

Pilgrimage and Embodiment: Captives and the Cult of Saints in Late Medieval Bavaria

Megan Cassidy-Welch

Historians have traditionally suggested that the cult of saints underwent two main transformations during the later Middle Ages. First, it is frequently argued that saints' bodies became less necessary at shrines as cults became more delocalised. Second, as Lionel Rothkrug has asserted, the act of pilgrimage became more about 'looking forward in hope' than 'looking backward in gratitude'. This article explores the nature of late-medieval pilgrimage in the light of these assertions. I concentrate on the cult of St Leonard, patron saint of prisoners, and the promotion of his cult in the small Bavarian town of Inchenhofen from the thirteenth century. My argument is that the cult of St Leonard reveals that bodies remained a focal point of devotional practice at this shrine, and that the act of pilgrimage itself might usefully be seen as a generative act or process of embodiment.

Honest matrons, good men, young women, adolescent boys – they all came to the small Bavarian town of Inchenhofen during the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries to tell of their encounters with St Leonard, a medieval miracle worker associated variously with healing the sick, saving infants from drowning, comforting women in labour, and liberating prisoners.¹ Inchenhofen was one of a number of places in Germany devoted to St Leonard, but it was this small

¹ Leonard was allegedly a Merovingian saint, active in the time of Clovis, and was recognised by the king as the saviour of Queen Clothilde, whose life was in danger during childbirth. Leonard was given land to found a monastery at Noblac in Limoges. He died sometime between 559–70, on 6 November. For Leonard's *vita*, see Poncelet, *Acta Sanctorum vol. III November* (Brussels: Bollandianists, 1910), pp. 149–55. The earliest manuscripts containing the *vita* of St Leonard are eleventh-century (see Steven D. Sargent, 'Religion and Society in Late Medieval Bavaria: The Cult of Saint Leonard, 1258–1500', PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1982, p. 16), while the first mention made of his cult is in Adhemar of Chabannes' eleventh-century *Chronicon*. See *Ademarus Cabannensis. Chronicon*, ed. P. Bourgain-Hemeryck, R. Landes, G. Pon (Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 129) (Turnhout: Brepols, 1999).

Markt just north-east of Augsburg which grew to be one of the most popular pilgrimage sites in Bavaria from the mid to late thirteenth century.² This was in no small part due to the active promotion of Inchenhofen as a pilgrimage site by the monastic community of Fürstenfeld, a thirteenth-century Cistercian foundation which administered the pilgrimage church.³ Fürstenfeld abbey had gained jurisdiction over Inchenhofen (then a mere *Dorf*) in 1283 when the monastery was granted the parish church of Hollenbach with all its temporal and spiritual appurtenances. Among the temporalities were the rents from various villages, including Inchenhofen. Among the spiritualities was the right to appoint the vicar of Inchenhofen and the right to jurisdiction over the chapel of St Leonard.⁴ The chapel and the shrine to Leonard were therefore already in Inchenhofen prior to the arrival of the Cistercians, but it was the work of the Fürstenfeld monks which ensured the longevity and popularity of the cult in this region.

Diligent in their support of the site, the Fürstenfeld monks recorded the pilgrims' stories in a miracle book which was kept in the Inchenhofen church to provide materials for sermons and to bear textual witness to the wondrous workings of St Leonard. Stories of Leonard's miracles had long been part of the saint's *vita*: one collection of Leonard's early miracles was composed soon after 1030, while another was written by various authors from the twelfth

² Sargent, 'Religion and Society', pp. 67-74, traces the saint's developing popularity in German-speaking lands and notes a number of churches dedicated to St Leonard from 1109.

³ For a brief history of Fürstenfeld abbey, see Franz Machilek, 'Die Wittelsbacher, Kloster Fürstenfeld und die Wallfahrt St Leonhard zu Inchenhofen' in *Die Wittelsbacher in Aichacher Land. Gedenkschrift der Stadt Aichach und des Landeskreises Aichach-Friedberg zur 800-Jahr-Feier des Hauses Wittelsbach*, ed. T. Grad, (Aichach: Mayer, 1980), pp. 197–208. The monks' own (unpublished) history of the abbey is held in Munich, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv (Klosterurkunden Fürstenfeld).

⁴ On the Fürstenfeld monks and the pilgrimage site, see *inter alia*, Edgar Krausen, 'Zisterziensertum und Wallfahrtskulte im bayerischen Raum', *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis*, 12 (1956), 115–29; Machilek, 'Die Wittelsbacher, Kloster Fürstenfeld und die Wallfahrt St Leonhard'; Birgitta Klemenz, 'Die Zisterzienserniederlassung (Superiorat) St. Leonhard', in *Inchenhofen: Wallfahrt, Zisterzienser und Markt*, ed. Wilhelm Liebhart (Sigmaringen: Thorbecke, 1992), pp. 107–25; Klaus Wollenberg, 'Die Zisterzienser in Altbayern, Franken und Schwaben – ein Überblick', in *In Tal und Einsamkeit. 725 Jahre Kloster Fürstenfeld. Die Zisterzienser im alten Bayern. Band III: Kolloquium "Die Zisterzienser in Bayern, Franken und den benachbarten Regionen Südostmitteleuropas. Ihre Verbandsbildung sowie soziale und politische Integration"* 29.8.–2.9.1988, ed. Klaus Wollenberg (Fürstenfeldbruck 1990), pp. 15–28.

century.⁵ Two important Latin manuscripts now held in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, contain the miracles reported at the shrine of St Leonard at Inchenhofen between 1346 and 1447,⁶ while a Latin fragment of a miracle book dated to around 1459 also survives.⁷ Some later miracles (reported in German) detail the saint's activity at the Inchenhofen shrine from 1498–1512,⁸ while a number of post-medieval compilations and collections replicate the reports contained in the earlier manuscript sources.⁹

Chief among the stories contained in these miracle stories are tales of escapes from captivity. Almost 40 percent of the reports in the two Munich Latin miracle collections deal with liberations from imprisonment and escapes from captivity of various sorts.¹⁰ We hear of those imprisoned for the commission of crime and those imprisoned unjustly; we are told of dark cells, impenetrable towers,

⁵ See Sargent, 'Religion and Society', pp. 29–36.

⁶ Munich, B[ayerische] S[taats] B[ibliothek] Clm 7685 and Munich, BSB Clm 27332. Clm 27332 is a copy of Clm 7685 with some 180 additional miracles. See Sargent, 'Religion and Society' for a detailed account of the two Latin manuscripts.

⁷ Munich, BSB Clm 4322.

⁸ Munich, BSB Cgm 1722. See Elisabeth Dafelmair, *Das Inchenhofener Mirakelbuch von 1498 bis 1512: Edition einer mittelalterlichen Handschrift mit statischen Auswertungen zur damaligen Wallfahrtswesen* (Munich: EigenVerlag, 1988); Theodor Wohnhass, 'Zur Verehrung des heiligen Leonhard in Inchenhofen', *Jahrbuch des Vereins für Augsburger Bistumsgeschichte* 15 (1981), 247–54. Other miracles deal with healing and rescuing children from various accidents.

