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**PART I  INTRODUCING MEMORIA**

1  **Introduction: Challenges in memoria research**

Since the 1980s, *memoria* research has been an important field in medieval studies.1 This becomes clear when looking at the historiographical publications in which the developments within the field are described. Michael Borgolte (1998 and 2002) situates the origins of *memoria* research in Germany; he explains its different phases, assessing historical and social factors from post-war Germany.

The 1950s saw the birth of the study into *Memorialüberlieferung*, with memorial registers as its object.2 This resulted in the research of nobility on the one hand, and of monastic commemoration of the dead on the other. In the 1980s this gave rise to the *memoria* paradigm and the research discussed in this article. As the historiography testifies, the commemoration of the dead also drew the attention of medievalists in other countries: Britain and other Anglophone countries, France, Scandinavia, the Netherlands and Central European countries.3 Michel Lauwers in his historiographical article of 2002 discusses the German *memoria* research in relation to the French *Annales* studies into death and attitudes towards death.

Anna Adamska assesses the state of research in Central European countries in her article of 2009. A bibliography has recently been made available for Dutch and Belgian *memoria* research (2009). Other authors concentrated on specific topics. Megan McLaughlin reviewed the scholarly historiography on the prayer for the

---

1  Any memorial practices other than those found in European societies of the Middle Ages and Early Modern Period will not be discussed in this article.

2  In this article the word ‘register’ will be used in a general way, not as thelimitative archival term.

3  Please note that ‘Commemoration of the dead’ will be used as an alternative for *memoria*.

When studying the publications in the field two – mainly practical – challenges come to the fore. First, as so often in medieval studies, the field of memoria requires the crossing of borders of academic disciplines. Medievalists from various backgrounds are involved in memoria research: historians, literary historians, music historians, art historians, and theologians researching the history of the Church and of liturgy. Many publications testify to cooperation between scholars educated in different fields, but also to the bridges that yet need to be built: in many cases researchers choose primarily the source type or types closely related to the discipline in which they are trained, even if the research questions require the use of a combination of sources.

Secondly, most memoria scholars have been largely focusing on case studies and small-scale projects and have hardly engaged in comparative studies across time and space. As a result, scholars either give in to the temptation to make unsubstantiated generalisations or they avoid the question of representativeness of phenomena. This is a serious problem. With regard to curial tomb sculpture, for instance, Julian Gardner remarks that scholars “have devoted a disproportionately large amount of time and attention to those of the signed tombs which are associable […] to a known sculptor”, while largely neglecting other tomb monuments. He argues that this not only gives a one-sided impression of the tombs stylistically, but that it also prevents scholars from looking into the historical contexts which led to the commissioning and different outlooks of these tombs.5 Willibald Sauerländer noted that an overall historical context for founder images (Gründerbilder) cannot be constructed, because no inventories exist.6 Although the mentioned publications date from 1992 and 1984 respectively, problems like these do not seem to have been solved sufficiently anno 2011. At conferences, scholars express the lack of broad comparative research as problematic, because

---


5 Gardner, *The tomb and the tiara*, 32. In the Preface the author remarks: “Too much is still cast in the venerable mould of monographic discussion of the stylistic development of a single, identifiable sculptor”, VII.

Apart from these two methodological challenges, this article will also address two content-related challenges: first of all, the study of parties involved and, secondly, of reception and appropriation. With ‘parties involved’ we refer to all parties who were, actively or passively, involved in commemoration practices, whether operating in networks or not. In recent years researchers have been paying more attention to the complexity of donation practices in relation to memoria and to the various roles played by the parties involved, but little comparative research has as yet been done into this problem. Research into the reception of medieval commemoration practices is vital as this can advance our understanding of its functions and meanings in society at large. However, before we can assess the parties involved in reception and the options for research into this subject, we need to define ‘reception’ in relation to medieval memoria.

These methodological and content-related challenges – and the prospects and possibilities they offer to the field of memoria research – are central to this article. We aim to discuss these matters in view of the ongoing Medieval Memoria Online (MeMO) project. In 2009 a team of researchers from different disciplinary backgrounds received a large grant from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). The MeMO project (2009-2013) is to make “available on the Internet an information system containing databases with inventories and descriptions of sources that are fundamental to the study of memoria” for the region of the present-day Netherlands up to 1580 (to be on the internet by January 2013). The research tools made available by MeMO can meet the four challenges addressed in this article. Accordingly, at the end of this article we will offer a further introduction to the MeMO project, its background and its possibilities.

First, in section 2, we will outline how memoria is defined and which subjects and themes come to the fore when overlooking the historiography of this research.

7 Especially this lack of research made Kansteiner very critical of memory studies in general. He identifies as one of the main problems: “Most studies on memory focus on the representation of specific events within particular chronological, geographical, and media settings without reflecting on the audiences of the representations in question.” The result is that “the wealth of new insights into past and present historical cultures cannot be linked conclusively to specific social collectives and their historical consciousness”. Kansteiner, ‘Finding meaning in memory’, 179. On the next page (180) he concludes that collective memory studies have “not yet paid enough attention to the problem of reception both in terms of methods and sources”.

8 The MeMO project is an initiative by Truus van Bueren (Utrecht University). For an overview of the grants from other institutions and the participating universities and institutions for cultural heritage, see the MeMO website, Medieval Memoria Online. The application is being developed in cooperation with DANS (Data Archiving and Networked Services) in The Hague. For the project proposal reworked into an article, see: Van Bueren and De Weijert, ‘Medieval Memoria Online (MeMO). New Research Possibilities’.

9 Around 1580 in the main part of the Netherlands the reformed church became the public church, as a result of which the commemoration of the dead changed in many respects. Any material from the period up to 1580 will be included, but the inventories show that the majority dates from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.
field. Sections 3 and 4 are devoted to two matters of method and the problems and possibilities they create for memoria researchers. Section 5 and 6 will discuss the challenges of researching the parties involved in memoria, and of reception and appropriation. Next, sections 7 and 8 introduce the MeMO project and list the sources for memoria research catalogued in the MeMO database. Section 9 describes the project’s methodological advantages. By way of conclusion we will present further themes for future research in section 10. In sum, this article has a twofold aim: on the one hand reviewing the existing memoria historiography, thus identifying subjects and themes that require attention from scholars, and on the other hand to introduce the MeMO project and the possibilities that tools such as MeMO offer to face the challenges posed.

2 State of the art

Definitions of memoria

Before we present the methodological and content-related challenges in the field, we need to take a step back and assess the scholarly discussion on memoria. This is all the more important because since 1980 the scholarly interest in the various forms of remembering and commemorating in the Middle Ages and other periods has increased exponentially. Memory studies, to use the prevailing collective term, are hot! In 2005, Astrid Erll wrote an extensive survey on the state of the art in memory studies, and the field has only expanded since.10

In the 1970s, scholars started using the term memoria for the research discussed in this paper.11 Two articles by Otto Gerhard Oexle were instrumental in defining the field: ‘Memoria und Memorialüberlieferung’ (1976) and ‘Die Gegenwart der Toten’ (1983). The author contended that even after death people were part of medieval society as ‘legal persona’ (‘Rechtssubjekte’).12 Mentioning their name was a key factor, because it made the deceased present among the living.13 The

10 Erll, Kollektives Gedächtnis. The second edition has appeared in November 2011. For a methodological critique of ‘memory studies’ in general, see Kansteiner, ‘Finding meaning in memory’.
11 Translations for the Latin memoria such as ‘commemoration’, ‘remembrance’, and ‘remembering’ (Gedächtnis) stand in close relation to each other and are often linked to all kinds of remembering of what is absent: absent objects, past events and deceased and absent persons. ‘Memory’ is also used both in the sense of the ability to recall/remember something (geheugen), and in the sense of an actual recollection (herinnering, Erinnerung/Andenken). For an analysis of the meaning of memoria, see: Oexle, ‘Gegenwart der Toten’, 22-26.
13 Oexle, ‘Gegenwart der Toten’, 31: “In der Nennung seines Namens wird der Tote als Person evoziert”.
year 1984 saw the publication of the key volume *Memoria: Der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter*, a collection of articles under the editorship of Karl Schmid and Joachim Wollasch. In this volume Oexle wrote the article ‘Memoria und Memorialbild’ in which he defined *memoria* as follows:

[...] für die *Memoria* war grundlegend, dass sie soziales Handeln bedeutete, das Lebende und Tote verband. Dabei wurde eine Vielzahl religiöser, politischer, rechtlicher und ökonomischer Gegebenheiten berührt und integriert. *Memoria* war somit nicht nur ein religiöses Phänomen, sondern umfasste auch das Moment der Rechtssicherung und Besitzsicherung, das Moment der Historiographie, der historischen Erinnerung, aber auch [...] das Moment der Sicherung politischer Legitimität. *Memoria* war also [...] ein ‘totales soziales Phänomen’ (see Plate 1).\(^{14}\)

By using the expression ‘total social phenomenon’ to describe *memoria* Oexle refers to the sociologist Marcel Mauss, who used it to characterize the concept of gift exchange.

Another important source of inspiration for the development of the concept of *memoria* have been the publications by Jan Assmann. In 1988 this Egyptologist summarized the epitaphs he was studying as ‘Sei eingedenk’, which he elucidated as “eingedenk des Vorangegangenen und des Kommenden. Handle für die, die gehandelt haben, und handle so, dass andere für dich handeln werden.”\(^{15}\) Herein lie the three aspects of *memoria* as expressed by Oexle with the triad ‘Tradition

---

– Sukzession – Memoria’, which is fundamental for the creation of nobility and the sense of belonging to the nobility. It means commemorating one’s predecessors (memoria) as it had been done and will be done (tradition) and being aware that one’s actions followed those of one’s predecessors and would precede those of one’s successors (succession).¹⁶ For instance, lists of successive officials that were read aloud as well as episcopal and abbatial gesta are expressions of this awareness of succession and continuity. Steven Vanderputten writes that gesta served as proof of the continuous succession of abbots, thereby ensuring the legitimacy of the present community.¹⁷ Painted and sculpted succession series of officials with their fixed iconography and composition, their fixed formulations in texts, and the open spaces reserved for the portraits of successors, are a direct visualisation of Oexle’s triad and are therefore depictions of the basic principle of memoria (see Plate 2).¹⁸ Bram van den Hoven van Genderen discusses the relation between memoria, tradition and honour in the activities of the canons of Oudmunster in Utrecht in Heren van de Kerk. He shows that the members of the chapter were constantly aware of being a community throughout time, and of having both predecessors and successors.¹⁹

Other definitions are closely related to Oexle’s.²⁰ Caroline Horch summarises various definitions in her 2001 dissertation. She sees four recurring characteristics: the community of the living and the dead; the presence or representation of the dead among the living; the acts performed by the living for the dead and vice versa; and the securing of those performances in the future.²¹ Memoria has also been summarized as ‘Care for the here and the hereafter’.²² All authors explicitly point out that memoria involves more than liturgical commemoration. “Die Memoria des Mittelalters ist ein Phänomen, dem man mit einer Reduktion auf nur einen Aspekt, etwa den religiösen, nicht gerecht wurde. Gerade das soziale Handeln der Menschen orientierte sich vielfach an der Notwendigkeit und den

