 1991. 105–16.
- 'The Virgin's Gaze: Spectacle and Transgression in Middle English Lyrics of the Passion'. *PMLA*, 106.5 (Oct. 1991): 1083–93.
- 'The Voyeur and the Private Life in *Troilus and Criseyde*'. *Studies in the Age of Chaucer*. Ed. T. J. Heffernan. 13 (1991): 141–58.

- Stefaniak, R. 'Corregio's *Camera di San Paolo*: an Archaeology of the Gaze'. *Art History*, 16.2 (June 1993): 203–38.
- 'Replicating Mysteries of the Passion: Rosso's *Dead Christ with Angels*'. *Renaissance Quarterly*, 45.4 (Winter 1992): 677–738.
- Steinberg, L. 'Animadversions: Michelangelo's Florentine *Pietà*: the Missing Leg Twenty Years After'. *The Art Bulletin*, 71 (1989): 480–505.
- "'How Shall This Be?'" Reflections on Filippo Lippi's *Annunciation* in London, Part 1'. *Artibus et historiae*, 8.16 (1987): 25–43.
- *The Sexuality of Christ in Renaissance Art and in Modern Oblivion*. New York: October/Pantheon, 1983.
- Stock, B. *Augustine the Reader: Meditation, Self-Knowledge, and the Ethics of Interpretation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Tachau, K. H. 'The Problem of the *Species in Medio* at Oxford in the Generation after Ockham'. *Mediaeval Studies*, 44 (1982): 394–443.
- *Vision and Certitude in the Age of Ockham: Optics, Epistemology and the Foundations of Semantics 1250–1345*. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- Trexler, R. C. *Church and Community 1200–1600: Studies in the History of Florence and New Spain*. Rome: Storia e Letteratura, 1987.
- *Public Life in Renaissance Florence*. New York: Academic, 1980.
- Tuana, N. *The Less Noble Sex: Scientific, Religious, and Philosophical Conceptions of Woman's Nature*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993.
- Turner, V. W. 'Betwixt and Between: the Liminal Period in *Rites de Passage*'. *Reader in Comparative Religion: an Anthropological Approach*. Ed. W. A. Lessa and E. Z. Vogt. 4th ed. New York: Harper, 1979. 234–43.
- Tyler, S. A. 'The Vision Quest in the West, or What the Mind's Eye Sees'. *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 40 (1984): 23–40.
- van Os, H. *Sieneese Altarpieces 1215–1460*. Vol. 1: *Form, Content, Function 1215–1344*. 2 vols. Groningen, Neth.: Forsten, 1988.
- Vauchez, A. *The Laity in the Middle Ages: Religious Beliefs and Devotional Practices*. Trans. M. J. Schneider. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.
- Vesey, G. N. A. 'Vision'. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. P. Edwards. 8 vols. New York: Macmillan, 1967. 8: 252–3.
- von Simson, O. *The Gothic Cathedral: Origins of Gothic Architecture and the Medieval Concept of Order*. Bollingen Series 48. 2nd ed. New York: Pantheon, 1962.
- Wartofsky, M. W. 'The Paradox of Painting: Pictorial Representation and the Dimensionality of Visual Space'. *Representation*. Special issue of *Social Research*, 51.4 (Winter 1984): 863–83.
- 'Picturing and Representing'. *Perception and Pictorial Representation*. Ed. C. F. Nodine and D. F. Fisher. New York: Praeger, 1979.
- Welton, D. 'Biblical Bodies'. *Body and Flesh: a Philosophical Reader*. Ed. D. Welton. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998. 229–58.
- Wetherbee, W. 'Philosophy, Cosmology, and the Twelfth-Century Renaissance'. *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*. Ed. P. Dronke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. 21–53.
- White, J. *The Birth and Rebirth of Pictorial Space*. 3rd ed. Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 1987.

- Whitebook, J. 'Sublimation: a Frontier Concept'. *Perversion and Utopia: a Study in Psychoanalysis and Critical Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995. 217–46.
- Whitman, J. *Allegory: the Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987.
- Wippel, J. F. 'The Condemnations of 1270 and 1277 at Paris'. *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 7.2 (Fall 1977): 169–201.
- Wogan-Browne, J. 'Chaste Bodies: Frames and Experiences'. *Framing Medieval Bodies*. Ed. S. Kay and M. Rubin. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1994. 24–42.
- Wolfson, H. A. 'The Internal Senses in Latin, Arabic, and Hebrew Philosophical Texts'. *Studies in the History of Philosophy and Religion*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973. 1: 250–314.
- Yates, F. A. *The Art of Memory*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1969.
- Young, I. M. *Throwing Like a Girl and Other Essays in Feminist Philosophy and Social Theory*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.
- Ziegler, J. E. *Sculpture of Compassion: the Pietà and the Beguines in the Southern Low Countries c.1300–c.1600*. Brussels: Institut Historique Belge de Rome, 1992.