⁹ See Elisabeth Dafelmair, 'Die Mirakelbücher', in *Inchenhofen: Wallfahrt, Zisterzienser und Markt*, ed. Liebhart, pp. 65–82. A number of non-Bavarian *vitae* of the saint were produced throughout the Middle Ages, and many of these incorporated stories of Leonard's miraculous activities. For a resume, see Sargent, 'Religion and Society', pp. 43–47.

¹⁰ See Steven Sargent, 'Miracles, Misfortune and the Concept of Nature in Late Medieval Bavaria', *Medieval Perspectives*, 3 (1991), 211–35 for a discussion of this. The high number of miraculous releases found in the Inchenhofen book may be contrasted with another fifteenth-century German manuscript from Lauingen (held in the Pfarrarchiv Lauingen), which includes only one account of a prisoner's release from captivity amid eighty-nine miracles of St Leonard. See Max Springer, 'Das Mirakelbuch der Wallfahrt zum hl. Leonhard in Lauingen', *Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins Dillingen an der Donau*, 73 (1971), 52–65. For the earlier history of saints' involvement in the freeing of captives and especially the saints of late-antique Gaul, see Frantisek Graus, 'Die Gewalt bei den Anfängen des Feudalismus und die "Gefangenenbefreiungen" der merovingischen Hagiographie', *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte* Teil 1 (1961), SS. 61–156, together with Steven Sargent, 'Religious Responses to Social Violence in Eleventh-century Aquitaine', *Historical Reflections/Reflexions Historiques*, 12 (1985), 219–40.

savage guard dogs, evil tyrants, and airless dungeons; we encounter prisoners of war, women incarcerated by their husbands, *horribiliter* torture, and the imprisonment of the mad. The escapes are often dramatic, and fugitives occasionally appeared at Inchenhofen still partially enchained, or at the very least, clutching the shackles and fetters that had bound them as evidence of their ordeal.

Historians have tended to deploy these stories as evidence of a turbulent social milieu in late medieval Bavaria, and one tale does indeed narrate the ‘mala plurima, iniustitia [sic] dominante’ of the period of the Princes’ War around 1421, reporting that duke Ludwig was known as ‘destructor monasteriorum et oppressor [sic] pauperum’.¹¹ It is frequently (and not erroneously) assumed that in such violent times, captivity was more frequently practised by those ‘petty’ nobles (described in the manuscripts as tyrants), who found themselves under threat from the centralising agenda of the Wittelsbach dynasty; for some, taking hostages provided income and property, while for others imprisonment was one way in which feudal power could be asserted and wielded. St Leonard himself had always been associated with the liberation of prisoners,¹² so it is no surprise that miracles in which the saint is responsible for releasing prisoners are incorporated into the Inchenhofen miracle collections.¹³

The preponderance of captivity/escape narratives in the Fürstenfeld collections poses further important questions about the saint as liberator and the specific act of pilgrimage. What do these Latin miracle collections tell us about pilgrimage in late medieval Bavaria? What role do incarcerated and liberated bodies play in creating meaning for and around the cult of St Leonard? In answering these questions, it becomes clear that bodies both entrapped and free *were* crucial in the cultural production of meaning at Inchenhofen. First, liberated bodies were material manifestations of the saint’s efficacy. Second, fleshly and metaphorical bodies were the means by which the saint himself was embodied and authenticated. That is, the bodies of pilgrims themselves, the

¹¹ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 85r.

¹² Leonard is said to have gained the favour of Clovis by persuading the king to release a number of prisoners, and the saint’s iconography frequently features Leonard holding chains or shackles, symbols of the bonds of captivity that he was allegedly able to dissolve.

¹³ For the relationship between social violence and ‘rescue’ miracles, see *inter alia*, Michael Goodich, *Violence and Miracle in the Fourteenth Century; Private Grief and Public Salvation* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

shackles and fetters they brought with them, and the body of evidence produced from their stories all combined at the little church of Inchenhofen to make real the absent saint. Imprisonment and liberation provided a discursive framework – a language – for the ongoing process of cultic production.

In historical terms, it is my suggestion that although it is usually posited that saints' cults were delocalised and saints' bodies were needed less and less as a central focus of devotion from the thirteenth century, the cult of St Leonard reveals something quite different.¹⁴ In this village in Bavaria, the cult of saints remained corporeally fixated. Moreover, the practice of pilgrimage, far from simply being a linear event or a journey with a topographical destination and final spiritual resolution, was a retrolinear construction of bodily totality and corporeal intactness. Narrated in text, performance, travellers' tales, and image-making, the miracles of St Leonard reveal a small part of the pre-Reformation world still anxious to promote liberation amid confinement and wholeness from fragments.

Captivity and Escape

Two men from the Alsace had been convicted of homicide and were enchained in a tower with only one window measuring four fingers width across to let in air. Despairing of their lives, one of the men called on St Leonard for help. While the prisoner was asleep, the saint appeared to him in a vision, telling him to get up. The prisoner lamented that the chains and stocks binding him prevented him from moving. Finally the saint tapped the prisoner's feet whereupon the chains miraculously dissolved. St Leonard then opened up the tower wall, allowing both the prisoners to escape. They travelled to Inchenhofen in 1346,

¹⁴ On this point, see André Vauchez, *La sainteté en Occident aux derniers siècles du Moyen Âge: d'après les procès de canonisation et les documents hagiographiques* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1981); Patrick Geary, 'The Saint and the Shrine', in Patrick Geary, *Living with the Dead in the Middle Ages* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 163–76; Lionel Rothkrug, 'Popular Religion and Holy Shrines. Their Influence on the Origins of the German Reformation and Their Role in German Cultural Development', in *Religion and the People, 800–1700*, ed. James Obelkevich (Chapel Hill, 1979), pp. 20–86. Also see R. W. Scribner, 'Ritual and Popular Religion in Catholic Germany at the Time of the Reformation', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 35 (1984), 47–77; P. M. Soergel, *Wondrous in his Saints: Counter Reformation Propaganda in Bavaria* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993), esp. pp. 15–44.

where their story was told in public (*publice enarravit*). An *honesta matrona* from the same region, who happened to be in the Inchenhofen church as the story was being told, verified the truth of the tale.¹⁵ This tale is typical of the stories found in the miracle book in that it describes physical confinement in both a building and in chains; it tells us why the prisoners had been incarcerated; and it tells us that St Leonard responded to calls for help not by transporting the prisoners out of the tower himself, but by creating circumstances in which the men could secure their own escape. The story ends with the public affirmation of St Leonard's miraculous intervention at the Inchenhofen shrine and with the declared truth of the events by an independent third party.