¹⁶ See: Oexle, ‘Memoria als Kultur’, 37-41 where he describes memoria as a means for the nobility to create, articulate and express identity; in the research of nobility the focus is on the function of memoria as a means to justify noble positions and hereditary status by solidifying the reputation of names and lineages.
¹⁸ Van Bueren and Oexle, ‘Die Darstellung der Sukzession’. See also Meuwissen, Gekoesterde traditie, on the succession series of the land commanders of the Teutonic Order, bailiwick of Utrecht, with extensive summaries in English and German.
²⁰ See for instance: Schilp, ‘Totengedenken des Mittelalters’, 22, and Geary, Phantoms of Remembrance, 18: “memoria was a key organizing principle, not only in medieval theology but in every aspect of medieval life. It meant memory, but also those objects and actions by which memory was preserved”.
²¹ Horch, Memorialgedanke, 15.
²² In Dutch: ‘Zorg voor het hier en het hiernamaals.’ Van Bueren and Van Leerdam, Care for the Here and the Hereafter. For an illuminating analysis of the combination of these two aspects in collegiate chapters, see chapter VI of Meijns, Aken of Jeruzalem, entitled ‘Pro anima mea, pro statu regni’, 617-659.
Nevertheless, liturgical commemoration is a fundamental aspect of memoria. Bijsterveld defines liturgical commemoration as “the remembrance of the living and the dead in all liturgical services that religious and clerics – secular and regular, male and female – performed collectively in masses, offices, anniversaries, vigils, prayers, and the saying or singing of psalms, as well as individually in ‘private’ prayers, whether or not in conjunction with fasts and the performance of ‘good works’ such as the distribution of alms, pittances, and commemorative meals or ‘refections’ in order to ensure salvation.”

This definition, like the previous definitions, also stresses the bond between the living and the dead and thus the care for the here and the hereafter.

23 Horch, Memorialgedanke, 14-15.
24 In the already mentioned Memoria volume of 1984, Arnold Angenendt contributed an extensive article on this subject, ‘Theologie und Liturgie des mittelalterlichen Toten-Memoria’.
Memoria and donation practices were closely related because the reciprocal nature of all activities involved is vital in defining the concept of memoria. In short, the memoria system is based on the adage do ut des. Reciprocal gifts were not only essential in the liturgical commemoration of the living and the dead, they were also an extremely potent social mechanism, as they were instrumental in acquiring and maintaining power and prestige, and in managing of conflicts and disputes. For this reason Bijsterveld gave his book the title Do ut des. Gift Giving, Memoria, and Conflict Management in the Medieval Low Countries. Thus, memoria is a total social and dynamic phenomenon because it is linked to religious, economic and socio-political issues.

Shifting boundaries

These definitions might create the impression that the concept of memoria is well-defined and that at least memoria researchers themselves know what they are talking about. Even so, in his 2002 article, Lauwers states that memoria is slowly becoming an all-encompassing term with vaguely determined and seemingly shifting boundaries. He mentions that just about everything that has been handed down to us in documents seems to belong to memoria culture. In his 2008 historiographical review of memoria research in Germany, Dieter Geuenich observed that indeed there is an expansion of the concept and the research field. He mentions the changes in the topics in three proceedings of conferences in Germany which have been published throughout the years: the already mentioned Memoria: Der geschichtlicher Zeugniswert des liturgische Gedenkens im Mittelalter (1984), Memoria in der Gesellschaft des Mittelalters (1994), and Memoria als Kultur (1995).

The authors have a point here. The strength and at the same time the weakness of the concept of memoria is that many aspects of medieval life can be considered to have been part of the practice of the commemoration of the dead, and that as a result boundaries are difficult to define. Therefore it may be helpful to describe memoria research in terms of what it is not – as opposed to what it is – for the MeMO project. It is not the ability to recall or remember something (memory, Gedächtnis, geheugen). The type of memoria studies we aim for is not historiography in general, and not every type of historiography is relevant for this memoria research. The object of memoria as defined here is not the liturgical commemoration of God and his saints. Hagiography and the lives of saints, the ‘very special dead’, are not central to the kind of commemoration of the dead we study, the dead instead being understood here as the common (sinful) people. Also, this type

26 The donation pro anima is the gift to a religious institution “…in order to receive a spiritual reward in the hereafter through the prayers of the clergy or monks for the benefactor’s soul”, Bijsterveld, ‘The Medieval Gift’, 20.
27 We use the term liturgical in the same broad sense as Bijsterveld and other memoria scholars do, including all types of communal and individual prayer.
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of *memoria* research does not involve the study of all remembrance practices, nor of *lieux de mémoire*, and it is not about collective memories, *i.e.* collectively shared representations of the past in the definition of Maurice Halbwachs.30

What then is *memoria* in the definition of the MeMO project? *Memoria* is the creation and expression of a community of the living and the dead who look after each other’s interests to secure eternal salvation.31 As such it is morally and religiously edifying, but it may also attest to one’s political, social and hereditary status in the here and now. It is a means to propagate beliefs and convictions, and a way to remember the achievements of the commemorated persons. But, as Schilp mentions: “Immer wieder ist der Rückschluss auf die inhaltlichen Dimensionen der *Memoria* über die Liturgie hinaus am Einzelfall zu untersuchen, als gedanklicher Schluss zu beweisen, eben nicht nur einfach vorauszusetzen oder a priori zu unterstellen”.32

It goes without saying that scholars working with the above-described concept of *memoria* want to know about – and participate in – developments in adjacent fields, and they do not wish to build walls around their research fields.33 This becomes clear if we look at the scholars involved in *memoria* research who step into adjacent fields.34 Recently a volume was published as one of the results of the project *Herinnering in geschreven en praktijk* (‘Memory in Word and Deed’) with a combination of articles focusing largely on memorial practices by Elisabeth van Houts, Arnoud-Jan Bijsterveld and Paul Trio, and articles on commemorative practices in religious institutions that go beyond the commemoration of the dead by Anne Bollmann, Truus van Bueren, Bas Diemel, Koen Goudriaan and Brigitte Meijns.35 A group of German *memoria* scholars is active in research in Stadtkultur and research of churches, and therefore also in research of cultural remem-

---

30 For an interesting collection of historiographical articles: Van Houts, *Medieval memories*. They show that apart from monks also women collected stories about the past to pass them on to the next generation. Some types of historiographical sources can contain information on memorial practices, see for instance Van den Hoven van Genderen, ‘Remembrance and *Memoria*’ (2005). For an example of research on liturgical commemoration, Rose, *Ritual memory* (2009).


33 See for instance, Oexle ‘Stadtkultur des Mittelalters als Erinnerungskultur’, 11 where he refutes criticism on research of ‘Erinnerungskulturen’: “Ich halte die Frage nach den ‘Erinnerungskulturen’ für eine der wichtigsten Innovationen der Geschichtsforschung an der Wende zum 21. Jahrhundert”.

34 As, for instance, two scholars involved in the MeMO project: Bijsterveld, ‘Commemorating Patrons and Gifts in Monastic Chronicles’ and Van den Hoven van Genderen, ‘Utrecht Canons’.

This kind of collaboration, however, does not mean that the boundaries of the various types of *memoria* studies cannot be defined. On the contrary, the above-made distinctions between adjacent fields of research related to commemoration practices and remembrance remove the problem of vague and shifting boundaries.

**Research themes**

Three themes come to the fore in the historiography of the research field as it is defined above: 1. the sources as such, both written sources and (other) objects; 2. the communities in which the commemoration takes place, and 3. *memoria* in relation to (changes in) medieval society and religion in general.

The first group consists of research projects that concentrate on one or more sources of the same type, resulting in editions and analyses of the sources. For the written sources the memorial registers (necrologies, etc.) must be mentioned in particular, these being the type of sources from which the paradigm of *memoria* evolved. Since 1970 many editions of these registers have been published, among others in the series *Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Libri memoriales et necrologia*, and still new editions and other publications on these types of registers appear, especially in Germany. Only a few memorial registers from the Early and Central Middle Ages are known for the region of the present-day Netherlands. Most of the over six hundred registers in the inventory made for the MeMO project date therefore from the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period (sixteenth century). They have been written down in approximately 190 manuscripts (including convolutes and miscellanies). The majority of these manuscripts have not yet been researched extensively. Other publications concentrating on one type of source deal with diverse types of narrative sources, foundation charters, last wills and testaments, and liturgical sources regarding the commemoration of the dead (see Plate 3). As for the objects other than manuscripts and books, only

36 See, for instance, Büttner and others, *Städtische Repräsentation* and Schilp, *Pro remedio et salute anime peragemus*. For a discussion of the various memory functions of the church building of the Frauenstift Essen, see Lange, ‘Sakralarchitectur und Memoria’.

37 Publications are numerous. Because of the space available we shall for each theme mention only a few, being well aware of the fact that by doing so we leave out important work. Also, as we aim to make *memoria* research of the Low Countries better known to scholars abroad we shall mention quite a few publications on this region.


40 1. On narrative sources, see, for example, Bijsterveld, ‘Commemorating Patrons and Gifts’ (chronicles), and Bollmann, *Frauenleben und Frauenliteratur* (biographies); 2. For foundation charters: Büttner, ‘Stiftungspraxis an der Essener Münsterkirche’, and Horch, ‘…pro
Plate 3. Two pages of a book of hours and prayer book. On the right page the Office of the Dead begins with the invitatorium: “Mi hebben ombevanghen die suchten des doots, die drovighe seer der hellen mi ombevanghen” (The sorrows of death have compassed me: and the pains of hell have found me; psalm (114) 116: 3). The initial M is decorated with two praying souls in purgatory. The left page shows the names and the dates of death of the owner’s husband and parents. The text ends with: “bid voer alle hoer sielen”, pray for all their souls.

two important groups have been published on extensively: tomb monuments and floor slabs (Plates 4 and 5), and memorial paintings and sculptures (see Plates 1, 2 and 6).


The second group of research projects is concerned with the study of rituals and memorial practices in religious and ecclesiastical institutions (convents, confraternities, chapters, parish churches). Architecture, but especially church furnishings, such as altar necessities, are mainly studied in connection to the research of these communities in which the commemoration of the dead took place. Both the administrative sources and the (other) objects are subject to research, as well

---

Plate 4: The cenotaph that Bishop Joris van Egmond († 1559) placed in the cathedral of Utrecht in 1549 between the choir pillars on the south east side. Joris van Egmond had founded a monthly Holy Sacrament mass in 1548, to be celebrated at the high altar. The text of the charter is hewn on the inside of the triumphal arch of this monument. Below the arch probably a statue representing the founder was placed, kneeling in the direction of the high altar. The bishop’s heart was buried under the monument after his death.

---


43 See Lange, ‘Sakralarchitektur und Memoria’, 61, who argues for architectural historians to include memoria more consistently in their research and to see “was sie zum Verständnis der Baukunst beitragen kann”.

