Oxen and Hogs, Monkeys and Parrots: Using "Familiar" and "Unfamiliar" Fauna In Late Medieval Visual Representation

Gerhard Jaritz (Budapest and Krems)

Animals played important roles in a variety of fields and aspects of medieval culture. One finds them as bones in archaeological material representing food refuse and remains from other economic, social and religious activities. They appear in textual as well as visual evidence, as representations of 'real' or fictitious creatures, as participants in religious or secular narratives, as symbolic or metaphoric objects: to document, to warn, to argue, to signal, to teach, to urge, or to motivate. They could be animals, very familiar in the surroundings from the immediate environment and also creatures whose existence was only known from some ancient or religious authorities, from theological or scientific discourse. Parts of different animals could also be mixed to achieve a variety of effects.

This way, animals represented, on the one hand, very familiar objects for their audience and recipients. They turned up in common and well-known situations. On the other hand, they became beings whose existence, appearance and function were mostly unknown, or only noted from some far-off messages, from mentions in the bible, from the writings of ancient savants, or from awesome travel accounts. Such contrasts between matters of familiarity and strangeness seem to have determined the image of animals in a multiplicity of evidence.[1] And just this familiarity and, at the same time, extraneousness must have influenced all kinds of perceptions.[2] They created and affected the individual animals' as well as, generally, the fauna's function in arguments and discourses.

[1] For such an approach towards animals, see also Jacques Voisenet, *Bêtes et Hommes dans le monde médiéval. Le bestiaire des clercs du Ve au XIIe siècle* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), particularly chapter I: "Monstres et animaux domestiques, la proximité avec l'homme" (p. 15-52).

[2] Regarding the perception of animals in the Middle Ages see, in particular, Esther Cohen, "Animals in Medieval Perceptions: the Image of the Ubiquitous Other," in *Animals and Human Society: Changing Perspectives*, ed. Aubrey Manning and James Serpell (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 59-80.

It is just such contexts that I would like to concentrate my analysis on visual source material from the Late Middle Ages, mainly originating from Central European territories.[3]

Fig. 1: Saint Bernard strewing salt for the animals.

Familiar representation of fauna was connected with typical late medieval 'realistic' depictions which were used to create visual closeness between beholder and picture, a closeness that was supposed to lead to the important proximity of the whole message of the image to its recipient.[4] Such a situation

[3] Concerning the role of iconography for the studies of medieval fauna, see Aleks Pluskowski, "Hares with Crossbows and Rabbit Bones: Integrating Physical and Conceptual Studies of Medieval Fauna," in *Medieval Animals*, ed. Aleks Pluskowski, Archaeological Review from Cambridge 18 (Cambridge: Department of Archaeology, 2002), 156-157. For the analysis of visual sources from medieval France, see Marcel Durliat, "Le monde animal et ses représentations iconographiques du XIe au XVe siècle," in *Le monde animal et ses représentations au Moyen Âge (XIe-XVe siècles)*, Actes du XVème Congrès de la Société des Historiens Médiévistes de l'Enseignement Supérieur Public (Toulouse: Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail), 73-92. Regarding an individual object of art, see William Brunsdon Yapp, "Animals in Medieval Art: the Bayeux Tapestry as an Example," *Journal of Medieval History* 13 (1987): 15-73.

[4] On closeness and distance in late medieval visual culture, see Gerhard Jaritz, "Nähe und Distanz als Gebrauchsfunktion spätmittelalterlicher religiöser Bilder," in *Frömmigkeit im Mittelalter. Politisch-soziale Kontexte, visuelle Praxis, körperliche Ausdrucksformen,* ed. Klaus Schreiner (Munich: Fink, 2002), 331-346. Concerning the reality effect of late me-

may certainly have been particularly relevant in rural space or for the representation of rural space.

There is, for instance, the miracle from the legend of Saint Bernard of Clairvaux's life concerning his strewing of consecrated salt for the domestic animals that had been struck by an epidemic (fig. 1[5]).

Fig. 2: Labors of the Months, September:
plowing the field with the help of oxen and horses.