INDEX

- Abelard, Peter, 46–7, 127, 181 n24, 208–9 n92
- abjection, Julia Kristeva's theory of, 130–1, 151, 155, 198 n30, 210 n116–n120
- Adam and Eve, 23, 29–31, 42–5, 104, 117, 150, 175 n80, 181 n24
- affect or emotion, 5–6, 21, 30–1, 36, 51, 63–4, 82–3, 92, 95–7, 102–6, 111, 118–20, 131, 134–8, 145–7, 160, 170 n43, 182 n34, 198 n22, 200 n68–n69, 203 n4, 216 n88, 217 n89. *See also* passion
- ageing, as attribute of the body, 36, 38, 100, 150
- Alan of Lille, 17–18, 36–8, 54, 171 n12, 203 n3, 206 n52
- Albertus Magnus, 49, 64, 153–4, 188 n15
- alchemy, 129
- Alexander of Hales, 143
- Alhazen, 70, 73, 76, 192 n59, n67
- Al-Kindi, 69
- altarpiece, 3, 6, 143, 215 n64
- analogy, medieval theories of, 111–14, 119, 122, 125–30, 162, 193 n83, 208 n81, n92, 209 n96. *See also* polarity
- anatomy: of the body, 153; of the eye, 68, 76, 100–1, 172 n20, 195 n104
- Ancient Wisdom*, 37, 42, 56–8, 98, 115, 180 n9, n11, 184 n62, 185 n64, 186 n91, n94, 204 n15
- Angela of Foligno, 136–7, 213 n27, 222 n162
- animal, compared to human nature, 18, 21, 27, 103, 185 n63
- appetites, 12, 21–2, 29–30, 33–6, 41, 45, 47–8, 53–4, 58–9, 65, 114, 117, 121–2, 149, 175 n80, 177 n96, 182 n34
- Aquinas, St Thomas, 45, 53, 64, 82, 124, 179 n124, 181 n29, 208 n83
- Arabian Nights*, 51, 183 n49
- Arabic theories of vision, 50, 65, 69, 73–4
- architecture, 56, 167 n21
- Aristotle, 32, 63–6, 69, 71, 73–4, 82–3, 87, 91, 93, 97–8, 100, 103, 105–6, 139, 177 n92, 184 n58, n60, 191 n54, n55, 195 n112, 199 n33, 200 n68–n69, 201 n71, n75, n77
- art: *see* image devotion; Man of Sorrows; naturalism; symbolism
- art history, 3–4, 8, 134–5, 212 n13
- atomistic theory of vision, 73–4
- attention, theories of, 100, 104–6, 120–2, 127, 131, 173 n46, 206–7 n64, 211 n124
- Augustine, St, 18, 22–36, 41–2, 45–8, 53, 64–6, 69–70, 74, 77, 87, 93, 96, 105–6, 120–2, 124–5, 154, 156, 163, 172 n31, 173 n46, 174 n51–2, 175 n80, 176 n90, 177 n94, n96, 178 n103, n115, 180 n15, 185 n63, 188 n12, n13, 191 n50, 193 n74, 198 n22, 200 n66, 203 n3, 205 n43, 206 n55, n58, n61, n64, 211 n124, 218 n112, 219 n132
- Avicenna, 69, 83, 195 n112
- Bacon, Roger: biographical information, 68, 73, 187 n2, 192 n65, 207 n67; on signs, 75, 193 n83; on sin and the senses, 21, 103–4, 202 n103, 203 n3; on vision, 63–4, 68, 72–93, 95–107, 111, 122–4, 131, 134, 137, 139, 149, 193 n71, 195 n111–n112, n116, 197 n18, 200–1 n69
- Bartholomaeus Anglicus, 194 n101
- basilisk, 51–2, 183 n53, n55
- 'beholdenness', Heidegger's theory of, 8, 168 n33
- Belting, Hans, 133–4, 138, 144–7, 211 n1–n2, 212 n10, 216 n76, n88, 217 n91
- Bernard of Clairvaux: and iconophobia, 208 n89; *On Conversion*, 23, 34–6, 54, 114–20, 129–30, 178 n103, 204 n23, 206