Plate 5 Tomb slab of Archbishop Siegfried III von Eppstein (†1249). Most beholders will have recognised the slab as a monument for an archbishop and the trampling of the lion and the basilisk as a triumph over death and sin. Those who had seen monuments elsewhere may have interpreted these beasts as common iconographic features on funerary monuments. The archbishop crowning two kings may have been recognised by many as unusual. However, only those beholders who were familiar with the political situation of the archbishopric of Mainz in the 1230s and 1240s may have recognised the intended meaning that was communicated through this deliberate mistake.
as the spoken and sung rituals such as funeral rites, visits to the grave, and sung memorials. As these expressions of memoria only exist while being performed, they can only be studied indirectly, through the extant memoria sources. The same holds true for the donation and use of transient goods, such as food, wax for candles, and most types of clothing. Next to memoria in religious and ecclesiastical institutions, families and social groups (especially the nobility and the clergy), memorial practices in towns and cities have recently appeared as an important research theme.44 Research on memoria and gender has become an increasingly important topic in the past decade as well.45

A third group of themes has an even wider scope; it deals with memoria in relation to (changes in) medieval society and religion. Relatively much research has been done on the consequences for gift-giving practices and memoria of changes in society as a result of the rise of the market economy, the formation and growth of cities, and the rise of new religious orders in the Central and Late Middle Ages.46 Samuel Cohn published widely on the consequences of the Black Death for society in general and for changes in memorial practices in particular. The relation between crises and memoria has been dealt with in Gerd Althoff’s article ‘Zur Verschriftlichung von Memoria in Krisenzeiten’, for example.47 Memoria and religious movements like the Modern Devotion is a topic begging for further exploration.48 Furthermore, there is the disappearance of the commemoration of the dead as it was practiced during the Middle Ages. Oexle and others state that memoria only fully disappeared in the nineteenth century.49 However, the various developments in the different types of Reformed churches each require

44 1. Families: Saul, Death, Art, and Memory. 2. Social classes and memoria: Borgolte, ‘Der König als Stifter”; Dumolyn and Moermans, ‘Distinctie en memorie”; Kuiken, ‘Prominente en paupertas”; Leenen, ‘Selbstvergewisserung nach der Krise”; Lieven, Adel, Herrschaft und Memoria; Van der Velden, The donor’s image; Oexle, Kulturelles Gedächtnis; 3. Towns and cities: Faber, ‘Zorgen voor de ziel”; Lauwers, La mémoire des ancêtres; Van Luijk, “Mors certa, hora incerta”; Robijn, ‘Brothers in life and death”; Schilp, for instance, ‘Spieelleute’. In her discussion on developments in the study of memoria in Central European countries Adamska also points to the attention authors pay to memoria “as one of the essential marks of urban piety”.
46 For a discussion of literature on social and political changes and its consequences for memoria, see the historiographical article by Bijsterveld, ‘The Medieval Gift’, especially 32-38. See also Magnani, Don et sciences sociaux.
47 Cohn, Death and Property; idem, The Cult of Remembrance. Althoff, ‘Zur Verschriftlichung von Memoria’.
48 Breure, Doodsbeleving en levenshouding; Breure and Van Bueren, Commemoration in the convent Mariënpoel (Rich Internet Application); Van Bueren, ‘Herinnering in praktijk”; Goudriaan, ‘Stein bidt voor zijn weldoeners’; idem, ‘Herinnering en herstel’. Diemel, “Want bij der schrifture soe bliven die dode”.
49 Oexle discusses the end of the memoria culture as a result of the French revolution by using the novel Die Wahlverwandtschaften by Goethe, see for instance: Oexle, ‘Gegenwart der Toten’, 22–26.
further research.\textsuperscript{50} For the Netherlands, Germany and the Scandinavian countries, in which the Calvinist and Lutheran churches became the official religious institutions, this kind of research still needs to be performed. The influence of the Counter-Reformation also deserves more attention.\textsuperscript{51} And last but not least, it would be very interesting to compare the memoria cultures of both Latin and Orthodox Christianity.

\textbf{PART II \ MATTERS OF METHOD}

\textbf{3 Building bridges and crossing borders}

It can be concluded from the previous sections that building bridges and crossing borders is a necessity for most research projects whose point of departure is the memoria paradigm. This is a challenging requirement. In this section we shall propose a new approach to ‘interdisciplinarity’, \textit{viz.} a three-level model that might help scholars to meet the challenges effectively. To illustrate this we will later on demonstrate how this model is applicable to the MeMO project.

\textit{Crossing disciplinary borders: problems and possibilities}

Memoria research cannot exist without crossing borders. This already becomes clear in the Memoria volume of 1984 that Patrick Geary described as: “a broad, multifaceted view of memory and remembrance as unifying themes of medieval self-perceptions.”\textsuperscript{52} The volume is considered the basic publication of memoria research and presents a diverse selection of studies of philologists, theologians, historians, art historians, and codicologists, some of whom did not hesitate to explore subjects and sources that were not considered to belong to their home discipline. Stepping over disciplinary boundaries thus has gradually become common practice in memoria research, although further steps could be taken. Historians successfully enter the field of art history. Oexle’s publication on the Fuggerkapelle in Augsburg is written from the memoria perspective and combines iconography, genealogy and history.\textsuperscript{53} Nigel Saul studied lineage and commemoration in

\textsuperscript{50} In \textit{The Stripping of the Altars} Eamon Duffy elaborated upon the changes which took place in England between 1400 and 1580, also discussing memoria culture. See also Gordon and Marshall (eds.), \textit{The Place of the Dead}, for articles dealing with post-Reformation phenomena regarding the commemoration of the dead and adjacent research fields in Early Modern Europe.

\textsuperscript{51} Bert Timmermans dedicated a chapter to the foundation of art and commemoration during the Counter Reformation in the churches of Antwerp, Timmermans, \textit{Patronen van patronage}, 185-223. See also Ciulisová, ‘Memory and witness’, in which she discusses changes made in pre-Reformation memorial paintings because of their continued functioning after the Reformation. About consequences of the regulations made at the Council of Malines in 1607 for memorial paintings in the Church of the Counter Reformation, see Van Miegroet, ‘Framing archaisms’, and Van Buuren and Wüstefeld, \textit{Leven na de dood}, 100-103 and 259-260.


\textsuperscript{53} Oexle, \textit{Kulturelles Gedächtnis in der Renaissance}. 
the family of the Cobhams over a period of two hundred years using their brass monuments as the point of departure. Art historians as well cross boundaries, as is shown by Birgitte Bøggild Johannsen in her publication on the mausoleum in Odense established by Queen Christine of Denmark († 1521). Her analysis involves a combination of knowledge and insights concerning architecture, works of art, history, genealogy and gender studies. These are just a few examples.

Obviously, memoria scholars cannot be specialized in all disciplines required. Still they need, regardless of their disciplinary background, to master a number of basic skills such as reading Latin and performing archival research and understanding and interpreting the results published by scholars from several fields. In daily research practise scholars have found several ways to cross boundaries. In some cases they work on their own, consulting scholars from other disciplines if necessary. In other cases researchers work as a group taking a theme or a question as the point of departure, while the group members mainly work on those aspects that fit their own specialism. An excellent recent example is the 2008 volume about the commemoration of the dead in the Frauenstift Essen, edited by Thomas Schilp; it contains articles on historical, liturgical and art historical aspects, but also on the relation between the architecture and memoria. Volumes like these with authors working from different backgrounds on an overall theme require a good overview of all aspects of the subject by the editors and a willingness of the authors to dovetail with other articles. Sometimes scholars from different disciplines go even further and make a joint publication in which the results of specialized research are completely intertwined. This is the case in Katerina’s Windows. Donation and Devotion, Art and Music, as Heard and Seen Through the Writings of a Birgittine Nun written by Corine Schleif and Volker Schier. Taking the letters of the Birgittine nun Katerina Lemmel as their starting point, the authors contextualized these sources with critical insights on the activities of this nun, on monastic life and on the period in general. The study is written from the perspective of medieval memorial practices, while relating to history, art history, musicology and liturgy, to gender studies and to theories of reception and appropriation. It offers transcriptions of the letters and other relevant sources, genealogical tables and many illustrations, including works of art and maps, that go beyond being mere images and add to the content of the book.

54 Saul, Death, art, and memory.
55 Bøggild Johannsen, ‘Genealogical Representation in Gendered Perspective’.
56 Marco Mostert addressed this issue in his inaugural lecture regarding medieval communication and literacy, Mostert, Maken, bewaren en gebruiken, 18-19. See also Mostert, ‘Das Studium von Handschriften’, 327-331.
57 For a discussion on the problems and possibilities of collaboration between historians and art historians regarding the description and interpretation of images (Bilder), see Von Hülsen-Esch, ‘Der Umgang mit Bildern’.
58 Schilp, Pro remedio.
59 Schleif and Schier, Katerina’s Windows.
60 Another example is the Rich Internet Application (RIA) developed by Breure and Van Bueren, Commemoration in the convent Mariënpoel.
Three levels of border crossing

Over the past twenty years a specific terminology has been developed to describe the crossing of disciplinary boundaries. As a result prefixes abound: authors refer to metadisciplinarity and supradisciplinarity, to multidisciplinarity and to trans- and interdisciplinarity. In many cases these ‘prefixes’ are used loosely by scholars who work across disciplinary boundaries themselves, supposing that ‘others will know what they mean’. Philosophers of science and others have attempted to stamp the terms, but the prefixes remain prone to confusion due to their number and because one and the same term can have multiple meanings.61

Although important from a theoretical point of view, looking for the correct definitions with the correct meaning does not seem to be helpful in everyday research practise. Instead, we propose to distinguish between three different levels on which the practise of disciplinary border crossing takes place.62 Firstly, exchange can take place on the level of perspective. ‘Perspective’ is understood here as the framework, assumptions and outlook inherent to a field of research. It helps researchers to decide on the relevant questions and on lacunas in the state of the art. Memoria is a good example of such a perspective. In fact, the perspective of memoria also crosses the artificial boundaries of the ‘Middle Ages’ and the ‘Renaissance’ or ‘Early Modern Period’. Secondly, crossing borders can take place on the level of methodology and methods. The influence of disciplines outside the humanities on memoria research is clear. We need but refer to the frequent mentioning and use of Mauss’s sociological model on gift exchange and the anthropological research by Jan Assmann.63 Other examples of methods from disciplines outside the humanities are the statistical methods used by for example Samuel Cohn for his analyses of wills and the anthropological approaches by Arnoud-Jan Bijsterveld in his research of gift charters.64 Thirdly, crossing borders can take place on the level of cognitive skills – to acquire knowledge and comprehension/insight, to apply knowledge and insight, and to analyse, synthesize and evaluate – and practical skills.65 One can think of the ability to carry out codicological research, or to use and interpret infrared reflectography and X-radiography in the study of paintings,66 and of skills usually not explicitly taught at university.