There are also the various and well-known representations of the Labors of the Months:[6] as, for instance, the month of September from the wall paintings in the episcopal residence of the Upper Italian town of Trento, showing the right

dieval art, see Keith Moxey, "Reading the Reality Effect," in *Pictura quasi Fictura. Die Rolle des Bildes in der Erforschung von Alltag und Sachkultur des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit*, ed. Gerhard Jaritz (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996), 15-22.

[5] Saint Bernard strewing salt for the animals, panel painting from a winged altarpiece, Jörg Breu the Older, c. 1500. Cistercian house of Zwettl (Lower Austria). See Cäsar Menz, *Das Frühwerk Jörg Breus des Älteren* (Augsburg: Kommissionsverlag Bücher Seitz, 1982), 24-25.

[6] For the Labors of the Months see, generally, Bridget Ann Henisch, *The Medieval Calendar Year* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999).

people carrying out the right work, in the right way at the right time and, concerning the topic of this contribution, also with the help of the right, that is, familiar animals (fig. 2[7]).

One also should think of the examples of moralistic-didactic depictions of the Virtues and Vices: in this case from Brixen in South Tyrol which shows the active bishop willing to work, that is, plowing the field with his oxen, and the idle and inactive bishop refusing to do it (fig. 3[8]).

Fig. 3: The active (virtuous) bishop plowing the soil.

Representations of the Virtues and the Vices are often connected with animals and with the symbolic values and connotations ascribed to the beasts:[9]

[7] Plowing with the help of oxen and horses, Labors of the Months: September (detail), wall painting, beginning of the 15th century. Trento (Upper Italy), Castello del Buonconsiglio, Torre Aquila. See Francesca de Gramatica, "Il ciclo di Mesi di Torre Aquila," in *Il Gotico nelle Alpi 1350-1450*, ed. Enrico Castelnuovo and Francesca de Gramatica (Trento: Castello del Buonconsiglio, Monumenti e Collezioni Provinciali, 2002), 343-365.

[8] Bishop plowing with oxen: The Active and the Lazy Bishop (detail), wall painting, 1420-1430. Brixen/Bressanone (South Tyrol), cloister of the Cathedral, tenth arcade. See Karl Wolfsgruber, *Dom und Kreuzgang von Brixen. Geschichte und Kunst* (Bozen: Athesia, 1988), 39-40.

[9] See Mireille Vincent-Cassy, "Les animaux et les péchés capitaux: de la symbolique à l'emblématique," in *Le Monde Animal et ses représentations au Moyen Âge (XIe-XVe siècles)*, Actes du XVème Congrès de la Société des Historiens Médiévistes de l'Enseigne-

like the familiar hog, already in the bible a symbol of impurity that served well as a mount for an unchaste, vicious couple from Levoča in today's Slovakia (fig. 4[10]).

Fig. 4: The unchaste couple riding on the impure hog.

ment Supérieur Public (Toulouse: Université de Toulouse-Le Mirail), 121-132; Ron Baxter, "Learning from Nature: Lessons in Virtue and Vice in the Physiologus and Bestiaries," in *Virtue & Vice: the Personifications in the Index of Christian* Art, ed. Colum Hourihane (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 29-41; Carmen Brown, "Bestiary Lessons on Pride and Lust," in *The Mark of the Beast*, ed. Debra Hassig (New York and London: Routledge, 2000), 53-70.

[10] The unchaste couple riding on the impure hog: The Capital Sin of Unchastity, wall painting, end 14th century. Levoča (Slovakia), parish church. See Dušan Buran, *Studien zur Wandmalerei um 1400 in der Slowakei. Die Pfarrkirche St. Jakob in Leutschau und die Pfarrkirche St. Franziskus Seraphicus in Poniky* (Weimar: Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaften, 2002), 50-52. Concerning the hog in medieval art, see, e. g., Wilfried Schouwink, *Der wilde Eber in Gottes Weinberg. Zur Darstellung des Schweins in Literatur und Kunst des Mittelalters* (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1985).