The places in which prisoners were kept are important topographical elements in the miracle tales. For many, prison was a tower. Hans Senft of Tiespeck was held in leg irons in a tower for four days and nights;¹⁶ Hans Swertferger of Worms was kept in a tower for over a year;¹⁷ one man was locked up in a tower where there was no light at all.¹⁸ The towers are often described as impenetrable, firmly closed, surrounded by moats and in the castles of tyrants. A *carnifex* of Püchen was imprisoned in stocks in the castle of Schillingfürst for six days and was only released when he invoked St Leonard and promised to go to Inchenhofen,¹⁹ while for a priest of Aychach in 1421, prison was a castle out of which he could only climb with the help of St Leonard.²⁰ For some, prison was squalid, suffocating, and dark, and for others, no food but bread and water was offered, sometimes for months.²¹ Some were not held in towers or castles but were tied to trees in woods, or, like one woman, buried in a hole in the forest and covered with foliage.²² The chains, stocks, fetters, and leg irons which bound prisoners in their towers or cells are also expressly described, as are ferocious guard dogs. One *adolescens* from Italy was chained up by his hands

¹⁵ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 4v.

¹⁶ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 101v.

¹⁷ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 95r.

¹⁸ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 62v: '... non vidit lumine celi ...'.

¹⁹ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 56v.

²⁰ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 86v. For the notion that imprisonment in castles indicates that most cases of incarceration involved nobility, see Sargent, 'Miracles, Misfortune and the Concept of Nature'.

²¹ 'Carcer squalore' (Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 87v); 'nichil gustans nisi panem et aquam' (Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 93v).

²² Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 48r.

and feet for six months before being liberated by St Leonard, while an honest man from Nürnberg appeared at the Inchenhofen shrine in 1414 carrying the iron chains which had bound his arms for twelve weeks.²³ Hans Gundran of Lichtenstein found that the pressure of his chains suddenly eased when he prayed to St Leonard and he was able to escape two rabid dogs to flee the castle in which he had been imprisoned.²⁴ Still others had been tortured by tyrants, including one man who endured eight days of suffering before the saint intervened, a young widow who was captured and tortured by a tyrant, and two merchants imprisoned and tortured for 26 weeks.²⁵

Why a person had been incarcerated is also elucidated in the miracle stories. Some prisoners, like the two convicted murderers of Alsace, had been imprisoned as a result of the legitimate workings of secular justice. Another man had been incarcerated for cutting off the hand of a foe, while others had been convicted of forgery, spying, thievery, and so on.²⁶ Some were not guilty of any crime and had been locked up unjustly. The adjective *honestus* often describes those who were innocent of any crime, and denotes not only that the prisoner was incarcerated without reason, but also underscores the veracity of their story. Many of these people had been captured for ransom, such as the two men from Mendorff who escaped from their chains and scaled a wall with the help of St Leonard in 1405.²⁷ Some merchants and travellers had been captured far away by pirates; others had been prisoners of war or captured by Hussites.²⁸

The dramatic situations of confinement in which prisoners found themselves called for dramatic escapes. One *honestus vir* who was captured in Franconia and bound by both chains and fetters (*cathenis et vinculis*) inside a tower had to scale the inside of the building, reaching the very top in order to then descend, whereupon he was confronted by an exterior wall (which also had to be climbed) and a moat. With the help of not only St Leonard, but St John the Baptist, the man was able to flee.²⁹ St Leonard needed to be specifically invoked for escapes to be facilitated: Hans Marolff prayed to the saint for 14 days before he was

²³ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 77r.

²⁴ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 111v.

²⁵ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fols. 14r, 67v, 91v.

²⁶ For a resume of these, see Sargent, 'Religion and Society', *passim*.

²⁷ Munich, BSB Clm, 7685, fol. 53r.

²⁸ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 94r, for instance.

²⁹ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 13v.

liberated, while Conrad of Salzburg was blessed by a vision of the saint dressed in monastic habit before he arrived at the Inchenhofen shrine. Often, Leonard would dissolve the chains and leg irons holding a prisoner before manufacturing some miraculous means of escape. Sometimes the prisoners were asleep when this occurred. Petrus Marschalk, for instance, was slumbering in his prison when he heard a voice saying ‘Get up!’ (*Surge!*). An opening (*clausura*) appeared at the door and the prisoner, once he realised what was happening, made good his escape.³⁰ Magical apertures suddenly appearing in prison walls provided a common escape route for such prisoners, but sometimes other hazards had to be negotiated, too. Hans Leonhard of Wemdingen appeared at the Inchenhofen shrine in 1425 to narrate his thrilling tale: he escaped from prison, was pursued by his captors and their dogs and hid in a river. Miraculously, the dogs failed to bark when they saw him and he was then able to run away to safety.³¹ St Leonard could ensure that swords would fail to stab, that horses to which prisoners were tied would suddenly bolt to freedom, that guards would drop into oblivious slumber, and that dogs, formerly ferocious, would wondrously become benign.

In these stories of captivity and escape, St Leonard inevitably appeared as a result of prayer and he usually performed his miracles in response to the prisoner’s promise that he or she would travel to Inchenhofen to give thanks to the saint and to testify to the miracle that had occurred. This was highly conventional. As André Vauchez has shown, late medieval saints worked on behalf of a petitioner in a pseudo-contractual way,³² while the narration of a miracle at the public site of a shrine provided sufficient justification of the miracle to allow for what Miri Rubin has described ‘appropriate institutional response’.³³ In the case of the cult of St Leonard in Bavaria, for a prisoner’s story to be legitimated the reported miracle had to be incorporated into the body of texts and tales that eventually made up the *liber miraculorum* kept at Inchenhofen. In this context, tales involving liberation from imprisonment were particularly effective in promoting the saint. This may be ascertained in a number of ways.

³⁰ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 45v. Another sleeping prisoner, Matthias von Preussen, woke up to discover that the chains binding his feet had loosened enough for him to wriggle free. See Munich, BSB Clm 27332, fol. 147r.

³¹ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 90v.

³² Vauchez, *La sainteté en Occident, passim*.

³³ Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 114.

First, accounts of incarceration and miraculous release stressed the remarkable power of the saint and his efficacious response to the prayers of the needy and desperate. For the insane man who came to Inchenhofen in 1404 still enchained, the saint could provide not only physical release but mental quietude.³⁴ If the miracle reports are to be believed, those who asked for St Leonard's help invariably received it, even if they had been imprisoned for committing a heinous crime like homicide. What mattered in this instance was that the prisoner was penitent.³⁵ Second, the theatrical nature of imprisonment and escape drew narrative attention to the transcendent qualities of divine intervention. Temporal justice and injustice were publicly and clearly mitigated by St Leonard's intercession. This is not to say that the miracle reports advocate the abandonment of secular law, but it is clear that liberation – in the broadest spiritual and ontological sense – was the gift and provenance of the saint, and that the escape, for this reason alone, was legitimate. Earthly confinement was thus transitory. Finally, imprisonment stories focused the reader's/listener's attention on the body. It was, after all, the fleshly body which experienced the material reality of incarceration, with all its attendant feelings of hunger, thirst, cold, hurt, and suffocation. And it was the recently liberated fleshly body which spoke at the Inchenhofen shrine, a corporeal attestation to the workings of the saint.

These points need some elaboration, especially given that a set of very specific textual records has provided the evidence for my assertions – namely, the miracle book itself. Let us now turn to the production of the Latin texts in order to begin unravelling the discursive and spiritual economies of the cult of St Leonard.