61 Balsiger, ‘Supradisciplinary research’, 412; Moran, Interdisciplinarity. For interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity, see also Lawrence and Deprès, ‘Introduction. Futures of Transdisciplinarity’, 400; Mooij, ‘Interdisciplinariteit’, 17-24; Oexle, ‘Mittelalterforschung in der sich ständig wandelnden Moderne’, 243-244.
62 Our proposal for this new approach is based on the ideas developed by Kim Ragetli. She wishes to thank Marco Mostert, Anna Adamska and Paul Wackers for inspiring conversations.
63 For the influence of Mauss and Assmann, see above, in section 2: ‘Definitions of memoria’. For a critical analysis of the use of the anthropological concept of gift exchange and recent developments in this field of research, see Bijsterveld, ‘The Medieval Gift’, 17-19 and 40-47 (with the telling paragraph titles ‘Moving beyond Mauss’ and ‘Back to Empiricism’).
64 For Cohn, see for instance Death and Property; Bijsterveld, ‘Beyond Legal Sources’.
65 The cognitive skills are from Benjamin Bloom’s still used and useful Taxonomy of Educational Objectives.
66 Van Bueren and Faries, ‘Care for the Here and the Hereafter: using IRR’; Van Bueren and
such as describing heraldry or doing genealogical research. Scholars have to be able to decide on the necessity of this research and to participate in it, or at least they have to be skilled enough to interpret the results. Exchange with IT and Internet specialists is needed in database projects and in executing digital text editions. Contacting a specialist with questions concerning medieval and early modern dress, hagiography, wills, Latin, diplomacy, musicology, medieval law, economics, palaeography, etc., now appears to be common practice.

The three level model as proposed above might provide a useful tool as it offers possibilities for researchers to reflect on their chosen perspective and to formulate and evaluate which methods, knowledge, and skills are needed for their research. As such it is beneficial for planning and performing memoria and other research. It offers possibilities to describe what kind of border-crossing research is needed in practical terms, thus aiding and directing the daily research practices. Besides, this approach can help in formulating views on the education of humanities students in general, and medievalists and memoria researchers in particular.

4 Research cycles

Comparative and quantitative studies: challenges

As already explained above, memoria is a dynamic phenomenon and can be considered an important factor in medieval society. Socio-political structures influence memoria, just as memoria influences social and political structures. Therefore we may ask ourselves, firstly, in which ways memoria was an agent in both the creation and expression of identity in communities of the Middle Ages, and, secondly, how the creation and expression of memoria varied between these communities.67 The commemoration of the dead and all aspects involved may differ between (European) regions, but also among religious orders, within the same types of religious and ecclesiastical institutions, etc. Also changes over time need to be taken into account. This makes a combination of case studies and comparative and quantitative studies not only interesting, but in many cases necessary as well. Take for example the following research problem: scholars have time and again wondered about the many inconsistencies they come across in memorial practices.68 These inconsistencies are very diverse. Dates of death may not be filled in on memorial paintings or on tomb slabs or monuments, while the spaces for these dates are provided for. Anniversaries for family members were not celebrated in a convent, even though they had consented to family capital being spent on the foundation of the convent. We find cases of husbands buried with their two wives

Wüstefeld, Leven na de dood, 115-118, 205-207; Schleif and Schier, ‘Puzzles on and under the surface’; Ciulisová, ‘Memory and witness’, 17-27.
67 These are the overall questions in the research plan for MeMO: see Van Bueren and De Weijert, ‘Medieval Memoria Online (MeMO)’, 5.
68 In 1998 Borgolte already pointed out discontinuities of memorial practices referring to publications in which these were recognised, Borgolte ‘Zwischenbilanz’, 209 and note 66.
while in other cases one of the wives has been buried elsewhere. And, although the cartulary shows that gifts indeed were made to a convent, these are not mentioned in the gift register. In many cases memorial services and foundations of liturgical services were supposed to be held eternally, as is stipulated in the foundation charters. But in quite a few cases ‘eternity’ only lasted a few decades, for various reasons. Are there any patterns in these inconsistencies that can be recognised throughout the centuries? The latter topic is particularly interesting because instabilities and changes in memoria culture – such as a decrease in donations and foundations in the Netherlands during the Late Middle Ages – have been a major part of recent research into the origins of the Reformation.69 We may assume that in some cases there were special, individual circumstances, but looking for patterns in the inconsistencies might prove useful.

The above-mentioned examples show that both results from a case study and results from comparative research can be the starting point for larger research cycles. These consist of preparatory studies, on the basis of which questions can be formulated which can be answered by broad(er) comparative and quantitative research. The results in turn lead to choosing individual case studies and analysing these case studies for the degree of representativeness for certain regions, during certain periods and over time. As a result, new research questions will come forward which require combinations of comparative research and case studies, and this may lead to a new research cycle. For this approach communities of researchers and scientific exchange are needed, but it possibly offers a greater chance of success than the approach we are currently often forced to take: comparing the results of individually performed case studies by different researchers who worked without communicating with each other. Here the problem is that researchers taking on the job of comparing these case studies often discover that a number of important factors are beyond their control: the scholars performing the case studies may have used different types of sources, from different geographical areas, from different contexts, from different periods, using different standards of source criticism, etc. Moreover, the validity of the comparisons cannot be assessed if the choice of the examined materials, the methods used and the degree in which source criticism is applied is not sufficiently accounted for.

**PART III MATTERS OF CONTENT**

5 The parties involved in memoria practices

*Who are involved in memoria practices?*

From a theological point of view the most important parties involved in memoria were God and the saints, the latter as the intercessors mediating between the

69 About changes in memorial practices and its possible relation to the development of the Reformation in the Netherlands, see Goudriaan, ‘Het einde van de Middeleeuwen ontdekt?’ and Speetjens, ‘A Quantitative Approach’.
Table 1  The parties involved and their gifts and countergifts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gifts/Foundations</th>
<th>Parties involved in arranging the gift/foundation:</th>
<th>Countergifts and reception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money (with/without mentioning a countergift, and a specific purpose (repair of a roof, meals for the poor))</td>
<td>- Persons coming up with the idea (convey)</td>
<td>Chantries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Brokers (induce)</td>
<td>Memorial services (i.e. daily, for a fixed period after death, or for eternity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Financers (fund)</td>
<td>Prayers (at fixed or variable moments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Artists, writers (create)</td>
<td>Privileges, such as the right to be buried in the church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Persons taking care of the execution (supervise)</td>
<td>The gift as a possibility to communicate (religious, political, etc.) intentions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, fuel, housing</td>
<td>Parties involved in the countergiving itself:</td>
<td>- Music, rituals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts meant for/related to all kinds of liturgical celebrations:</td>
<td>- Persons mentioned above</td>
<td>- Sermons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- architectural structures</td>
<td>- Officials of the receiving institution responsible for the fulfilment of the obligations</td>
<td>- Pittances, doles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- tomb slabs and sepulchral monuments</td>
<td>- Unofficial supervisors (whistle blowers)</td>
<td>- Works of art, such as stained-glass windows.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- furnishings (for liturgy and decoration in general)</td>
<td>- The performers (priests, nuns, brothers, etc. celebrating masses and saying the prayers requested)</td>
<td>Unintentional reactions, i.e. discussions, imitations, adaptations, refutations, and reuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- music, rituals</td>
<td>- Those profiting from the gift (poor, sick, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privileges</td>
<td>- The family having obligations towards their predecessor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Various audiences (e.g. parishioners attending rituals, seeing the donations; visitors to the church).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirectly involved parties: the networks of the benefactors
sinful souls and the judging God. In this section, however, the focus will be on the practicalities of memoria, that is on the donors and founders and those involved in the process of founding a commemorative practice on the one hand, and the persons involved in taking care of the countergift on the other hand. For an overview of their roles, we refer to Table 1 listing the parties involved and their gifts and countergifts. In research into the roles of the parties involved in memorial practices more attention has recently been paid to the roles of women. Especially the publications about Katerina Lemmel by Schleif and Schier are illuminating with respect to the influence a woman could have, given time, place and position. Katerina (†1533) was a business woman who became a nun after she was widowed. Her letters to her family and friends show her involvement in her convent receiving gifts and her family and friends receiving countergifts. The letters demonstrate how one person could play several roles at the same time. Katerina decided (sometimes in collaboration with others) what would be important to the convent, she solicited contributions from potential donors and she oversaw the realisation of the donations. Memory studies in general point to an important role of women in commemoration and remembrance practices, and therefore it would be worthwhile to perform large-scale quantitative research into gender and the commemoration of the dead in particular.

There are numerous other questions to be asked regarding gift giving. For instance: how much control did donors have both over their donations and over the countergifts they expected? For example, only a limited number of stained-glass windows are extant in the present-day Netherlands. Nevertheless the database Memoria in beeld (‘Representations of Medieval Memoria’) shows that the descriptions and the scans of the windows offer opportunities for researching the extent to which the window being part of an iconographic programme limited the donor’s opportunities to realise personal goals apart from representing their piety. Interestingly, this shows that works of art can be considered countergifts as well. After all, by accepting the gift the receiving institution permitted the donor to use it as a means to express concerns other than religious ones, for instance

---

70 A clear indication of the importance attributed to saints can be found in testaments and foundation charters in which gifts are not donated to the clergy, the churchwardens, the monks or the nuns, but to the saint to which the institution was dedicated, see Van Hout, ‘Frieze testamenten tot 1550’, a report of research based on the publication of the Frisian testaments by Verhoeven and Mol, Frieze testamenten. In the section on ‘Problemen met de begunstigde’ (Problems determining the beneficiary) she shows that it is often not clear which institution was the beneficiary in case more than one institution was dedicated to the same saints.

71 See also Van de Velde, ‘Gerritgen Ysbrandsdochter van Rietwijk’; and Breure and Van Bueren, Commemoration in the convent Mariënpoel (Rich Internet Application): Timeline, about Gerritgen van Rietwijk (†1572), the last prioress of the Mariënpoel convent near Leyden.

72 For example Van Houts, Gender and Memory; Van Houts, Medieval Memories.

73 Charlotte Dikken is working on a dissertation (Utrecht University) in which this question will be extensively explored. For two case studies with similar research questions concerning stained-glass windows of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, see Van Hest, ‘Xavier Smits en de Rozenkransramen’, and Mattijs, ‘Glasramen in de Sint-Gummaruskerk van Lier’.
political concerns (see Plate 3). But how much leeway did the donors have? The question is valid: Schleif shows that donors could not decide on all aspects concerning the execution of their donation. The magistrate of Nuremberg, a powerful party in the donation and foundation processes in that town, did not allow the Horn couple to place their memorial monument above the St Roch altar in the St Lorenz church. Their coats of arms were considered to be too prominently represented for persons not belonging to the city’s patricians. As a result the donors had to content themselves with their monument being placed in the churchyard.

Similar questions can be posed for donations and foundations such as liturgical rituals and music performances, the performance of works of mercy, and for newly built or rebuilt churches, chapels and hospitals and sepulchral monuments.

For recurring countergifts, such as masses and prayers, one may ask which possibilities the donors had to keep control over the countergifts. The Utrecht bishop Joris van Egmond had the 1548 charter in which he had founded a mass of the Holy Sacrament hewn in his cenotaph in the Utrecht cathedral, for all to witness and to take action if the stipulations are not carried out properly. Another possibility to institute supervision an arrangement was, for example, to have two orphanages check on each other for attending a commemorative mass. In case one party failed to fulfil its obligations, the feast meal it was entitled to would be given to the other party, that as a result would have two meals. These options for control seem to have been common practise, but broad comparative research is needed to establish how common the various types of regulations really were over time and space. Research of charters with stipulations of this kind may be based on digital charter collections such as the impressive Monasterium (MOM), predominantly containing charters from Central Europe, and the Dutch digital editions of charters from Groningen and Drenthe and from Noord-Brabant.