- Bernard of Clairvaux: and iconophobia –
continued
 n46; *On the Song of Songs*, 111, 121–3,
 128, 132, 149, 205 n37
- bestiaries, 154, 183 n53
- Bible: art as ‘Bible of the illiterate’, 168
 n26; body and flesh in, 18, 24, 27–30,
 174 n53, 218 n108; David and
 Bathsheeba, 104; evil eye in, 52, 184 n56;
 Gal. 2.20, 135; Jer. 9.21, 47, 54, 185 n70,
 205 n28; 1 John 2.16, 188 n8; Matt.
 5.29, 115; Song 4.9, 159, 160, 221
 n148–9; Susanna and the Elders, 104. *See*
also Song of Songs
- Blemmyae, 18, 21, 171 n11
- blindness, 5, 8, 49, 113, 115–16, 118, 125,
 128, 163, 178 n114, 182 n36, 186 n91,
 203 n3
- bodily memory, 135, 215 n53
- bodily parts: brain, 22, 49, 81, 97, 100–1,
 171 n15, 184 n58, 195 n111, 207 n69;
 eyes: *see* eye; face, 82; heart, 17, 21–3, 36,
 46, 48–53, 123–4, 138–40, 144, 159–61,
 171 n12, 15, 183 n49, 185 n70, 186 n91,
 220 n136, 221 n160, 222 n161; head,
 21–2, 171 n12, n15, 172 n22; diaphragm,
 21; genitals, 22, 33, 53, 152–3, 157, 161,
 187 n100, 191 n149, 220 n137; mouth,
 35; nose, 19; stomach, 22, 35, 116, 206
 n43; uterus or womb, 33, 100–1, 161,
 195 n111, 202 n93, 220 n138
- body: *sōma*, 28, 174 n60; *corpus*, 22, 28, 32,
 150; corporeal hierarchy, 21–2, 171 n15,
 172 n22; disorder, 17–23; embodied
 mind or soul, 83, 97–103, 123, 163, 198
 n21; as matter, 24–35, 37, 71, 100, 102,
 171 n18, 177 n91, 178 n105; medieval
 body, 26, 152; as metaphor or symbol,
 22, 172 n22–n24; as microcosm; 71, 154,
 172 n23, 219 n130; passive, 26, 32–6, 41;
 positive attributes of, 24; as prison, 23,
 39, 173 n34; psychosomatic unity, 88,
 171 n9; resurrected, 21, 26, 37–8, 95,
 150, 174–5 n65, 175 n74; as tomb, 28,
 174 n60. *See also* bodily parts; flesh;
 gender
- Bonaventure, St, 127–9, 131, 139–40, 160,
 173 n50, 208 n82
- The Book of the Thousand Nights and a
 Night: see* Arabian Nights
- Brennan, Teresa, 5, 10, 88, 166 n15, 197
 n18
- Bynum, Caroline, 24–6, 32, 36, 152,
 171 n18, 173 n35, 176 n89, 178 n111,
 218 n102, n115, 219 n131, 220
 n136–n137
- camera obscura, 10, 88, 102
- Camille, Michael, 2, 167 n21, 171 n15, 172
 n23, 184 n60, 186 n83, 212 n13, 213
 n21, 214 n46, 217 n89
- canticles: *see* Song of Songs
- castle or fortress allegories, 54–6, 98–9, 185
 n78, 186 n89
- Catherine of Siena, 136
- carnal vision: *see* vision, carnal
- censorship: *see* internal sense as censor
- Certeau, Michel de, 127
- chastity, 53–8, 206 n61
- Christus und die Minnende Seele*, 159
- cognition, theories of, 38, 68, 71, 74–5, 78,
 83, 113, 123, 171 n15
- common sense, 81–2, 98
- Communion: *see* Eucharist; ocular
 communion
- compassion, 135, 139, 160, 216 n88, 217
 n91
- conception and pregnancy: theories of,
 32–3, 100, 153, 176 n90, 219 n123;
 perceptual analogies, 99–103
- concupiscence of the eyes, 65, 105, 188 n8.
See also vision, carnal
- contemplation, 5, 55, 118, 122, 128, 131,
 133, 143, 165–6 n50
- conversion, role of sight in, 136
- corpse, 144, 151, 216 n76, 218 n108
- Corpus Christi, feast of, 142–3
- cosmology: man as microcosm, 22, 71, 76,
 154–5, 172 n23, 219 n130
- courtly love and amatory literature, 41, 48,
 52–7, 96, 98, 139, 149–50, 159, 161, 182
 n34, n36
- creation, 67–8, 113, 127–8, 139–40, 163,
 188 n10, 190 n33, 191 n50
- crucifixion, images of, 3, 123–4, 135–40,
 143–9, 158–61, 217 n91, 218 n115, 220
 n137
- curiosity, 11, 35, 47–8, 64–7, 117
- custody of the eyes, 13, 58, 111–32,
 163