Producing the Stories, Shaping the Saint

Those liberated from captivity by St Leonard made their way to Inchenhofen (mainly in the warmer spring and summer months) to fulfil the vow they had made to the saint and to give thanks for their release. When they arrived at the chapel of St Leonard they were met by the chaplain, often in the sacristy, where

³⁴ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 48r.

³⁵ An example is the case of Hanns Marolff, mentioned above, who had been imprisoned after murdering one of his adversaries (in self-defence, it was said) but who was still able to avail himself of the saint's aid after a fortnight of prayer and penitence.

they would recount their tale.³⁶ One of the later miracle books from Inchenhofen tells us that bells were rung to alert the community to the arrival of a pilgrim, whose story would then be narrated not just to the chaplain, but before an audience.³⁷ A Fürstenfeld monk stood by, listening to the narrative and taking notes in the vernacular. The story was then written up later, after having been translated into Latin. Thus, there were three stages in the production of the final version of the story: the oral telling of the tale, the initial transcription, and the ultimate textual versions that we may read in the manuscripts. These were written by a number of scribes over a period of time.³⁸

The preface to the first of the Latin miracle books immediately reveals some anxiety on the part of the chaplain, Eberhard, writing around 1350, that no one should doubt the reality of the miraculous occurrences:

Let no-one, doubting the greatness of these things, believe that I am lying. Far be it from me to lie about sacred things and to let something written about God be corrupted.³⁹

Eberhard is particularly concerned to validate his text by being very explicit about the evidence for Leonard's miracles. He tells us that he compiled the miracles from the information he had heard from honest people and what he had seen at the Inchenhofen shrine.⁴⁰ The great devotion (*magna devotio*) of the pilgrims, the veracity (*veritate*) of their words, and the proof of God's greatness (*maxime experientia magnalia Dei*) combined to provide, for him, indubitable factual evidence and by extension, truth. Eberhard states again;

³⁶ Hermann Bach, 'Mirakelbücher bayerischer Wallfahrtsorte (Untersuchung ihrer literarischen Form und ihrer Stellung innerhalb der Literatur der Zeit)', Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität zu München, 1963. See also Steven Sargent, 'Miracle Books and Pilgrimage Shrines in Late Medieval Bavaria', *Historical Reflections/Réflexions historiques*, 13 (1986), 455–71.

³⁷ Inchenhofen Mirakelbuch (1659), cited in Bach, 'Mirakelbücher bayerischer Wallfahrtsorte', p. 35.

³⁸ See Sargent, 'Religion and Society', pp. 201–39 for a paleographic description of the manuscripts Munich, BSB Clm 7685 and Munich, BSB Clm 27332.

³⁹ AASS, III, November, p. 184: 'Nec quisquam me mentiri estimet, rei magnitudinem dubitans: michi enim absit sacris mentiri rebus et adulterari verbum ubi Deus memoratur ...'.

⁴⁰ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, f ol. 2: '... Vidi et audivi ac ab honestis personis ...'.

Let no man believe me to be so mad, insane or irreligious that I would exalt my God or St Leonard with trifles or honour [them] with lies ... If I were to recount fictions and lies about God and his saint, I would provoke his ire and indignation damningly against me ...⁴¹

The events of which Eberhard writes occurred both elsewhere (such as the liberations from captivity which invariably took place in the German countryside or abroad) and sometimes at the shrine itself, in view of the chaplain. One child who came to Inchenhofen in 1364, for example, was unable to walk until St Leonard cured him – and Eberhard says that he himself led the cured boy by the hand as he walked around the chapel to the wonder of all the visitors.⁴² Other miracles were reported by individuals, as I have noted above, especially those described as *honestus/a*. The ratification of their stories by other pilgrims created a communal or collective consensus as to the tale's authenticity. And the memories of respected inhabitants of the village were also brought to bear on the longevity of Leonard's wondrous actions. Eberhard tells us, for example, that he gathered together some of the older people from Inchenhofen in order to find out about the origins of the site as a place where St Leonard performed miracles. They informed the chaplain that their ancestors (*progenitores*) had told them that a chapel had long stood on the site and that miracles had occurred there before the arrival of the Fürstenfeld Cistercians. Overall, then, what constituted Eberhard's evidence was historical and immediate, individual and collective, and derived from either the chaplain's own eyewitness authority or from secondhand accounts.

Steven Sargent has suggested that the tone of Eberhard's preface is defensive and that the chaplain's focus on justification and legitimacy hints at a wider ambivalence in fourteenth-century Bavarian society towards the truth of saintly miracles.⁴³ The shoring-up of truth in such texts, however, is at least in part rhetorical and Eberhard was certainly not the first medieval miracle writer to state his evidentiary and authoritative credentials. Moreover, the production of

⁴¹ Munich Clm 7685, fol. 2: '... nemo hominum estimet me tam delirum fore insanum atque irreligiosum quod vellem Deum meum ac S[anctum] L[eonardum] nugis exaltare ac mendaciis honorare ... si ausus dicere essem figmenta et mendacia de ipso Deo et sancto eius ipsius iram utique et indignationem adversum me dampnabiliter provocarem ...?'

⁴² Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 17v.

⁴³ Sargent, 'Religion and Society', p. 249.

the miracle books was in itself a historicising project which required the conventional historiographical apparatus of verification and justification in order to stake its claims to truth. Cistercians like Eberhard came from a culture in which, as has recently been shown by Elizabeth Freeman, foundation stories and accounts of spiritual origins had long been important, while the styles and narrative formulae employed in the service of Cistercian historical writing in all its guises were both classical (and rhetorical) and monastic (and spiritual).⁴⁴ Narrative conventions of truth such as the construction of evidence which I have outlined above were perennial elements in historiographical and spiritual texts, including *libri miraculorum*.⁴⁵

The body of evidence brought together in the miracle books was thus sealed by the material finality of the written text. For Eberhard, the human tongue was simply insufficient to narrate the miracles of St Leonard which, for their sheer number alone, made them worthy of permanent record.⁴⁶ The book object(s) which contained the miracles glorified God and the saint in enshrining story and verisimilitude in physical form. The same solidity was also found in the objects that pilgrims brought with them to Inchenhofen. Eberhard tells us that shackles, chains, irons, and other instruments of entrapment were piled up in the chapel as evidence of the saint's miracles,⁴⁷ while the miracle stories themselves state what sort of offerings were brought to the chapel. In 1389 an honest man who had been imprisoned for 14 days and freed by St Leonard brought the chains and irons which bound him to the shrine, and three years

⁴⁴ Elizabeth Freeman, *Narratives of a New Order: Cistercian Historical Writing in England 1150–1220* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002). For a non-Cistercian example, see Amy Remensnyder, *Remembering King's Past: Monastic Foundation Legends in Medieval Southern France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995).