The example of Katerina Lemmel shows the importance of letters in providing information about involved parties. Less rare sources for the Middle Ages and Early Modern Period that have proven essential in research in the parties involved are the already mentioned charters, but also the accounts of the donating and the receiving parties. Charter collections, now on the internet, can be very helpful in this research. Especially the accounts of the churchwardens have proven to

75 See Van Bueren, ‘Care for the Here and the Hereafter’, 14, and Damen, ‘Vorstelijke vensters’, 141.
76 Schleif, ‘Donatio et memoria’, 76-129, especially 76-89 about the monument.
77 This holds true for the gift-giving procedures as well. See Bijsterveld, ‘A Glove on the Altar’.
78 De Groot, Dom van Utrecht, 120 and 277. Almost one hundred years earlier (1460) Nynke Kanen had the charter hewn in stone when she founded masses and sermons in her parish church of St James in Utrecht. See Van Bueren and Wüstefeld, Leven na de dood, 83, and Van Bueren, Van Leerdom and Visser, website Memoria in beeld.
79 See Van Bueren and Wüstefeld, Leven na de dood, 60-61.
80 Website MOM at www.monasterium.net (August 2011). For digital editions of charters from Groningen and Drenthe (Netherlands) until 1600, see www.cartago.nl. As from 2010, the charters of Noord-Brabant (Netherlands) until 1312 are gradually being made available through www.donb.nl.
81 For extensive and strict regulations in foundations charters, see for instance Schier,
be very useful. For the role of the churchwardens in the urban parish church of All Saints in Bristol, for instance, Clive Burgess could delve into the so-called Church Book. The manuscript, set up at the beginning of the fifteenth century contains, besides parish ordinances and a list of benefactors and their gifts, the deeds of each pair of churchwardens during their term of office. It was to be “a memorial and remembrance for ever for curates and churchwardens” and “they must yearly be prayed for”.82 Another evocative example are the accounts of the St John’s church in Gouda. They testify to the importance of the churchwardens in the acquisition of new stained-glass windows after the church burnt down in 1552.83 Mario Damen has shown that some people at the Burgundian court acted as agents between the donors and the receiving parties in donations of stained-glass windows. He stresses that the donation was nearly always initiated by the receiving party.84 Louise van Tongerloo researched the donations of stained-glass windows by the Utrecht chapters, using the telling subtitle: ‘an orientation into the networks of relations’ (‘Een verkenning in relatiekaders’). She mentions bishop Joris van Egmond († 1559) as a passive figure who gave many stained-glass windows, but mostly after having been asked to donate. Once involved, however, he seems to have been actively supervising the execution of the work.85

**Benefactors and their networks: external influences**

It is also useful to look at the extended networks of the parties involved, as these may have influenced the donation processes too. Through these networks important and long lasting traditions may develop, like the feast of All Souls (November 2), founded in the abbey of Cluny in the eleventh century, that became a church-wide tradition from the twelfth century on.86 The wider context may also have had effects on a less grand scale, for instance resulting in the emulation of objects that functioned in memorial practices. In many medieval contracts artists are directed to imitate examples from other churches, both regarding composition and quality.87 Also the objects themselves – grave monuments, memorial paintings and sculptures, etc. – testify to the fact that copying and borrowing of objects was

---

82 Burgess, ‘Death and commemoration’, 62. The quotations are by Burgess from the Church Book.
84 Damen, ‘Vorstelijke vensters’, 153, 158-159; idem, ‘De schenkers van Scheut’. For a discussion on the involved parties in the iconographic program of the mausoleum in Odense see Bøggild Johanssen, ‘Genealogical Representation’, 91 and 93.
85 Van Tongerloo, ‘Glasschenkingen van de Utrechtse kapittels’; for Joris van Egmond, see ibidem, 152 and note 7.
86 See for instance McLaughlin, * Consorting with Saints*, 75-78 and 230-231, and Iogna-Prat, ‘The Dead in the Celestial Bookkeeping’.
87 For an analysis of the stipulations in these contracts, see Dijkstra, *Origineel en kopie*, 7-28, and Helmus, *Schilderen in opdracht*.
common practice for both commissioners and artists. The sometimes high quality of these copies show that rather than lack of the creativity on the side of the artist or the commissioner other factors were at play here. Instead of originality, recognisability was important, as commissioners wanted to have their messages received by a wide audience. Memorial paintings and sculpture, like rituals, have fixed patterns that were pursued over the centuries. They concern the placement of the portraits in relation to the religious image, the hierarchy of the portraits of the persons represented through placement and attributes and, to some extent, the content and fashion of the texts (Plates 1 and 6).

In many cases we may be able to detect the reasons for the emulations. The copying and the borrowing of rituals, the emulation of already existing objects and tomb monuments may be perceived as an expression of a bond existing between the donating party and external influential parties. In the Utrecht chapter churches, the donation of the pallium, a costly piece of cloth to adorn the church, was part of the death duty of the canons. The privilege of this donation was, however, reserved to full canons, an unmistakeable sign of status and an expression of the mutual bond between the deceased canons and the deceased canons to be.

Tanja Michalsky in her research of the tomb monuments of the royal house of Anjou (kingdom of Sicily) showed that they were of a similar type, thus clearly presenting the kings and queens as the lineage in power. She also shows that the monuments were soon copied by the nobility, who doubtlessly wanted to express their proximity to the royal family. The opposite is also possible: similar but larger monuments, with more expensive decorations, more costly donations to the poor, and grander rituals may also express competition. Schier detected this kind of competition in the foundations of performances of the Salve Regina in the Nuremberg churches and hospitals. As there were several of these daily and weekly performances to attend to, founders were aware that in order to be successful, that is to attract a large audience, they had to ascertain the maintenance of a high quality. Thus, stipulations were made concerning the quality of the performance. In one case a clause in the founding contract states that the compositions of the chants had to be renewed every three or four years, no doubt so that people would continue to attend.

We conclude with an excellent and inspiring example of ‘thick’ research into both the active and indirect, intentional and unintentional involvement of several parties, although it is just outside the field of memoria as we define it. In her article ‘Altarpieces and agency’ Michelle O’Malley analysed the commissioning and functioning of the altarpiece Virgin and Child enthroned among angels and saints (Plate 7) with regard to its operation within a group of social connections.

---

88 See for instance Gardner, The tomb and the tiara, and Michalsky, Memoria und Repräsentation.
89 Van Bueren and Wüstefeld, Leven na de dood, 89-108 and 127-128.
90 Van den Hoven van Genderen, ‘Utrecht canons’, 175-177 (with a discussion on similar customs and the history of this type of donations in the Latin church of the Middle Ages).
91 Michalsky, Memoria und Repräsentation.
92 Schier, ‘Memorials Sung and Unsung’, 128-133, especially 133.
The painting was commissioned in 1461 from the painter Benozzo Gozzoli by the Florentine Confraternity of the Purification and St Zenobius. For her analysis O’Malley used the concept of agency as developed by Alfred Gell in his book on the anthropology of art, *Art and Agency. An anthropological theory* (1998). O’Malley showed that Gell’s framework is useful for exploring the question: “why does this work of art exist?” O’Malley offers a specific approach to this question by looking at three factors: the commissioning confraternity and its relations, the altarpiece as the product of these relations, and the social efficacy of the work itself. She convincingly shows that the confraternity both created and expressed its identity as closely associated with the Medici family, with the Dominican San Marco Convent where the brothers had their chapel, and with the town of Florence. This was achieved through the composition and the iconography, as well as the choice of the painter and the feasts in which the altarpiece featured. The author concludes that considering the efficacy of a work of art “permits the simultaneous grasp of a network of relations: not relations in a series, but an en-
ity that consists of a number of concurrent associations. Ideas about agency offer a way to draw together relationships concerned simultaneously with politics, patronage, religious devotion and civic responsibilities”.93

Gell’s and O’Malley’s question “why does this donation exist?” is central to memoria research, not only for objects but also for specific commemoration practices and for the administration of memoria. O’Malley’s systematic approach has the advantage of highlighting not only the direct involvement of parties, but also showing the relevance of other influences, be it intentional and unintentional.

93 O’Malley, ‘Altarpieces and agency’, 436-437; the citation O’Malley uses is from Gell, Art and Agency, 62.
6 Reception and appropriation of memoria practices

What are reception and appropriation?

As has become clear from many examples in this article we can be certain that the donating parties wished their donations to have an impact on the various audiences, or rather the ‘publics’. For this the word ‘reception’ is often used. However, this word is misleading, because it has a connotation of passivity, as has been pointed out in studies concerning the public as producers of culture and meaning. Therefore the word ‘appropriation’ is to be preferred, because it refers to activity and agency. First of all a definition of appropriation will be proposed and, secondly, the relevant factors will be discussed.

The present-day outlook on ‘reception’, in everyday life in general and in art history in particular, is often preoccupied with a qualitative judgment, i.e. beautiful, unpleasant, well painted, badly sung, etc. Reception of memoria should, however, not be understood as the reception of a ‘work of art’, but as a social act; the aesthetic quality of this act is subordinate to its intentions, meanings and functions. The countergift emanates from this reaction. Having said this, in some cases we come across sources about contemporary judgments that are quite revealing. Katerina Lemmel’s above-mentioned letters for instance provide “rare glimpses of users’ expectations of sacred art”. To Katerina’s dismay the windows she had ordered turned out to be designed in the new, Renaissance style. She complained that the work was made “in a strange new way” that did the Lord “little honor” and made Him look “like a fat priest”. Although Katerina’s critique was not directed at the commemorative aspects of the work, but at the religious scene accompanying it, her disappointment about the quality and style of the work influenced her reception of the windows. For her, and no doubt for the other nuns as well, the images should have been emotionally moving and fit to stimulate their pious contemplation and thus to incite them to pray for the persons who had paid for the windows. As Schleif concludes, “for Katerina, technique, style (including colour) and iconography (including dress) were surveyors of meaning and facilitators of function”.