- David and Bathsheeba, 104
- death: body as tomb, 28, 174 n60; sin and death, 23–4, 28–34, 47–8, 54, 117, 150, 175 n73, n79, 185 n70. *See also* dowries of the glorified body; *Imitatio Christi*; liminality
- dematerialisation, perception as process of, 13, 67, 73–81, 102, 123
- Descartes, René, 24, 86
- desire: ocular or perceptual, 10, 12, 41–59, 85, 93, 103–6, 111, 114–22, 149; redemptive, 155, 157–63; relationship to power, 113; sexual, 28–37. *See also* sublimation; vision, carnal
- devotional practices, role of sight, 3, 125–31, 133–64
- dichotomies: *see* dualism; polarity
- disciplinary techniques: *see* custody of the eyes; enclosure; internal sense as censor
- disease and illness: associated with sin and corporeal disorder, 19, 21, 35–6, 153
- Douglas, Mary, 172 n24
- dowries (*dotes*) of the glorified body, 18, 37–8
- dualism or dichotomy, 18, 23–6, 32, 83, 112–14, 125, 127, 144, 173 n40, 208 n82
- Durandus, William, 126–7, 143, 204 n16, 205 n33, 208 n84
- Eckhart, 176 n79, 202 n95, 211 n124
- Eco, Umberto, 2, 9–11, 208 n89
- ecstasy, 130–1, 147, 155, 211 n124
- Edgerton, Samuel Y., 8–11, 166 n9, 168 n34, 169 n43
- emotion: *see* affect
- empiricism, 63, 86, 106–7, 196 n6, 200 n53
- enclosure, sensory, 13, 54, 56–7, 111–21, 186 n94, 204 n15
- Eneas*, 48–9, 53, 55, 181 n29, 182 n32
- Epicurus, 73
- epistemology: *see* knowledge
- Eriugena, John Scotus, 125, 177 n95
- Eucharist, 38, 92, 124, 135, 140–1, 143–4, 156, 162, 215 n54, n56, n60 n62, 218 n101. *See also* ocular communion
- Euclid, 69, 76, 87
- evil eye, 6, 51–2, 58, 96, 182 n34, 184 n55–n57
- exchange of gazes, 43, 53, 133, 145–6, 149–50. *See also* interpenetration; participation
- exempla literature, 55, 136
- extramission, 5, 71–2, 85–8, 91, 97, 101, 105, 120, 149, 191 n55, 192 n56, 197 n15, n18, 199 n38, 211 n130
- eye: of the body, 48, 67, 93, 113, 128, 132, 137, 161, 174 n50, 206 n58; of the flesh, 22, 41–59; of the heart, 17, 36, 118, 174 n50, 222 n161; of the mind, 17, 66–7, 71, 92, 111–13, 123, 174 n50, 189 n24, 198 n25, 203 n3, 206 n58; evil eye, 6, 51–2, 58, 96, 182 n34, 184 n55–n57; disembodied, 92–5; God's eye, 8, 117; wounding eye motif, 5, 48–53, 221 n148, n149; eye as orifice, 35, 41, 53–7, 115, 159, 161
- fall, 23, 26–9, 31, 41–3, 45–6, 53, 117
- fasting, 37, 171 n18
- Febvre, Lucien, 7, 168 n24
- female form, 48, 53, 104. *See also* Virgin Mary
- female spirituality, 56, 115, 135, 152, 155, 157–8, 160, 180 n9, 204 n15, 213 n22, n25, 220 n139
- flesh: *bāsar*, 27; *caro*, 22, 26, 28, 32; *sarx*, 27–8; Christ's flesh, 136, 149–51, 155. *See also* vision, carnal
- folklore, 52, 96
- form: union with matter, 24, 32, 67, 71, 100, 177 n92, 190 n31; in perception, 74–9, 98, 100–2, 131, 202 n95; theory applied to the Trinity and eucharist, 124
- fortress: *see* castle
- Foucault, Michel, 2, 113, 203 n7
- Francis of Assisi, 136, 139–40, 155, 214 n45–n46, 215 n53
- Franciscans, 24, 37, 51, 64, 73, 99, 136–7, 139, 146, 159, 192 n65, 206 n67, 215 n53
- free will, 83, 86, 120
- Freud, Sigmund, 128–9, 166 n15, 210 n108–n109
- Galen, 33, 52, 91, 171 n15, 183 n55, 219 n119
- gaze: divine, 8, 117, 162; female, 51–2, 57–8, 184 n57; male or phallic, 48–9,