⁴⁵ For some historiographical examples, see P. Damian-Grint, *The New Historians of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance: Inventing Vernacular Authority* (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 1999), p. 68, for the Latin tradition of eyewitness, and Jeanette Beer, *Narrative Conventions of Truth in the Middle Ages* (Geneva: Librairie Droz S.A., 1981). For the German Cistercian context in which earlier miracle books were composed, see *inter alia*, Die niederrheinischen Zisterzienser im späten Mittelalter. *Reformbemühungen, Wirtschaft und Kultur*, ed. Raymund Kottje, (Köln: Rheinland-Verlag GmbH. 1992) and Brian Patrick McGuire, 'Written sources and Cistercian inspiration in Caesarius of Heisterbach', *Analecta Cisterciensia* 35 (1979), 227–82.

⁴⁶ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 1v: '... lingua humana non sufficiat enarrare ...'

⁴⁷ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 1v: 'compedibus, kathenis, seris, ferramentis ceterisque instrumentis vinculatorum'.

later, a young man who had been starved for eight weeks in prison brought the two manacles which had bound his hands and feet.⁴⁸ Even those who had been prisoners abroad brought their fetters to Inchenhofen; one man chained up by his hands and feet by the Venetians managed to secure the chains which had bound his arms and bring them to the shrine.⁴⁹

Waxen representations of chains and shackles, together with wax images of body parts, candles, and unformed lumps of wax were also heaped on the altar. Steven Sargent has conveniently summarised these votive offerings, finding that out of the 199 wax votive recorded in the miracle book, 131 were unformed, 24 were images of figures, 18 were candles, 13 were instruments of captivity, and the remaining were either specific waxen images of body parts such as eyes or miscellaneous objects like a horse, a tower, or a ship.⁵⁰ In comparison, there were 192 iron votive offerings, the majority of which were instruments of captivity, 20 of which were figures, nine of which were unformed, and only a few were towers, rings, belts, and so on.⁵¹ The tradition of offering iron votives was already well established at St Leonard's 'home church' of Noblat, near Limoges, while wax votive offerings were commonly donated to saints' shrines throughout Europe during the medieval period.⁵² The specific association of iron with St Leonard derived from his function as liberator of captives who, as the miracle stories state, were frequently confined by means of iron restraints. Furthermore, at various churches dedicated to St Leonard in southern Germany

⁴⁸ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 28v–29r; Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 30v (*duas catenas*).

⁴⁹ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 73v: '... pedibus compressis et firmiter vinculusque brachio in turri positus [est]'.

⁵⁰ Sargent, 'Religion and Society', p. 345. For more on wax offerings, generally, see Susann Waldmann, *Die lebensgrosse Wachsfigur: eine Studie zu Funktion und Bedeutung der keroplastischen Porträtfigur vom Spätmittelalter bis zum 18. Jahrhundert* (München: Tuduv, 1990).

⁵¹ Sargent, p. 348. For some earlier discussions of the iron votive offering see Rudolf Kriss, *Eisenopfer: Das Eisenopfer in Brauchtum und Geschichte* (Munich: Hüber Verlag, 1957) and Richard Andree, *Votive und Weihegaben des katholischen Volks in Süddeutschland* (Brunswick: Vieweg, 1904). For more recent work on this subject see Joseph Moos, 'Iron Votive Offerings: Hope forged from Iron', *Hephaistos. Internationale Zeitschrift für Metallgestalter*, 9(10) (1996), 38–39. For some later examples of votive pictures of St Leonard, see Lenz Kriss-Rettenbeck, *Das Votivbild* (Munich: Verlag Hermann Rinn, 1958), especially pp. 58, 95, 108.

⁵² For a fairly recent overview of votives and the wax medium, see Susann Waldmann, *Die lebensgrosse Wachsfigur*.

(although not, it appears, at Inchenhofen itself), iron chains were wound around the exterior of the buildings. One example may still be seen at the tiny chapel of St Leonard at Hüfingen in Baden-Württemberg.

Votive offerings served a number of purposes at Inchenhofen. Initially, these objects constituted the *quid pro quo* in the contractual relationship between saint and prisoner which I have mentioned above. For an *adolescens* of Tolltz who had been imprisoned in the castle of Schlosperg for spying, his promise to the saint was not only to visit the shrine at Inchenhofen but also to bring with him the chains that had bound him during his time in captivity.⁵³ Another man who came to the shrine in 1443, Berkhart Schneider, promised to come to the shrine with his chains if he was able to carry them,⁵⁴ while the father of another prisoner promised to bring the combined weight of his son, his clothing, and his armour in iron if Leonard released his son from captivity.⁵⁵ Additionally, chains and other instruments of captivity bolstered the pilgrim's claims that their stories were true, as Steven Sargent has emphasised, in that they provided (weighty) material evidence that someone had experienced captivity and escaped from it.

Votive offerings were also semiotically meaningful in the same way that the corporeal, audible presence of pilgrims at the shrine was important. That is, in the absence of actual relics of the saint at the Inchenhofen shrine, other sorts of objects served to materialise Leonard, making the supernatural tangible and real in the clearest sensory way. Such offerings, I suggest, reworked traditional Christian cultural practices of acquiring the saint's body in the form of a relic, by imagining St Leonard and his work through specific representations of the body in tribulation and release.

At this point, it is worth noting that the actual relics of St Leonard were held primarily at Noblat, but a few appear to have made their way to Germany during the twelfth century. In 1139, bishop Otto of Freising 'consecrated an altar containing a relic of St Leonard' on the Petersberg in upper Bavaria, while another report of the saint's relics in Germany may be found in a letter written sometime after 1111 by Bishop Walfram of Naumberg, who had visited Noblat

⁵³ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 79v. Other promises were made to St Leonard in return for his assistance, including promises to abstain from eating meat or drinking wine until the journey to Inchenhofen had been completed, and undertaking the journey to Inchenhofen whilst begging for alms.

⁵⁴ Munich, BSB Clm 27332, fol. 154r.

⁵⁵ Munich, BSB Clm 27332, fol. 162r.

between 1106–11.⁵⁶ As far as we know none of these relics ever appeared at the Inchenhofen shrine.

Votive offerings thus served as corporeal substitutes in a general devotional discourse at Inchenhofen which revolved around the body. The chains and shackles presented at the altar represented the limbs that had been entrapped and then released by saintly intervention and sites where wonders had been performed. The fragmentary and individual nature of such offerings – one wax arm, a set of chains, an iron man – together created a corpus, not merely of evidence of the saint's actions, but of religious meaning. Here was a repository of objects which spoke of promises and contracts, of fear and hope, of what had happened in the past and in the present, and, moreover, of the pervasive links between the material and supernatural which lay at the heart of the medieval cult of saints. Such votive objects also served as cultural communicators by inviting a spectatorial sensibility at the shrine. As the chaplain, Eberhard, wrote in the preface to the miracle book, one purpose of publicising St Leonard's miracles was to prevent them from being 'buried silently in the earth'. A display of votive offerings was another public proclamation of Leonard's presence.