Bestiaries and other illustrated encyclopaedic works that dealt with fauna were not meant for such a public space as the aforementioned wall paintings.[11] In the encyclopaedias an attempt was made to mention all known or existing animals. Therefore, they describe, on the one hand, very familiar creatures and offer a visual representation of them. On the other hand, they also concentrate on unfamiliar and perhaps strange beings. An example is the *Hortus Sanitatis.* The description and depiction of the louse in this Latin version published at Strassburg in 1499 (fig. 5[12]), for example, belongs to the first group of familiar animals and their representations. Some of these vermin appear in and beside the plate which is positioned between the woman and the man. The main content of the image again depicts a very familiar situation, that is, delousing the hair of one's partner with the help of a licebrush.

Fig. 5: *Hortus Sanitatis*: The louse.

The *Hortus Sanitatis*, however, also contains a large number of unfamiliar animals and their visual representations which would certainly not have been found in the regions where the producers and recipients of the encyclopaedias lived. Such examples are, for instance, the centaur (*onocenthaurus)* and the giraffe (*orasius*) (fig. 6[13]).

---

[11] Concerning the reception of bestiaries see in particular, Ron Baxter, *Bestiaries and Their Users in the Middle Ages* (Phoenix Mill: Sutton, 1998).

[12] The louse: *Hortus Sanitatis* (Strassburg: Johannes Prüm the Older, c. 1499), Tractatus de Animalibus, capitulum cxix: *pediculus.*

[13] *Hortus Sanitatis* (Strassburg: Johannes Prüm the Older, c. 1499), Tractatus de Animalibus, capitulum cvii: *Ex libro de naturis rerum. Onocenthaurus est animal monstruosum et*

Fig. 6: The centaur (*onocenthaurus*) and the giraffe (*orasius*).

There are clear connections and contexts between some of the unfamiliar contents of the scientific encyclopaedias and the public space of religious paintings. This is particularly true for the unicorn, or for fish and other creatures

---

natura biforme capite scilicet azinino et corpore velut humano, faciem habet satis horridam manusque formatas abiles ad omnem actum dum vocem promit quasi loqui incipit. ... Hoc monstrum ... inter ceteras bestias ab initio non fuisse tale creatum sed aliquando et alicubi casualiter ex adulterine commixtione generari. Orasius. Isidorus: Orasius in anteriori parte altum eminens valde, ita ut extenso capite xx cubitorum altitudinem possit attingere. In posteriori vero parte demissum est, instar cervi. Collum habet extensum, caput equinum, licet minus pedes autem et caudam ut cervus, pellem vero sic omni colorum genere diuersimode variatam, ut homo frustra temptet artificio naturalem eius pulchritudinem imitari ... Albertus ...appellat eum Orafflus (Out of the Book of the Nature of Things: The o*nocenthaurus* is a wondrous animal of ambiguous nature, with the head of an ass and a humanlike body; it has a rather terrifying face and hands able to do anything, while it issues sounds as if starting to speak. This wondrous being … was not created in the beginning like the other animals but born sometime and somehow out of an adulterous commingling. *Orasius*: Isidor: The o*rasius* appears at its front part very high so that, with stretched head, it can reach a height of 20 cubits. But in its back part, it becomes lower, like a stag. It has a long neck, a horselike head, but smaller feet and a tail like a stag; it has a coat varying in color in different ways so that man might try in vain to imitate its natural beauty artificially. … Albertus (Magnus) … calls it *Orafflus*"]. For the centaur, see Elizabeth Atwood Lawrence, "The Centaur: Its History and Meaning in Human Culture," *Journal of Popular Culture* 27:4 (1994): 57-68; Ludo Jongen, "Do Centaurs Have Souls? Centaurs as Seen by the Middle Dutch Poet Jacob van Maerlant,", in *Animals and the Symbolic in Medieval Art and Literature*, ed. L.A.J.R. Houwen (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1997), 139-154.

living in waters or in the sea. There is, for example, the mermaid (*syrena*) depicted and described in detail in a large number of bestiaries and encyclopaedic treatises.[14] Such beasts also could be found in public space and would have been visible and 'familiar' to everybody, for instance on wall paintings on both the outside and inside wall surfaces of churches that depict Saint Christopher carrying Jesus over the river (fig. 7[15]).