Instead of a definition in which qualitative judgments figure prominently, an apt definition of appropriation would be: the ways in which the involved parties receive, perceive, process, judge and act upon an object or action while using any combination of their five senses. In this definition all important aspects are clearly formulated. First, although research of appropriation is possible because

94 Please note that in our discussion of reception we shall not include the ‘official’ roles of the parties taking care of the countergift, such as the priests, the sacristans preparing for liturgical services and the chorals: see Table 1.
95 Frijhoff, ‘Toeëigening: van bezitsdrang naar beteekenisgeving’. We thank Koen Goudriaan for mentioning this article to us and for sharing his insights concerning appropriation.
96 Schleif, ‘Forgotten Roles of Women’, quotation on 148.
97 Schleif, ‘Forgotten Roles of Women’, quotation on 150-151. For the complete transcription of the letter (16 February 1519) and an extensive annotation, see Schleif and Schier, Katerina’s Windows, 320-342, especially 329.
persons can be researched as group members, the parties involved do not necessarily represent uniform groups of people: a person could simultaneously belong to several communities and groups, and communities could also consist of varieties of sub-groups who did not necessarily share the same points of view in every respect. Second, the emphasis on the five senses indicates that eyesight is only one aspect of the spectrum of experiences. Third, the five verbs (receive, perceive, process, judge and act upon) indicate several phases in an ongoing dynamic process. Finally, all persons involved produce cultures and meanings of remembrance as they appropriate the practice of memoria and actively participate, for instance by praying for the souls of the family who donated the food or the clothing, by discussing the stories behind the ritual, or by contemplating the iconographical programme on the windows. But they could also do so by having objects and texts copied or adapted to their own purposes and by adapting rituals from elsewhere. Appropriation is thus not the final stage in the process: the reactions, in other words the praxis, of the parties involved generate new meanings, functions and actions. Donations in many cases resulted in new donations. The reception and appropriation of memoria is thus a dynamic process during which the involved parties create a culture of remembrance in which traditions are created and recreated, sometimes abandoned, and in which some practices never make it to such customs. The process is both synchronic and diachronic as several generations are, simultaneously and successively, involved in these dynamics of remembrance.

**Parties involved in appropriation**

Researching the process of appropriation requires study not only of the re-enactors, but again of all parties and factors involved: the parties in the gift-giving process, the gift itself, the parties involved in the countergiving, and the interactions between these (see Table 1).

The first are the parties involved in arranging the gift. As we have seen, the appropriation of memoria may serve several interests of the founding parties, some of which relate to the afterlife and others to the here and now. Important aspects for exploring appropriation are the intended functions, and therefore the background of the parties involved, as well as the strategies they used to achieve a

---

98 Schier stresses that the fact that we can still physically see objects (or remnants thereof) has led to a one-sided emphasis and overestimation and appreciation of objects as sources: Schier, ‘Memorials Sung and Unsung’, 125. In this article he emphasises the importance of researching memoria in relation to all senses. For an extensive discussion on the manifestations of the five senses in the church building, see Wenzel, *Hören und Sehen*.

99 Frijhoff, ‘Toeëigening: van bezitsdrang naar betekenisgeving’, 108, 112, 115, 117. Jauss writes in the same line of reasoning: “A literary event can continue to have an effect only if those who come after it still or once again respond to it – if there are readers who again appropriate the past work or authors who want to imitate, outdo, or refute it”. Jauss, *Toward an aesthetic of reception*, 22.

maximum effect. There may even have been different intentions and intended audiences at the same time. Transparency and comprehensibility of the message were imperative, but messages that were meant to be clear to one intended group, may even have been meant to be missed by other groups (Plate 5). The second factor is the gift itself. The arrangement of the gift (either the ceremony or the object) may be reflected by its procedure, style, iconography and even in its quality, as well as by the strategies and intentions of the parties involved in the donation. Here style and quality are brought to the fore as instruments consciously employed by the senders to achieve the goal or goals they want to achieve. An interesting case in point is the above-mentioned foundation of sung memorials in Nuremberg which stipulated that every three or four years a new composition had to be made for the weekly performance of the *Salve Regina*. These clauses give insight both into the intentions of the founders, namely (the perpetuation of) their remembrance, and into the foreseen reception of the memorial: the intended public would lose interest after a while. Perhaps beauty, but certainly novelty mattered to the public, at least that was what the founders expected when they anticipated the future audience’s opinions. Cases like these show how important the donation and/or foundation and their stipulations are for appropriation research, be it a foundation of a musical performance, a sermon, a church, a distribution to the poor, or a sculpture.

For the third factor, the audiences involved in the countergiving, we may assume that they also have intentions with regard to the countergifts. Again, countergiving is not a static factor, as the audiences and their intentions not only vary between various groups of audiences, but also over time and within one and the same audience. This can be further discussed when taking the fourth factor into account: the relation between the benefactors and those who are taking care of the countergift. This relationship is partly determined by the degree of proximity between the two in time, class, space, culture, intellect, and spirituality. Education, upbringing, status, one’s place in society, the passing of time, and other changes in contexts have an impact on the relation between the various parties. The parties involved in arranging the gift could, in theory, look ahead in order to ensure that the message would continue to be comprehensible for a future audience, regardless of changes in contexts. Nevertheless, parts of the appropriation will inevitably remain outside the area of influence of those arranging the gift. Meanings, functions and rituals of *memoria* are handed down by way of tradition and storytelling. These will evolve, change and be adapted over time, even to the extent of the development of new meanings and functions. Traditions may also disappear over time. Ultimately the commemoration of the dead is in the hands of the parties that are involved in the countergiving; they are responsible for the appropriation and the continuation of the foundation. A tomb monument, for example, would surely be looked at differently by the poor who knew that attending the memorial service and the subsequent visit to the grave of their benefactor would guarantee a good meal that day, than by an ecclesiastical official visiting...
the church while contemplating the tomb monument he wishes for himself. In the first case it is quite possible that the reaction will be in accordance with the intentions, in the second we may wonder about that.

**Approaches to research of appropriation**

Information on the acts and the nature of the audiences is as important as the factors mentioned above. In this subsection we will explore two ways of detecting the responses of the audiences. The first are texts with observations and judgments regarding the commemoration of the dead. The second possibility is suggested by Katryn Brush, which involves the study of the reactions we may expect considering the diverse types of audience.

For scholars looking for suitable written sources, that is for sources which explicitly tell us how people reacted in words to expressions of *memoria*, the results have as yet been disappointing. There are sources, such as travel accounts, reports on joyful entries, foreign language books, descriptions of churches and exempla, that provide information about the opinions of individual members of the public. In his 2005 article ‘Remembrance and *Memoria*’ Van den Hoven van Genderen made an analysis of these sources. He concluded that it is very difficult to make valid generalizations: sources are few, may contain topoi, show too much variations in content, and information on the contexts is lacking.\(^{102}\)

In her article on the thirteenth-century tomb slab of archbishop Siegfried III von Eppstein in Mainz Cathedral (see Plate 5) the art historian Kathryn Brush, dismisses “twentieth-century historical and art historical explanations of the slab, which have assumed a form of ‘absolute’ or ‘ideal’ beholder”.\(^{103}\) Instead she takes a “variance in viewer behaviour and experience” as her point of departure for detecting the various types of interpreting and understanding the communications of the slab. She explores the diverse audiences that may have approached and moved around the slab: the bishops and canons of the cathedral, other clergy and the inhabitants of Mainz, bishops and other officials of the Church travelling in Europe, etc. This enabled her to distinguish the various reactions of groups of beholders, depending on “the audience’s experience, educational sophistication and familiarity or non-familiarity with local historical circumstances”.\(^{104}\) Brush concludes that the various and varying nature of the beholders’ processes leads to a variety in the actual functions and meanings of expressions of *memoria*.

To conclude, valuable information on the culture of the commemoration of the dead can be obtained if we broaden our perspective from reception to appropriation. In this respect scholars of medieval *memoria* may learn from literary historians and from scholars involved in memory studies for modern times who have found the study of ‘re-writing’ a fruitful approach.\(^{105}\)

---

102 Van den Hoven van Genderen, ‘Remembrance and *Memoria*’.
104 Ibidem, 35 (both citations).
105 See for instance Plate, *Transforming Memories*. 
PART IV PROSPECTS AND POSSIBILITIES: THE FUTURE OF MEMORIA RESEARCH

7 Medieval Memoria Online (MeMO): a new research tool

For scholars taking up the two methodological challenges mentioned above – the necessary crossing of disciplinary borders and the need for comparative studies across time and space – availability and accessibility of the relevant sources is a conditio sine qua non. However, the problems in gathering the relevant material for broad comparative research can hardly be overestimated, even if we keep to one source type. Scholars such as Samuel Cohn, who has analysed thousands of wills in his research on the impact of plague epidemics on memorial practices, can testify to the time-consuming process of just finding the material.\textsuperscript{106} We may safely assume that Arnoud-Jan Bijsterveld never would have been able to analyse almost 6000 charters on the use of the word memoria if he had not had access to the Thesaurus Diplomaticus cd-rom.\textsuperscript{107} The time-consuming process of compiling an inventory by Truus van Bueren for her research into memorial paintings and sculptures was a direct motivation for starting the Medieval Memoria Online project.\textsuperscript{108}

This project is proposed as a tool assisting scholars to combine the use of different types of sources that are relevant to their research subjects. Of course it would be best having available in the MeMO application inventories, descriptions and images of all sources that inform us about the phenomenon of memoria and its expressions. But feasibility is paramount. Consequently the MeMO project started with making available descriptions and images of four source types that have already been inventoried: memorial registers, narrative sources regarding memoria, memorial paintings and sculptures, here also called memorials (Memorialbilder), and tomb monuments and floor slabs, which will be further discussed in the next section.

MeMO will also provide basic information on the institutions from which the described sources originate. Moreover, this institutions database will offer concise information on the archives, libraries and museums in which relevant sources can be found other than the ones described in the MeMO application. These overviews of sources will include both the main memoria sources not (yet) included in MeMO (such as foundation charters and wills) and sources containing context information (such as accounts and inventories of institutions).

The core business of MeMO is making memoria sources available on the World Wide Web. In doing so, MeMO also contributes to making the medieval cultural heritage of the Netherlands more widely known.\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{106} Cohn, Death and Property; idem, The Cult of Remembrance.
\textsuperscript{107} Bijsterveld, ‘In mei memoriam’.
\textsuperscript{108} Van Bueren and Wüstemfeld, Leven na de dood. For the resulting database, see Van Bueren, Van Leeram and Visser, website Memoria in beeld. For his dissertation project, Douglas Brine compiled a corpus of 243 ‘wall-mounted memorials’ that had been placed above a grave in the Southern Netherlands: Brine, Piety and Purgatory.
\textsuperscript{109} Researchers working in the field of medieval commemoration can already benefit from the MeMO project’s additional – and freely accessible – products. The digital newsletter Medieval Memoria Research informs scholars on conferences and congresses, publications and ongoing
clear: *memoria* researchers will have online access to a complete overview of the extant materials, not only those restricted to their own discipline and they will know where to find it, allowing for more efficient time-management. The authors therefore consider the present MeMO project to be the first phase of a larger undertaking, in cooperation with scholars from elsewhere who wish to take on projects like MeMO for their regions and periods of interest (one may think of Post-Reformation periods). Such a project could of course also aim at describing other *memoria* sources than the ones that are included in MeMO’s first phase. For scholars not to have to re-invent the wheel time and again and guaranteeing optimal usability, a standard for *memoria* texts and objects, MeMO DS (MeMO Description Standard), has been developed in collaboration with an international group of *memoria* experts. Both the description standard and the data model are published on the *Medieval Memoria Online* website. In 2013 the Open Source software will be available for others too.