Like the *liber miraculorum*, votive offerings were objects or textual forms through which specific cultural and spiritual meanings were narrated. There are, however, further 'discursive affiliations' which may be traced beyond the frame of these texts.⁵⁷ Such affiliations were quite specific to the devotional and spiritual environment of the Cistercian monastic community which administered the Inchenhofen shrine and whose monks were responsible for writing the miracle book.

⁵⁶ The letter was written to the daughter of Margrave Ecbert of Saxony. See AASS III, Nov., p. 173 for this and the reference to Otto of Freising.

⁵⁷ I borrow the term from Paul Strohm, *England's Empty Throne: Usurpation and the Language of Legitimation, 1399–1422* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998), p. 214. See Natalie Zemon Davis, *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1987) for the cultural specificity of textual forms.

Cistercians and Imprisonment

The Cistercians of Fürstenfeld brought their own spiritual and intellectual baggage to the Inchenhofen shrine, especially in relation to theories of imprisonment and liberation. Cistercian writers had long found the prison to be a useful metaphor for talking about their own monastic way of life. For St Bernard, the monastery could be described as a prison in which the monk's gaze was directed inward to the soul and he described Clairvaux itself as a harsh prison in which he was confined. William of Thierry echoed these sentiments in his letter to the brothers of Mont-Dieu, while for Stephen of Sawley, a Cistercian novice ought to be aware that sometimes the solitude of the monastery could be upsetting, and that a new member of the community ought to imagine himself in paradise at such times.⁵⁸ Such language constructed the Cistercian monastery as a space in which confinement and enclosure were immediate and material. The inclusion of stories in Cistercian *exempla* and miracle collections concerning the inability of would-be fugitives to escape from this environment also emphasised the absolute necessity for monastic confinement in a physical space.⁵⁹ Behind the metaphor of monastery as prison lay the notion that one of the cornerstones of Cistercian life was stability and that a resolute commitment to this principle was crucial for each and every monk. Stephen of Sawley warned that a novice's heart would become like a 'broken jar' unless he remained in the monastery and that he must avoid leaving the abbey 'as you would avoid the noonday devil'.⁶⁰ The prison motif served to reinforce this principle by stressing confinement, permanence, and earthly commitment.

Such language was tempered, however, by a concomitant Cistercian spatial discourse in which the liberating propensity of monastic spirituality was stressed. For writers like Matthew of Rievaulx, the monastic site was paradisaical and

⁵⁸ See G. Penco, 'Monasterium-Carcer', *Studia Monastica*, 8 (1966), 133–43; Jean Leclercq, 'Le cloître est-il un prison?', *Revue ascétique et de la mystique*, 47 (1971), 407–20; Joan M. Ferrante, 'Images of the Cloister – Haven or Prison?', *Medievalia*, 12 (1989), 57–66; Megan Cassidy-Welch, 'Incarceration and Liberation: Prisons in the Cistercian Monastery', *Viator*, 32 (2001), 23–42.

⁵⁹ *Caesarii Heisterbacensis monachi ordinis Cisterciensis dialogus miraculorum*, ed. Joseph Strange (Coloniae: Sumptibus J.M. Heberle, 1851), Book 4, Ch. 56: *De sanctimoniali, quae dum nocte vellet ire ad saeculum, et caput ostio illideret, a tentatione liberata est.*

⁶⁰ E. Mikkers, 'Un *Speculum novitii* inédit d'Etienne de Sallai', *Collectanea Cisterciensis Ordinis Reformatorum*, 8 (1946), 17–68 (p. 66).

imprisonment was to be found outside the abbey gates. The German author of the famous thirteenth-century *Dialogus miraculorum*, Caesarius of Heisterbach, believed that denying an enthusiastic recruit entrance to the monastery was to condemn him to the eternal confinement of hell.⁶¹ For others, the monastic site was the gateway to heaven, a kind of second paradise, inhabited by angels and filled with the chanting of heaven. Topographical confinement allowed the monk to locate himself in an eschatological landscape of infinite freedom. The contrast between the prison of this life and the eternal liberation that would follow was, as I have argued elsewhere, a particularly Cistercian concern.⁶²

Imprisonment for some Cistercians, however, was not merely metaphorical. From 1206, the Cistercian General Chapter formally decreed that prisons should be constructed within Cistercian monasteries to house apostates, violent monks, and occasionally non-monastic criminals.⁶³ The Cistercians at Fürstenfeld were not averse to imprisoning their own criminous monks. One of the chaplains of the shrine of St Leonard, Paul, was incarcerated sometime between 1454 and 1463 for squandering the monastery's resources and for allegedly plotting to murder the abbot. He was certainly imprisoned for at least six years without a hearing.⁶⁴ These Cistercian prisons were generally sited to the east of the monastic precinct, where the infirmary was also housed, and were places associated with punishment and with healing. In the tradition of Tertullian, who had written to the Christian martyrs advising them to take full advantage of being imprisoned in order to move closer to God, Cistercians utilised incarceration as a reminder to those monks, especially fugitives, that the world outside was a 'dark and terrible ... prison, a land of drought and a symbol of death'.⁶⁵ The punitive agendas behind incarceration in a monastic prison were thus mitigated

⁶¹ *Dialogus miraculorum*, Book 1, Ch. 14.

⁶² Megan Cassidy-Welch, *Monastic Spaces and their Meanings: Thirteenth-Century English Cistercian Monasteries* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001).

⁶³ *Statuta Capitulorum Generalius Ordinis Cisterciensis ab anno 1116 ad annum 1786*, 8 vols., ed. J. M. Canivez, (Louvain: Bureau de la Revue d'histoire Ecclesiastique, 1933–41), vol. 1, 1206, 4: 'Qui voluerint carceres facere, faciant, ad fugitivos suos et maleficos, qui talia meruerint', and *Statuta* vol. 2, 1229, 6: 'Statuitur ut in singulis abbatis Ordinis, in quibus fieri poterit fortes et firmi carceres construantur, ubi ad abbatis arbitrium retrudantur et detineantur, secundum quod exgerint crimina, criminosi ...'.

⁶⁴ Munich, Bayerisches Hauptstaatsarchiv (Klosterurkunden Fürstenfeld), 1210.

⁶⁵ Mikkers, 'Un *Speculum novitii*', p. 68.

by ideologies of emplacement and enclosure which were at the heart of Cistercian monastic practice.⁶⁶

I would suggest that the cult of St Leonard was attractive to medieval Cistercians at least in part because this saint deployed a spatially driven language of liberation and transcendence. For theologians like Bernard of Clairvaux, the liberation of the spirit was available to those who could properly negotiate the confines of the present. For St Leonard, as was stressed in the miracle book at Inchenhofen, the same principles of transcendence were at work in his actions. In the monastic world, the confines of the present were the confines of the monastery itself with all its disciplinary regimes. For lay Christians like those who visited the little chapel at Inchenhofen, the confines of the present were the prison cell, the tower, the stocks, and so on, but they were also the confines of secular justice and secular law, social structures, and feudal or domestic constraints. These constraints could be negotiated by proper prayer to St Leonard just as the material rigours of monastic life could be endured by the freedom that simultaneously existed in the Cistercian landscape. Of course, as I have pointed out above, the Inchenhofen shrine was not an invention of the Fürstenfeld Cistercians. That community's support of the pilgrimage, however, may easily be understood in the context of Cistercian views on imprisonment and the organisation of disciplinary and spiritual spaces.