- gaze: divine – *continued*
 52–3, 57–8, 162, 182 n36, 184 n58;
 psychoanalytic theories of, 5, 41, 57–8,
 87, 92, 197 n16. *See also* exchange of
 gazes; eye; Lacan; vision
- gender: and biological sex, 152–4; male
 lactation and pregnancy, 153, 219 n123;
 sense feminine / intellect masculine, 177
 n95–n96; and vision, 57–8, 101, 131;
 woman associated with body and flesh,
 25, 31–4, 59, 149. *See also* Jesus Christ,
 sexuality of; Jesus as mother
- Gerald of Wales, *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, 22, 42,
 46–8, 53–4
- Gertrude of Helfta, 136, 161–2, 222 n162
- Giotto, 139
- gluttony, 22, 55, 177
- Gombrich, E. H., 8, 11, 169 n36
- Gregory the Great, 47, 127; mass of,
 iconographic motif of, 144
- Grosseteste, Robert: biographical
 information, 65, 73, 188 n17; *Chateau
 d'Amour*, 54–6; *Commentary on the
 Posterior Analytics*, 65–7, 71; *De Dotibus*,
 18, 37–9; *On Light*, 67–9, 70–1, 162, 191
 n32–n33; theory of vision, 69–71, 88,
 95, 188 n10, 191 n55, 192 n56
- Grosz, Elizabeth, 88–90, 94, 97, 167, 187
 n100, 198 n23, n30, 200 n61
- Guerric of Igny, 151
- Guibert of Nogent, 156
- Gundisalvo, Domingo, 76, 193 n85
- Hadewijch, 155–6, 219 n131
- Hamburger, Jeffrey, 1, 158–60, 213 n22,
 216 n85, 217 n90, 220 n139,
 n141–n142, 221 n149
- hearing, 78, 82, 90–2, 115–16, 121, 133,
 156, 191 n55, 199 n33, 202 n103, 198
 n25
- Hélinand of Froimont, 23
- Heliodorus, 52, 183 n55
- Henri de Mondeville, 21, 24
- hierarchies: of bodily parts, 21–2, 171 n15,
 172 n22; cosmic, 71; of the senses, 7, 46,
 82, 103, 128, 209 n92
- Hilary, St, 124
- Hildegard of Bingen, 152
- host, 124, 133, 138, 140–4, 215 n64, 216
 n72. *See also* Eucharist
- Hugh of St Victor, 20, 46, 76, 193–4 n85
- Huizinga, Johan, 2, 166 n11
- humours, 52, 58, 73–5, 79, 90, 95, 98, 101,
 131, 184 n 58
- idealism, philosophical, 86
- image devotion, 5, 13, 102, 124, 133–4,
 144–5, 149, 157, 213 n21, n22, n25, 215
 n53, 216 n88, 217 n90. *See also* *Imitatio
 Christi*, Man of Sorrows
- images: Annunciation by Filippo Lippi, 202
 n93; crucifixion and Man of Sorrows, 3,
 123–4, 135–40, 143–9, 158–61, 217 n91,
 218 n115, 220 n137; indulgence images,
 3; memory images, 214–15 n52; miracle
 working, 3, 136; pictorial narrative,
 144–5, 158. *See also* image devotion;
 naturalism, pictorial
- imagination, 10–11, 25–6, 56, 67, 76, 81–2,
 98–9, 123, 129, 138, 173–4 n50
Imitatio Christi, 134–7, 140
- incarnation, 124, 134, 136, 143, 149, 155
 'inner' and 'outer' man, 23–5, 106, 172 n31,
 176 n82, 188 n12
- Integumentum*, 126
- intellect, 18–19, 29, 31, 36, 66, 71, 76,
 81–4, 86, 92, 95, 97–8, 100, 113, 122–3,
 130, 177 n95, 188 n13, 192 n57, 196
 n124, n126, n128, 197 n19, 203 n4, 210
 n108. *See also* vision, intellectual
- internal sense, as censor, 113–14, 122–5,
 207 n69
- interpenetration, devotional and literary
 motif, 58, 99, 131, 134, 156–62. *See also*:
 exchange of gazes
- interpretation, levels of: 4, 12, 106, 119,
 125–8, 207 n79
- intromission, 71, 73, 81, 85–6, 88, 91, 97,
 101, 104, 149, 153, 181 n21, 192 n56
Involucrum, 126
- Irigaray, Luce, 167, 198 n29
- Isidore of Seville, 33, 46, 177 n97, 183 n53
- Jacopone da Todi, 139
- Jay, Martin, 1–2, 11–12, 87, 165 n1, n3, 167
 n20, 197 n15
- Jesus Christ: as bridegroom, 18, 37, 115,
 121, 128, 151, 155, 157–8, 160, 209
 n103; depicted in art, 3, 123–4, 135–40,
 143–9, 158–61, 217 n91, 218 n115, 220