8 Sources catalogued in MeMO

The sources for *memoria* research made available in the MeMO application can be divided into objects (i.e. the memorials and tomb monuments) and texts (i.e. the memorial registers and narrative sources). Members of religious and ecclesiastical institutions kept memorial registers for administrative reasons. These were used for keeping track of the possessions and of the liturgical obligations for benefactors, but also for legal and sometimes political reasons. The well-known classification Huyghebaert made in *Les documents nécrologiques* in 1972 is still used by scholars. The author took the functioning of the different kinds of registers as a point of departure. Huyghebaert himself, however, warned for the pitfalls of this approach, being well aware of the fact that in the Middle Ages one did not...
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keep to the strict genre classifications that come in useful for modern scholars.\textsuperscript{114} For projects like MeMO, which aim at providing scholars with an inventory and description of sources, a classification based on the contents of the registers, instead of on their functions, is more helpful as it leaves the interpretations of what those functions were to the scholars that use the application.\textsuperscript{113} The memorial registers have accordingly been divided into:\textsuperscript{116}

- registers of burial places containing a. the names of those buried, and b. the registers of owners of graves;
- registers of memorial services containing information for whom, when, which memorial services should be performed;
- registers of gifts and foundations. This category includes registers of pittances and doles with information in whose name, to whom, when, where and which doles and supplements to meals should be given and what these alms should consist of, and
- registers of names not belonging to the aforementioned groups.

For the second group of memoria texts, the narrative sources, the MeMO project is cooperating with the Narrative Sources project (NaSo).\textsuperscript{117} NaSo uses the classification by Léopold Genicot, which is based on the contents of the sources.\textsuperscript{118} In MeMO, however, only those narrative texts will be included that give information concerning memorial practices described as ‘care for the here and the hereafter’ (see above, section 2, ‘Definitions of memoria’). This will have two implications. In the first place only those types of narrative texts most likely to offer the required information will be described. These are:

- historical sources: annals and chronicles of religious and ecclesiastical institutions;

\textsuperscript{114} See Huyghebaert, \textit{Documents nécrologiques}, 35-37. See also Fischer ‘Überlegungen zur Neuanlage’, 263-264 about problems of terminology in research of memorial registers.

\textsuperscript{115} As in Huyghebaert’s classification, the MeMO set-up will have to deal with deviations and changes in the composition and the type of information in the memorial registers. Therefore, the description standard and the database include fields to describe these variances as systematically as possible.

\textsuperscript{116} The inventory of memorial registers for the Netherlands was initiated by \textit{Signum}, a contact group of scholars researching the medieval social-economic, legal and institutional history of religious and ecclesiastical institutions of the Low Countries. (www.contactgroepsignum.eu) in the early 1990s. From January 2004 on, the project was continued by the ‘Werkgroep Memorieboeken’ (Project group Memorial Registers). The classification used in MeMO was developed by this project group.

\textsuperscript{117} See the extensively revised website of \textit{Narrative Sources}. NaSo is a joint research project of Ghent University, the Catholic University of Louvain and the University of Groningen, with Jeroen Deploige and, until her retirement in 2010, Renée Nip as its project leaders. See also Verbeke, Milis and Goossens (eds.), \textit{Medieval Narrative Sources} and Deploige and others, ‘Remediing the obsolescence of digitised surveys of medieval sources’.

\textsuperscript{118} As for memorial registers the classification of narrative sources is also problematic. See Vanderputten, ‘Typology of Historiography Reconsidered’, 161 who states that “we can no longer speak of the annals as a medieval genre and describe its general characteristics”. He continues by pointing out that “each group had other reasons, other moments” at which it wanted to write this kind of historiography, resulting, we add, into differences in form and content.
biographical sources: *gesta* commemorating the lives and important deeds of abbots and other ecclesiastical officials, and other manuscripts with biographies of the deceased. These manuscripts mainly concern the lives of conventuals written in the houses of the Modern Devotion, in remembrance of their virtues and special deeds, their gifts to the convent, etc.

In the second place, the project will only include those manuscripts of the above-mentioned types that offer relevant information. This means that all *gesta* and biographies will be described in the database, as they have or may have had a function in the care for the here and the hereafter anyway, but for chronicles and annals this is not a matter of course. Therefore criteria have been developed to decide which ones will be included. The database will contain only descriptions of manuscripts with information about donors and founders, countergifts, (solutions to) conflicts about memorial practices, prayer confraternities and changes in memorial practices. As a result the MeMO and NaSo databases may be considered complementary tools for scholars who want to research commemoration and remembrance practices more widely.

Not included in the first phase of the MeMO project will be text sources that, although fundamental to *memoria* research, have not yet been properly inventoried. These are, for instance, legal documents (such as donation and foundation charters, and testaments and codicils that provide information regarding commemoration) and liturgical manuscripts, books of hours and prayer books that contain annotations concerning deceased persons and their commemoration.119

Before turning to the objects included in MeMO, it is useful to briefly look more generally at the objects that functioned in the commemoration of the dead itself. These can be classified according to their function(s): 1. architecture, specifically (sepulchral) churches and chapels; 2. tomb monuments and tomb slabs; 3. donated requisites for liturgical services, such as liturgical vessels and utensils, vestments of the priests and their assistants, altar cloths, objects used during processions, lecterns and tabernacles, *pallia*, but also donations which added to the comfort of the clergy and the faithful, such as cushions to sit or kneel on, and 4. other donations which served to decorate the house of God, such as altar pieces, sculptures and paintings, memorial pieces (including stained-glass windows), tapestries and *pallia*. Of these objects only two types have as yet been systematically inventoried and these will be part of MeMO: the tomb monuments and tomb slabs, and the memorial paintings and sculptures.120 These are paintings and sculptures that show a religious scene, the prayer portraits and/or coats of arms and often the patron saints of the people to be commemorated, together with a text

---

119 About annotations in books of hours, see for instance Brinkmann, ‘Zur Rolle von Stundenbüchern’, 91-100.
120 Memorial painting and sculptures have received attention from *memoria* researchers, including historians, ever since the very beginning, as becomes clear in Borgolte’s historiographical overview. See Borgolte, ‘Zwischenbilanz’, 205. The important 1984 volume *Memoria* contains articles on *Memorialbilder* (Oexle), tomb monuments and tomb slabs (Renate Kroos), the founders’ statues (*Stifterfiguren*) in the Dom in Naumberg (Willibald Sauerländer and Joachim Wollasch) and on the sepulchral church which Maximilian I planned in Innsbruck (Karl Schmid).
in which their names and death dates are recorded, often in combination with an appeal to pray for the salvation of their souls (*Memorialbilder*). Descriptions (in Dutch) and scans of this group of sources are already available on the Internet in the database *Memoria in beeld* (‘Representations of Medieval Memoria’). However, for this group an important restriction has been made: *Memorialbilder* can also be found on liturgical vessels, liturgical vestments, and many other furnishings of religious buildings. These objects cannot yet be included in the MeMO application because no proper inventories are currently available.

The point of departure for both types of sources will be the complete object. For the written sources this will be the manuscripts, because text carriers and combinations of texts in manuscripts may provide information on the practical use of the texts which cannot be deduced from the individual texts themselves. For this reason MeMO will offer, first, brief descriptions of the text carrier itself, second, extensive descriptions of all texts in the manuscript dealing directly with *memoria*, and, third, (for convolutes and miscellanies) overviews of the other non-*memoria* texts in the manuscript. For the same reasons the complete artefact rather than only the iconography will be described for the memorial objects.

In the last section of this article we will zoom in on MeMO as a tool for crossing the borders of traditional disciplines and for enabling research cycles.

### 9 Methodological advantages of MeMO

The MeMO application is proposed as both a tool for and an expression of border crossing in memoria research. In section 3 we argued that a three-level approach for crossing the borders of disciplines will be fruitful for *memoria* research: when developing research projects we should first consider the perspective, secondly the methodology and thirdly the necessary cognitive and practical skills.

We have already pointed out that the perspective of MeMO, *i.e.* the *memoria* paradigm, is inherently tied to a combination of traditional disciplines. The necessity of crossing borders for *memoria* scholars is the very reason why a description standard was developed for the manuscripts and the (other) objects. It was necessary to develop this new standard because other standards are discipline oriented (such as the Categories for the Description of Works of Art), or they provide only general information (which is the case for the Encoded Archival Description). We name but a few advantages of the MeMO Description Standard. In MeMO DS for the texts and text carriers there are possibilities to summarise the contents of the complete manuscripts, but only the *memoria* texts will be described more elaborately. Following the MeMO standard, the style in which the work of art has been made, and the school in which the artist has been placed by art historians will not

---

121 This includes over five hundred memorial painting and sculptures. The introductory articles on this website are also available in English. See Van Bueren, Van Leerdam and Visser, website *Memoria in beeld*. This database has also been reworked and translated into English to be included in MeMO.
be mentioned, the artist generally not being the prime focus of attention. Two separate fields are included for the commemorated persons as portrayed and for the commissioners of memorials, however. Contrary to what art historians often assume, these two are not necessarily one and the same person.

Passing by the second level of border crossing for a moment and turning to the third level first, we are of the opinion that researchers will profit from the MeMO descriptions resulting from a variety of cognitive and practical skills. This can be demonstrated using the example of the memorial paintings and sculptures, as the database *Memoria in beeld* is already available on the Internet. Some fields in the database offer the results of relatively simple research skills, such as defining the type of carrier – panel, canvas – on which the image has been painted; taking the measurements of the object; and identifying the patron saints on the basis of their attributes and other characteristics. Other fields provide the results of more advanced cognitive and practical skills. To establish the functions of a memorial painting the authors of the website had to perform a combination of various types of research, *i.e.* on the object itself (iconography, text, etc.), archival work on the commissioners and the persons commemorated and their involvement in for instance the political issues of the time. Very important is the information on the many changes in memorial paintings that come to the fore because of technical research and restorations. The number of portraits, coats of arms and texts that have been painted over or added prove that memorials were objects to be used and therefore adapted if this was considered useful. Results from practical skills outside the academic disciplines can also be found in *Memoria in beeld*. For example, it contains descriptions of the heraldry in the paintings and sculptures.

The information offered in the application will be particularly useful for the second level of border crossing, *i.e.* methodology. This is due to the possibilities MeMO offers for broad comparative and quantitative research, using statistic analyses of different types that have been developed in the social sciences. In both the manuscript and the object databases standardised fields are created to allow for systematic searching possibilities. Open text fields are mostly dedicated to additional explanation.

The standardised fields in the application offer the information needed to establish research cycles as introduced in section 4. MeMO will enable researchers to find the appropriate material for case studies as well as for quantitative and comparative research. As an example we will take one memorial painting as our point of departure. It is a triptych depicting the *Last Judgment* (probably from the Dominican church in Haarlem) and four generations of the family of Anna van Noordwijk: the commissioner herself, her husband and their children, her parents and her grandparents (see Plate 6). It was probably made shortly after

---

122 As mentioned before, this database will be integrated in the MeMO application.
123 For the description of heraldry the MeMO project employs the system used by the Central Bureau for Genealogy (CBG), The Hague. This system is accessible to users who are not well-versed in the art of heraldry. For the English translation of the terminology the publication by Kroes is very useful: Kroes, *Chinese Armorial Porcelain*. 
1510 or 1512 to commemorate Anna’s husband Gijsbrecht van Duvenvoorde, and her mother Aleid Jan Foeyensdr. who died in those years respectively. A wealth of information was already available on the family and on the background of the painting, but questions remained as to how representative the triptych really was. Using the database Memoria in beeld to compare this memorial with other paintings, it could be determined in which respects the iconography of the image followed tradition and how it varied. For the placement of the portraits Anna van Noordwijk followed tradition: related to the religious scene, the portraits of the males all occupy more important places than the females. However, comparisons with other works of art in the database showed that this triptych is the only extant painting from the region of the present-day Netherlands in which the female commissioner had the preceding generations of her family, i.e. parents and grandparents, represented. Also, it is the only extant Last Judgment for the present-day Netherlands in which Mary and John the Baptist have descended from heaven to stand behind the portrayed persons as their patron saints. And finally we observe that only ten of the over 500 works of art included in Memoria in Beeld depict more than two generations of a family.