It should also be stated that the pilgrimage church of Inchenhofen brought revenue to the Fürstenfeld monastery and to the surrounding community. Various privileges granted to the monastery from the later thirteenth century show that the Fürstenfeld Cistercians gained authority over the Inchenhofen markets and rights to the taxation of food and drink sold in the village, together with (after 1328 when the church of St Leonard was formally incorporated into the monastery) the right to keep two-thirds of the offerings brought to the shrine by pilgrims.⁶⁷ Pilgrims were attracted by a series of indulgences during the early fourteenth century, while continued patronage from Emperor Ludwig of Bavaria ensured the continued survival and growth of the pilgrimage site.⁶⁸ Income from

⁶⁶ For more on Cistercian prisons and the link between Cistercian spirituality and practice, see Cassidy-Welch, 'Incarceration and Liberation'.

⁶⁷ See Sargent, 'Religion and Society', pp. 107-20 for the sources.

⁶⁸ A new church was also constructed by 1332 and new indulgences were issued in 1349, 1352 and 1391. There seems to have a twenty-year lull in activity at the shrine (from 1366-83, probably associated with the Plague) but the popularity of the pilgrimage certainly revived from 1383 onward. See Sargent, 'Religion and Society', for this information.

sustained pilgrimage traffic was not inconsiderable, and the inventory of the Inchenhofen chapel written in 1448 reveals that the monks possessed a number of chalices, a couple of effigies of St Leonard, silver and gold crosses, four monstrances, silver ampules and thuribles, and a number of other valuable objects. The inventory also lists books; several of these were liturgical and biblical, while others included a copy of Jacobus de Voragine's sermons on the saints, more sermon collections, a collection of decretals, German and Latin vocabularies, various papal works, glosses, and so on.⁶⁹

Were Cistercians particularly devoted to St Leonard? There is no evidence to suggest this. Dedications of Cistercian abbeys were to the Virgin Mary, as was legislated by the general chapter in 1134, and in 1281 Mary is mentioned as special patroness of the Cistercian order.⁷⁰ Although some claim that Cistercians brought the cult of St Leonard to Germany, there is little support for this either.⁷¹ It seems that the inherited chapel of St Leonard was supported by the Cistercian community at Fürstenfeld partly for the revenue it brought to the abbey and partly because the saint's activities were in keeping with broader Cistercian understandings of the Christian spiritual life.

Pilgrimage as Embodiment

Lionel Rothkrug has argued that pilgrimage was 'the purest possible expression of a devotion "looking forward in hope", as opposed to looking backwards in gratitude.'⁷² This view may be nuanced if the corporeal nature of the act of pilgrimage is understood. We know that after the twelfth century, there was a shift in what people venerated at saints' shrines. No longer was it so necessary to have the actual physical remains of the saint as a specific object of veneration at a shrine – a statue would do, or an object such as the host, which represented, and became at certain moments, an entire body. There was a material difference in the objects which assumed the saint's identity after the twelfth century, a change described by Patrick Geary as 'the transformation of

⁶⁹ For a printed copy of the inventory see *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, ed. Paul Ruf (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, second edition, 1970), 4 vols., vol. 3 (1), pp. 123–25.

⁷⁰ Canivez, *Statuta* vol. 1, 1134, 18; *Statuta*, vol. 3, 1281, 6.

⁷¹ See Sargent, 'Religion and Society', pp. 97–100 for the debates.

⁷² Rothkrug, 'Popular Religion and Holy Shrines', p. 49.

the physical'.⁷³ At Inchenhofen, as I have shown, there was no saint's body, but there were objects and stories, images and words. These were the things, I argue, that effectively built the body of the saint. Pilgrimage here was a generative act which was not simply about making a journey but about embodiment.

Issues of embodiment and corporeality – the 'fuss about the body' – have occupied medievalists for a number of years. Historians like Caroline Walker Bynum and more recently Suzannah Biernoff have shown that medieval understandings of the body cannot be described as simple dualisms. The flesh and the spirit, the material body and the soul – these 'entities' were constituent parts of more complicated and sometimes puzzling discourses surrounding what the body was and what the body did.⁷⁴ Attention, too, has lately been paid to the service and shaping of bodies in medieval lay and religious thought. For some, psychoanalytic paradigms describing the construction of the body can help us to understand medieval attitudes to corporeality, especially in a religious context. Sarah Kay and Miri Rubin describe the (Lacanian) process whereby a body is 'staged' as a unity (or seen as whole) in a longer project of ego formation, and the concomitant anxiety that arises from innate, infantile perceptions of a *corps morcelé*, or body in fragments. Kay and Rubin argue that although critiques of the totalising propensity of Lacanian thought are well-founded, we may still see in medieval culture various attempts to create bodily totalities and to resist the anxiety 'that such bodies may, after all, result from pretence or illusion, that bodies may in fact just be fragments'.⁷⁵

⁷³ See Patrick Geary, 'The Saint and the Shrine'.

⁷⁴ Caroline Walker Bynum, 'Why all the Fuss about the Body? A Medievalist's Perspective', *Critical Inquiry* 22 (1995), 3–33; Walker Bynum, *Fragmentation and Redemption: Essays on Gender and the Human Body in Medieval Religion* (New York: Zone Books, 1992); Walker Bynum, *The Resurrection of the Body in Western Christianity 200–1336* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1995); Suzannah Biernoff, *Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages: Ocular Desires* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002).

⁷⁵ *Framing Medieval Bodies*, ed. Sarah Kay and Miri Rubin (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1994), p. 6. For another exposition of Lacanian thinking on the body in a medieval context see Miri Rubin, 'The Body, Whole and Vulnerable, in Fifteenth-Century England', in *Bodies and Disciplines: Intersections of Literature and History in Fifteenth-Century England*, ed. Barbara A. Hanawalt and David Wallace (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), p. 21. And for some criticisms of Lacan by another medievalist, see Madeline Caviness, *Visualizing Women in the Middle Ages: Sight, Spectacle, and Scopic Economy* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001), pp. 37–40. For Lacan's own expression of these ideas, see Jacques Lacan, 'Le stade du miroir comme formateur de la fonction du Je telle qu'elle nous est révélée dans l'expérience psychanalytique' (1949) in *Écrits* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1966).

Kay and Rubin's examples of attempts to assert whole bodies include the religious symbolism of transcendence, the language of the body politic, and the discursive gendering of male and female bodies. Embodiment in this poststructuralist and psychoanalytic context is interactive, reflective, and reactive. That is, the process of embodiment requires bodies to communicate desire for totality, embodiment reflects a desire for totality, and embodiment reacts against fragmentation by positing wholeness in its stead.