- Jesus Christ: as bridegroom – *continued*
 n137; doctrine of transubstantiation, 141,
 143; humanity of, 6, 24, 56, 136, 143–4,
 149–52, 217 n96; *imitatio Christi*, 124,
 134–7, 140; incarnation, 124, 134, 136,
 143, 149, 155; as mother, 151, 155–6,
 161, 218 n115; sexuality of, 152–6;
 wounds of, 5, 123–4, 128, 137–8, 143–4,
 152, 157–62, 216 n76, 221 n146, n158,
 n160. *See also* Eucharist
- jouissance*, 130, 155
- Judaic tradition: flesh and body in, 27, 174
 n53; evil eye in, 184 n57; attitude to
 images, 12
- Julian of Norwich, *Showings*, 135–7, 140,
 155, 162, 212 n17
- Keller, Evelyn Fox, 92–3, 95, 189 n27–n28,
 198 n25
- Kepler, Johannes, 7, 68
- kinaesthetic sense, 94, 97, 198 n24
- knowledge: experimental, 63–5, 72, 85;
omnis scientia bona est (all knowledge is
 good), 65, 188 n11; privileged
 relationship to sight, 66–7, 70, 78, 85,
 92–3
- Kristeva, Julia, 129–31, 151, 155–6, 198
 n30, 210 n120, n122, 211 n127, 218
 n108
- Lacan, Jacques, 1, 87, 92–5, 97–9, 102, 166
 n15, 179 n3, 187 n100, 197 n9, n16, 198
 n23, 199 n52, 200 n53, n61
- Laqueur, Thomas, 102, 152–4, 219 n116,
 n123, n130
- Le Goff, Jacques, 21, 23
- leprosy, associated with sin, 19–21
- Levin, David Michael, 7–8, 10–11, 168
 n31, n33, 192 n64–n65
- libido: *see* desire
- light: in Bacon's optics, 76–7; divine,
 116–18, 127–8, 131, 139, 161–2, 192
 n64, 202 n93, 214 n46, 221 n155;
 Grosseteste's philosophy of, 37–8, 67–74,
 88, 95, 170 n126, 190 n30–n33; in Plato,
 92
- liminality, Victor Turner's theory of, 151–5,
 157, 218 n102
- Lindberg, David, 68–9, 190 n32, 192 n56,
 193 n74
- Lloyd, G. E. R., 113, 126, 208 n81
- Lochrie, Karma, 31, 35, 175 n80, 178 n103,
 217–18 n101
- love at first sight, literary motif, 48, 181
 n28
- love, personifications of: 48–9, 53, 55, 57,
 147, 157, 159, 161–2, 221 n146
- Manichaeism, 26, 174 n52
- Man of Sorrows (*Imago Pietatis*), devotional
 image, 134, 143–51, 157–8, 212 n12
 maps, 18
- Marguerite of Oingt, 156–7
- marriage: as analogy for perception, 45,
 101–2, 202 n95; of body and soul or
 mind, 31–4, 45, 155; mystic marriage,
 155, 157, 162; positive attitudes to, 24
- Mary, the Virgin: *see* Virgin Mary
- mathematical theory, 64, 68–70, 76, 79, 84,
 190 n38, 191 n45, 193 n85, 194 n85
- matter, 24–35, 37, 67, 71, 100, 102, 171
 n18, 177 n91–n92, 178 n105, 190 n31
- Mechtild of Hackeborn, 157, 159, 200
 n139
- Meditations on the Life of Christ*, 137, 214
 n35
- memory, theories of, 35, 54, 72, 81–2, 100,
 116–23, 135, 140, 173 n46, 189 n20, 193
 n74, 204 n23, 205–6 n43–n44, n46, 210
 n122, 214–15 n52–n53
- menstrual eye, theory of, 52, 58–9, 184
 n57–n60
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice, 5, 8, 86–7, 103,
 166 n16–n19, 196 n6, 197 n10, n19, 202
 n98
- Miles, Margaret, 105, 136, 174 n65, 198
 n22, 206 n58
- mind/body dualism, 82–3, 97, 196 n122.
See also body, embodied mind; intellect
- mind's eye, 17, 64, 66–7, 71, 92, 111–13,
 123, 174 n50, 189 n24, 198 n25, 203 n3,
 206 n58
- mirror stage, Lacanian theory, 1, 93–5,
 98–9, 200 n53, n56, n61
- monstrance, 133, 143
- monstrous races, described by Pliny, 17–18,
 35, 38, 170 n2, 171 n10, 178 n108
- moral eye: *see* Peter of Limoges, *De oculo
 morali*
- multiplication of species: *see* species