It can be concluded that in-depth study of this painting alone would not have offered the same results: now we know the Van Noordwijk triptych is untraditional in many respects. This result first of all might incite us to ask why this Last Judgment differs from other memorial pieces, and to enter new phases in the research cycle. We might choose to explore the involvement of smaller or larger series of generations in memorial practices. Several authors have concluded that in the later Middle Ages and Early Modern Period people started to take care of their souls on a more individual basis, but was this (still?) the case in the late-medieval Low Countries, for instance? For this new phase in the research cycle we might start with case studies, and choose comparative research as the following step, but we might also start with comparative research, after which we could select further cases for in-depth analysis. Sources may be memorial registers, chronicles, tomb monuments and memorial pieces, all described in the MeMO application, and sources not (yet) included in MeMO, such as foundation charters and last wills.

All in all, we expect memoria to remain a fruitful paradigm and an engaging research theme for the years to come. The Netherlands-based MeMO project not only will offer ample possibilities for further study of case studies but will also stimulate innovation through fostering interdisciplinary, comparative, and quantitative research. These possibilities will further research into several of the themes mentioned above – and, sure enough, into new topics we cannot think of yet.

124 Her grandmother was last mentioned in 1485, and her grandfather died in or before 1466.
125 The exceptions to the rule show that in these cases the commissioner intended to communicate something special, see in Van Bueren, Van Leerdam and Visser, website Memoria in beeld: ‘Summary of the research results’, ‘The prayer portraits’.
126 See Van Bueren and Visser, ‘Website Memoria in beeld’.
10 Conclusion. Future research themes

In the preceding sections we have discussed the origins and early development of *memoria* research as well as the present state of affairs. In this concluding section we shall address its future by asking the following question: what can and what should be the result of the effort of developing an application like MeMO? Before doing so, we propose to identify some promising research goals in addition to and underlining what has already been suggested above, giving preferential treatment to Dutch and/or Flemish research.

In summary, we conclude that in our research, by *memoria* we generally mean collective and/or individual practices of commemorating the dead and the living, of which liturgical commemoration is a fundamental part, but which practices also have (other) religious, political, moral, legal, economic, and social implications, meanings, and effects. *Memoria* aimed at linking people across time and space, across the boundaries of death, geography, and generations, making them members of a virtual community *avant la lettre*. In addition, the concept of *memoria* is used to indicate a research theme covering the entire Middle Ages and Early Modern Period and even the centuries beyond, as commemoration of course did not halt at the Reformation. As mentioned above, *memoria* runs the risk of becoming an all-encompassing and, thus, a too diffuse research theme or paradigm. Therefore, for the purpose of MeMO we defined *memoria* as the creation and expression of a community of the living and the dead who look after each other’s interests to secure eternal salvation. As researchers in this field we need to disassemble *memoria* in order to be able to analyse and describe it. Over the last four decades or so, historians have identified the following aspects of *memoria* that need investigation:

- Space(s), including architecture, spatial hierarchies (inner-outer world, sacred-profane, public-private, town-countryside, etc.), institutions, towns, regions;
- Objects, including memorial paintings and sculptures and other items (liturgical vessels and utensils, liturgical vestments, altar cloths, processional objects, lecterns and tabernacles, pallia, etc.), tomb monuments, tombs and their contents (archaeological artefacts), and written sources;
- Performances, including rituals, liturgy, music and other sounds;
- Meanings, be it religious, political, moral, legal, economic, and/or social, and the shifts therein;
- Actors, as the persons and/or communities playing some role in *memoria*.

These are the aspects which are key to the research themes that are to be explored in the future. We name but a few. Diachronic studies of the actual performance of *memoria* within specific institutions, regions, and/or towns over time, assessing all of the aforementioned aspects, have already proven to be fruitful. A wonderful example of this type of research is offered by the already mentioned collective volume on *memoria* as performed in the community of secular canonesses in Es-
Likewise we would like to underline the importance of studying the performative aspects of memoria, as this only existed when performed, appropriated time and again by new generations, communities, and individuals. This should result in a more dynamic approach in research, focussing on actors and agency, and depict memoria as a continuous process of creation, interaction, mediation, negotiation, and appropriation. In short, future research should (continue to) be about memoria as a process, as a performance in the past, present and future, evolving in directions not presupposed, as part of a memorial culture and of cultural remembrance. This may stand in contrast to the sources that in themselves may confer a message of unbroken continuity and static relations. But the reality obvious to any memoria researcher is of course quite the opposite, as many ‘eternal’ memoria arrangements in fact turn out to have been rather short-lived. This entails an approach comparable to the one proposed for objects by Igor Kopytoff in his concept of the ‘cultural biography of things’.

In a ‘cultural biography of memoria’ we might highlight the life cycle of the aforementioned aspects of memoria (spaces, objects, performances, meanings, actors) as well as the agency of objects (of any kind) through appropriation, including re-use (e.g. of spolia) and the (re)assignment of meaning. Therefore, performance and appropriation are vital concepts, as memoria only continued to exist as long as people were willing and capable to repeat the commemorative act. Thus, aspects such as innovation and (dis)continuity could be assessed much more in depth.

An additional research direction would be to reintegrate memoria research with liturgy studies, such as the study of monastic and canonical customary to get a better grasp of the actual performance of memoria in monasteries and secular chapters. This also entails the study of the successive reform movements, from the Carolingian reform of Aachen through the Cluniac Movement to Modern Devotion and the reformations of the sixteenth century. In this respect we refer to the interdisciplinary research performed by international research groups such as the one doing comparative research on religious orders and their rules directed by Gert Melville and the research network ‘Conventus. Problems of religious communal life in the High Middle Ages’ led by Steven Vanderputten. Individual researchers too have studied the norms and practices of liturgical performance and its development both in monastic and episcopal contexts, such as Susan Boynton and Diane Reilly. In the Netherlands, Bram van den Hoven van Genderen has done semi-

128 Schilp, Pro remedio.
129 Kopytoff, ‘The cultural biography of things’.
130 Andenna et al., Regulae – Consuetudines – Statuta.
131 See www.conventus.ugent.be (7 May 2011) and Vanderputten and Meijns, Ecclesia in medio nationis.
132 Boynton, ‘Prayer as liturgical performance’; Boynton and Cochelin, From dead of night to end of day and the contributions by Melville and Reilly herein: Melville ‘Action, Text, and Validity; Reilly, ‘The Cluniac Giant Bible’. See also Boynton, ‘Monastic Death Ritual’.
nal work in this field by investigating the liturgical practices and commemoration of the Utrecht canons.133

This research might enable us to identify and assess turning points in medieval memoria and, thus, might give us a better idea of the longue durée of commemoration. One such turning point, the turn from collective to individual commemoration, was identified by Dominique Iogna-Prat, who sees this happening as a result of Cluniac innovations, among other things responsible for the introduction of the feast of All Souls around 1030.134 Another shift might be the development and proliferation of specific liturgies and rituals of association and commemoration in the twelfth century,135 and the contemporary adoption by canonical and secular circles of monastic commemorative practices.136 Next, we might observe the introduction of these commemorative and associative practices in urban confraternities and guilds and other corporations as well as in urban civic culture from the late twelfth century onward.137 At the other end of the Middle Ages late-medieval and early-modern innovations as a result of the Modern Devotion, the Observant movement, and the Reformation and Counter-Reformation all had their impact on memoria as performed by monks and nuns, canons, and laypeople. With regard to impact of fifteenth- and sixteenth-century reformations we await the dissertations of the Dutch researchers Vincent Robijn and Annemarie Speetjens.138

On a more general level, an approach focussing on appropriation and performance, and on the roles played by actors (agency) might would help us to overcome all too obvious dichotomies such as lay vs. religious, town folk vs. religious communities, spiritual vs. mundane, private vs. public, or individual vs. collective, focussing instead on the dynamics of interaction and interplay. A particular topic which would benefit from such an approach is the field of political history, in which aspects of legitimation, propaganda, and continuity obviously played an important role. In several recent studies such an approach from a religious and cultural perspective was applied successfully.139 For the Central Middle Ages the Adelsgeschichte that fathered modern memoria research in Germany, still may benefit much from the inclusion of memoria as a topic and the analysis of commemorative sources as a means for genealogical reconstruction and prosopographical research, especially in the Low Countries.

Last, not least: the vast research of field of memoria demands of us to publicise our research outcomes to an international audience in order to create opportunities for comparisons across time and space. Crossing borders and building bridges between nations, languages, and citation communities has to remain high on the

134 Iogna-Prat, ‘The Dead in the Celestial Bookkeeping’.
135 Bijsterveld, ‘Looking for Common Ground’.
136 Bijsterveld, ‘In mei memoriam’.
139 Lieven, Adel, Herrschaft und Memoria; Noordzij, Gelre.
medievalists’ agendas. A big question remains how to organize joint research and to propagate our results across the ‘usual suspects’, who are to be found in Germany, France, and the Anglophone world, into Southern and Central Europe.
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Plates

1. *Mary and the Christ Child* and the Van Zwieten family. Artist: PS (Pieter Willemsz. Slyuter?), date 1552 (in text below portrait of commissioner, Johanna van Zwieten, second to the left); canvas, 129,5x385 cm; Leiden, Mariënpoel convent; see also http://memo.hum.uu.nl/ under Products: Prayer and Politics. Image reproduced with kind permission of Museum De Lakenhal, Leiden.

2. Photo from 1916 with the portraits of the Land Commander, six Commanders and the Secretary of the Teutonic Order, Bailiwick of Utrecht, taken in the meeting hall of the Duitse Huis at the Hofpoort. Photographer unknown. Image reproduced with kind permission of the Teutonic Order, bailiwick of Utrecht.


6. *Last Judgment* with the family of Anna van Noordwijk, Jan Mostaert, ca. 1510-1514, Panel, middle: 109x71cm, wings: 115x35 cm; probably from the church of the Dominican convent, Haarlem; Bonn, Rheinisches Landesmuseum, GK 168. Image reproduced with kind permission of Rheinisches Landesmuseum, Bonn.

7. *Virgin and Child enthroned among angels and saints*. Artist: Benozzo Gozzoli; tempera and gold on panel 162x170 cm. Commissioned in 1461 by the Confraternity of the Purification and St Zenobius; London, National Gallery. Image reproduced with kind permission of the National Gallery Picture Library, London.
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