These points may be useful in teasing out what I see as the generative or constructive nature of the pilgrimage to Inchenhofen. Interaction, for instance, can certainly be seen in the convergence of pilgrims at the chapel site. The miracle book frequently speaks of the great multitude of people at the Inchenhofen chapel and care is taken, as I have mentioned, to report that the pilgrims' stories were told in public before an audience comprising of ecclesiastics and other pilgrims. Occasionally, the climax of the pilgrim's tale required the active participation of the people present at Inchenhofen. In 1423, for example, the continuator of the miracle book, Ulrich Riblinger, cut free one escaped prisoner from the chains he was still wearing as he told his story.⁷⁶ In another instance, a man who had been miraculously cured by St Leonard climbed into the pulpit with the priest and caused a great tumult by showing himself to be healed of paralysis,⁷⁷ while an amazed crowd of pilgrims witnessed the healing of another pilgrim at the shrine in 1360.⁷⁸ Similarly, the stories of escape and release in the miracle book use the prisoner's body to describe the relationship between earthly corporeal confinement and transcendent saintly liberation. An example may be seen in the case of Burchard Schneider, who appeared at the shrine in 1443 to describe his experience of being incarcerated and released by St Leonard. Schneider's guard fell asleep, allowing the prisoner to pick the locks of the chains which bound him. In order to prevent Schneider from murdering the guard in order to free himself, St Leonard magically widened the window so that Schneider could climb out, negotiate the guard dogs, and finally escape.⁷⁹ Here, the prisoner needed the saint to escape his gaol without

⁷⁶ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 88v.

⁷⁷ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 15v '... et statim tumultus factus in populo ...'.

⁷⁸ For instance, Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol.37r: '... multis tunc presentibus et audientibus videntibus et stupentibus...', and Munich, BSB Clm 27332, fol. 123v: '... per merita sancti le[onhardi] visum recepit multis coram presentibus peregrinis ...'.

⁷⁹ Munich, BSB Clm 27332, fol. 154r-v.

committing a heinous sin, just as the saint needed the prisoner's testimony and physical presence at Inchenhofen to publicise the miracle. The physical and spiritual interaction between St Leonard and Schneider was the mutual basis on which their relationship rested.

The need for embodiment, or what Rubin and Kay call the 'desire for totality', may primarily be seen in the conscious use of a specific site to broadcast the miracles, authorise the meanings of the saint's work, and build the reputation of St Leonard. The chapel at Inchenhofen was the terrestrial locus where information about the saint was brought together and eventually included in the text of the *liber miraculorum*. From the fragments of information communicated by individual pilgrims and witnesses, an authoritative corpus of saintly activity was composed. In this way, desire for totality was as much about the creation of certainty as it was about shaping the authentic saint. In the preface to the miracle book, too, chaplain Eberhard reflects this desire by bringing together in his narrative the memories of the Inchenhofen elders, the stories of the pilgrims 'from diverse parts of the world' and the material solidity of the votive objects. The combination of these elements formed the text of the miracle book and, as I have suggested above, helped to embody the actions of the saint, and by extension the saint himself.

Reaction, which Lacan sees as arising from anxiety about bodily fragmentation and the dissolution or non-existence of identity, was also part of the pilgrimage act. In socio-political terms, we can certainly see in the *liber miraculorum* a narrative and spiritual assertion of the Christian body against the attempts by tyrants and others to dislocate prisoners from their communal or familial contexts. Stories which depict devoted Christians overcoming oppression, repression, and constraint by invoking St Leonard asserted an intact community of the faithful which could not be dismantled. The story of Ulrich Falkner exemplifies this. Falkner had been imprisoned in the city of Nürnberg and had managed to escape from the iron chains which bound him. Those in charge of the prison demanded to know how he had escaped and upon hearing that St Leonard had responded to the prisoner's request for help, Falkner was set free 'out of honour and reverence for St Leonard'.⁸⁰ In this story, the saint's intervention reminded those responsible for imprisoning Falkner that they too

⁸⁰ Munich, BSB Clm 27332, fol. 158r: '... ob honorem et reverentiam sancti le[onhardi] ...'.

were part of the wider spiritual community touched by the actions of the saint. Likewise, the collective and public authorisation of Leonard's miracles asserted in memory, story, and text at Inchenhofen affirmed a devotional consensus of meaning around the saint's cult.

Was there a sense of anxiety in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Bavarian society that might account for such interest in wholeness and embodiment? The authors of the miracle book are certainly concerned to give us this impression. There are numerous examples of people being captured during the Hussite wars, as well as examples of people being imprisoned during the seemingly interminable feudal battles between rival dukes, especially in the period 1392–1505.⁸¹ It has even been suggested that this constant warfare added to St Leonard's popularity, as the use of incarceration was increasing as a means of conflict resolution and money-making in the lawless social and political climate of southern Germany. For Steven Sargent '[c]aptivity and imprisonment, whether just or unjust, were a pervasive source of insecurity in late medieval society'.⁸² It is also asserted in the miracle book that in such times there was general cosmic disorder; at one point during a period of warfare a locust plague obscured the sun and ruined the land, forcing many paupers to come to the monastery at Inchenhofen for relief.⁸³ The implication is that St Leonard provided something of an antidote to social and political malaise, and the miracle book strongly suggests that St Leonard could be invoked to provide succour during tumultuous and uncertain times.

More importantly, the shrine of St Leonard at Inchenhofen reveals some need on the part of pilgrims and the Cistercian community to materialise the saint's actions, to embody the miracles. As I have shown in this article, the written

⁸¹ For prisoners of war captured by Hussites, see Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fols. 94–95r, 99r, 107–08. For the general notion that anxiety pervaded northern European culture during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, see Johan Huizinga, *Herfstij der Middeleeuwen: Studie over levens-en gedachtvormen der veertiende en vijftiende eeuw in Frankrijk en de Nederlanden* (Haarlem, 1919; 21st edition ed. Anton van der Lem, Amsterdam and Antwerp, 1997; English translation by Rodney J. Payton and Ulrich Mammitzsch, *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

⁸² Sargent, 'Religion and Society', p. 290. For some more general comments on the metaphor of prison as human existence, see *inter alia*, Gerhart B. Ladner, 'Homo Viator: Medieval Ideas on Alienation and Order', *Speculum*, 42 (1967), 233–59.

⁸³ Munich, BSB Clm 7685, fol. 17v.

word, the oral story, and the bringing of objects to the shrine were all ways in which this was done. I have argued that in this context, pilgrimage was a practice deeply rooted in the corporeal sensibilities of the earlier medieval cult of saints. Although it is often asserted that saints' cults in the period after the thirteenth century were less dependent on the body, the cult of St Leonard shows us something different. There may have been no relics of St Leonard at Inchenhofen, but there was a repository of incontrovertible evidence as to the efficacy of the saint. Such evidence was also used to express more profound spiritual anxieties about dislocation, confinement, and imprisonment. That such anxieties might be allayed and perhaps resolved, it was the purpose of the shrine of St Leonard to offer those who visited it ways of seeking, achieving and recognising both physical freedom and inner freedom – those elusive socio-cultural freedoms that Christianity had long promised to provide.

*Department of History
The University of Melbourne*