- mysticism: bridal or nuptial, 18, 37, 115, 121, 128, 151, 155, 157–8, 160, 209 n103; experience defined by Michel de Certeau, 127. *See also* visions
- naturalism, pictorial, 2, 7, 9, 63–4, 69–70, 145, 169 n36, 188 n10, 216–17 n88–n89
- ‘nobility’ of sight, 11, 70, 87, 106, 191 n49
- objectivity, 9–11, 65, 68–70, 85, 87, 89, 92, 106, 169 n36, 196 n2
- ocularcentrism, 2–3, 7–8, 12, 67, 72, 89, 98, 134, 162, 164, 198 n29
- ocular communion, 134, 140–4, 149
- ocularphobia, 2, 7, 11, 163
- Oedipus complex, 99
- optics, history, theory and applications of, 7, 11, 50–2, 63–107, 111–12, 115, 122–6, 131–2, 134–5, 137, 148–9, 160, 162–3, 188 n10, 189 n27, 191 n45, 192 n66–n67. *See also* perspective
- original sin, 22–3, 26, 28–9, 42–6, 141, 150, 217 n96
- ostentatio genitalium* (genital display), 152
- ostentatio vulnerum* (display of Christ’s wounds), 152
- Ovid, 48–9, 181 n28, n31, 221 n146
- Panofsky, Erwin, 145, 168 n26, 169 n41, 170 n44, 191 n45, 208 n87, n89, 212 n12
- participation: devotional ideal, 111, 133–5, 143; epistemological attitude, 8, 87. *See also* exchange of gazes; interpenetration
- passion: associated with the abject, 135; defined, 35–6, 38, 96, 139; of Jesus Christ, 57, 124, 135–9, 143, 155–8, 162; in Roger Bacon’s theory of perception, 96, 124, 137–9. *See also*: crucifixion; Man of Sorrows
- Paul, the Apostle, 18, 24, 27–8, 34, 135, 174 n59–n60, n65, 175 n67
- Pecham, John, 68, 190 n34, 201 n87
- penitential practices: *see* disciplinary techniques
- perception: as assimilation, 87, 96–7, 99, 102, 123–4, 131, 136–7, 139, 147, 160, 162; reproductive metaphors, 99–103. *See also*: hearing; smell; taste; touch; vision
- perspective: applied to art, 2, 7–9, 145, 147–9, 168–9 n34, n36, 170 n44, 191 n45; theory and etymology of, 68; perspective of the flesh, 157–62
- Peter of Celle, 115, 221 n148
- Peter of John Olivi, 99, 194 n93
- Peter of Limoges, *De oculo morali*, 51–3, 123–6, 128, 178 n50, 183 n52, 207 n69, n79, 222 n161
- Peter the Chanter, 42, 46, 175 n77, 180 n5, 181 n23
- phallus, phallic gaze, 49, 57–8, 101, 159, 187 n100, 198 n29
- Piaget, Jean, 8
- picture theory of vision, 64, 66–7, 75, 81, 102, 123, 169 n36
- Pietà, 151
- Plato: *Phaedo*, 105, 203 n4; *Phaedrus*, 50–1, 182 n43; *Republic*, 203 n4; *Timaeus*, 21, 37, 50; theory of vision, 50, 71, 86–7, 92–3, 197 n12
- Platonism and Neoplatonism, 23–4, 28, 31–2, 67, 70–1, 73, 86, 98, 114, 125, 171 n18, 183 n46, 183–4 n55, 188 n12–n13, 203 n6
- Pliny, *Natural History*, 17–18, 21–2, 38, 170 n2, 171 n11
- Plotinus, *The Enneads*, 85, 98, 196 n1, 199 n38, 201 n77–n78
- Plutarch, 52, 183–4 n55
- polarity: theory of, 112–14; examples of, 2, 25, 32, 81. *See also*: analogy; dualism
- Pouchelle, Marie–Christine, 24, 172 n24, 191 n49, 201 n80
- Pseudo–Dionysius, 41, 179 n2
- psychoanalytic theory, 1, 5, 41, 57–8, 88–9, 92–3, 98, 128–9, 150, 187 n100, 199 n52, 200 n53. *See also* Lacan; mirror stage
- psychology of perception, 4, 10, 73, 75, 82, 86, 88, 98, 104–5, 114, 120–5, 138, 145, 193 n74, 204 n23
- Ptolemy, 70, 87
- realism: *see* naturalism, pictorial
- ‘reality effect’, Roland Barthes’ theory of, 69, 190 n40
- reason, 1, 17–19, 24–5, 31, 33, 35–7, 47, 53, 59, 64–7, 71, 75, 82, 93, 103, 112–14, 116–18, 125, 130, 149, 156, 169–70 n43,

- reason – *continued*
 174 n50, 175 n80, 177 n96, 203 n4, 208 n82, 217 n89
- redemption, 13, 25–6, 29, 105, 111–15, 127, 141, 144, 150, 155–6, 162–3, 217–18 n101
- relics, 133, 138, 143, 156, 212 n10
- reliquaries, 55, 135, 143
- repression, sensory, 7, 12–13, 112–14, 123, 125. *See also* custody of the eyes; disciplinary techniques; internal sense as censor
- resurrection of the body, 18, 21, 26, 37–9, 95, 150
- Richard of St Victor, 31, 45, 130–1, 133, 176 n82, 178 n114, 203 n3, 209 n95, 210 n113, n122, 211 n130
- Ringbom, Sixten, 166 n12, 213 n21, n23, 216 n88
- rites of passage, 151, 157, 217 n101
- Romance of the Rose*, 55, 98, 186 n81–n83
- Rothschild Canticles*, 147, 158–60, 162, 220 n139, n141–n142, n144, 221 n147, n149
- Rubin, Miri, 141, 143, 215 n54, n56, n60, n62, 217–18 n101, 221 n158
- sacraments: *see* Eucharist
- saints' lives (*vitae*), 136
- Salernitan questions*, 49, 52, 182 n40, 183 n53
- salvation: *see* redemption
- scholasticism, 64, 188 n15
- science: experimental knowledge, 63–5, 72, 85; history of, 8, 11, 13, 63–4, 69–70, 190 n39, 191 n43; scientific observation, 7, 66, 90, 103, 106, 122, 188 n10; scientific worldview, 11. *See also* optics
- self, ideas of, 1, 8–11, 23–4, 26, 28–31, 37, 41, 58, 89–95, 98–103, 112–13, 115–17, 129–32, 147, 149, 155–6, 171 n9, 186 n94, 197 n19, 198 n30, 200 n61
- senses: as gates or windows, 47–8, 53–6, 98, 115–18, 120, 123, 185 n70, 204 n16, 205 n33; as guardians or sentries, 54; hierarchy of the senses, 7, 46, 103; inner and outer, 36, 81, 113–14, 116, 118, 121, 123, 125, 135, 138, 173–4 n50, 188 n12, 211 n124. *See also* hearing; smell; taste; touch; vision
- sensuality, 17, 24, 30–4, 43, 45–7, 53, 64–6, 112–14, 118–19, 121, 125, 149, 156, 163, 177 n96, 203 n3, 206 n64, 216 n89
- sermons, 4, 6, 18, 20, 24, 34–6, 47, 54, 101, 103, 112, 114, 116, 119, 124, 128, 143, 149, 168 n22, 176 n79, 178 n106, 205 n37, n40, 217 n100
- serpent, 42–3, 45–7, 53, 180 n12, n15
- sexuality: sexual ambiguity or androgyny, 151; sexual continuum, 152–4, 219 n130; sexual dimorphism, 154. *See also* flesh; gender; vision, carnal
- shame, 29–30, 35, 42, 106, 117
- Sicard of Cremona, 138
- signs, Roger Bacon's theory of, 75, 193 n83. *See also* symbolism
- sin: associated with corporeal disorder, 19, 21, 35–6, 153; and death, 23–4, 28–34, 47–8, 54, 117, 150, 175 n73, n79, 185 n70; original sin, 22–3, 26, 28–9, 42–6, 141, 150, 217 n96. *See also* vision, carnal
- skin, 27, 79, 90–1, 94, 97, 106, 124, 198 n30
- smell, 7, 36, 54, 72, 78, 82, 90–2, 118–19, 171 n11, 191 n55, 199 n33
- Song of Songs, 114–15, 118–19, 121, 128, 147, 149, 156–60, 205 n36–n37, 209 n103, 221 n148
- soul: Aristotelian theory of, 32–3, 100, 191 n54; relationship to body, 18–19, 21–6, 29–35, 37–8, 45, 66, 71, 83, 88, 97, 105–6, 114, 150, 171 n18, 173 n34, 174 n52, 177 n94–n95, 178 n105, 179 n117, 211 n124; relationship to vision, 43, 48, 50, 53–4, 77, 81–3, 86–7, 90–1, 93, 96–7, 111, 116–19, 123, 127–8, 131, 185 n70
- species, theory of, 70–1, 73–83, 86–91, 95–102, 104–5, 121, 123–4, 139, 153, 193 n74, n83, 196 n124, 197 n14, 202 n103
- Stanbury, Sarah, 55, 57–8, 187 n99, 187–8 n107
- Steinberg, Leo, 144, 152, 202 n93, 218 n115, 220 n137
- stigmata: female stigmatics, 213 n25; stigmatisation of St Francis, 136, 139–40
- subjectivism, in medieval art, 9–10, 169–90 n43

- sublimation, 13, 26, 112, 118–19, 122,
 128–32, 162–4, 209 n105, 210
 n108–n120
 sublime, 26, 128–32, 155, 210 n110, n120,
 n122, 211 n127
 Suger, Abbot of St-Denis, 126–7, 208 n87,
 n89
 surgery, 21, 24, 172 n24, 201 n80
 surveillance, 113, 203 n7
 Susanna and the Elders, 104
 symbolism: and medieval art, 7, 145, 191
 n45, 216–17 n88; in science, 69, 84, 191
 n43, n45; symbolic outlook, 9–11;
 theories of, 25, 32, 126
 sympathy (*sympatheia*), 98

 Tachau, Katherine, 75, 78, 82–3, 194 n93
 taste, 36, 82, 90, 92, 103–4, 135, 143, 193
 n83, 199 n33
 Thomas of Cantimpré, 18
 touch, 54, 79, 82, 85, 89–93, 97, 103–4,
 111, 116, 133–4, 144, 168 n24, 198 n25,
 n29, 199 n33
 transcendence: 13, 24–7, 31, 65–6, 69, 84,
 93, 103, 106, 111, 113, 123, 125–7,
 129–33, 135–6, 188 n12, 211 n127. *See*
also sublimation; sublime
 transubstantiation, 141, 143
 Trinity, 25, 43, 45, 124, 155, 173 n46, 177
 n96, 180 n15, 188 n8, 200 n66, 206 n55
 Turner, Victor, 151, 218 n102

Unitas carnis, 154

Verses on Death, 23, 172 n26
 Virgin Mary, 54–8, 144, 151, 155–6, 202
 n93, 217 n96
 virtues and vices, 55
 vision: carnal, 41–59; spiritual or mystical,
 111–64; distancing effect, 88–92; history
 of, 1–12, 58, 163; ocularcentrism, 2–3,
 7–8, 12, 67, 72, 89, 98, 134, 162, 164,
 198 n29; oclularphobia, 2, 7, 11, 163;
 privileged relationship to knowledge,
 66–7, 70, 78, 85, 92–3. *See also* eye;
 optics; visions; visualisation
 visions, 10, 111, 135–8, 158
 visual pyramid, 77–8, 89, 91, 194 n90
 visual rays, 49, 51–2, 87, 91, 161, 196 n4
 visualisation, 3, 140, 158
 visuality, defined, 4–6
 vital spirit (*spiritus*), 22, 32

 wax and seal analogy, 75, 139–40, 193
 n82
 will, personification of, 34–6, 117–18
 William of Auxerre, 124
 William of Ockham, 78, 95
 women: *see* female form; gender; sexuality
 wounds of Christ, iconographic motif, 5,
 123–4, 128, 137–8, 143–4, 152, 157–62,
 216 n76, 221 n146, n158, n160
 Word of God, 116, 140