Fig. 7: Mermaid in the river crossed by St. Christopher.

A similar situation existed for representations of the dolphin, *frater hominis dicitur*, which was said to be very close to humans in its character.[16] An animal like the dolphin which would have been unfamiliar in Central Europe

[14] See, e. g., again the *Hortus Sanitatis* (Strassburg: Johannes Prüm the Older, c. 1499), Tractatus de Piscibus, capitulum lxxxiii: *syrena*.

[15] Mermaid: St. Christopher Carrying the Christchild (detail), wall painting, 1511. Pens/Pennes (South Tyrol), parish church.

[16] *Hortus Sanitatis* (Strassburg: Johannes Prüm the Older, c. 1499), Tractatus de Piscibus, capitulum xxvii: *delphin* (the illustration is very close to the one of the *syrena*; see note 14): *Delphinus frater hominis dicitur quia moribus humanis quodammodo assimilatur* ...(The dolphin is called the brother of man as it has assimilated with human mores); with references to Aristotle, Plinius and the Physiologus.

certainly may have been visually represented differently from its actual appearance. In the mid-fourteenth-century monastic manuscript of the so-called *Concordantiae Caritatis*, one is confronted with a rather strange dolphin whose love for music is emphasized, as a typological example of the "Annunciation to the Shepherds" (fig. 8[17]). Sometimes, also the dolphin could find its way into public space: for instance in a Czech wall painting that again offers a glimpse into the river through which Saint Christopher carried the ChristChild and shows rather different dolphins from the one depicted in the *Concordantiae Caritatis* (fig. 9[18]).

Fig. 8: The dolphin enjoys music and follows the musician.

Such a variety of distinct visual representations is certainly generally significant for the depiction of unfamiliar animals: for example, the fish or whale that swallowed Jonah whole and spit him out after three days. The only

[17] The dolphin enjoys the music of lutes and flutes, and follows the musician; *exemplum* to the Annunciation of the Shepherds, manuscript illumination, c. 1350. *Concordantiae Caritatis*, Cistercian house of Lilienfeld (Lower Austria), monastic library, cod. 151, fol. 12v: *Simphonidens vocem delphin sequiturque velocem* (The dolphin quickly follows the sound of chords). See Hedwig Munscheck, *Die* Concordantiae caritatis *des Ulrich von Lilienfeld. Untersuchungen zu Inhalt, Quellen und Verbreitung, mit einer Paraphrasierung von Temporale, Sanktorale und Commune* (Frankfurt/Main et al.: Peter Lang, 2000), 216.

[18] Dolphins, Saint Christopher Carrying the Christchild (detail), wall painting, 2nd quarter of the 15th century. Boritov (Czech Republic), St. George's church.

comparable matter to be found in all depictions of it are what treatises in encyclopaedias often mention at the beginning of the beast's description: ... *est immense magnitudinis bestia* ...(It is an animal of enormous size).[19] In a similar way, for instance, very different elephants may be encountered, occasionally horse-like ones, only recognizable because of their trunks.[20] Such a phenomenon of visual diversity is true for 'scientific' representations in encyclopaedias or bestiaries as well as for images in the public space of wall paintings. Particularly unfamiliarity led to differences in the depictions, to something that today would be called a wrong image: a term of which I think that it is generally out of place when talking about medieval ways of the portrayal of animals that included specific meanings.

Fig. 9: Dolphins in the river that Saint Christopher crossed with the Christchild.

[19] See, e. g., *Hortus Sanitatis* (Strassburg: Johannes Prüm the Older, c. 1499), Tractatus de Piscibus, capitulum xiiii: *balena.*

[20] See, e. g., elephant, Death of Eleazar, wall painting, Leonhard of Brixen, c. 1470. Brixen/ Bressanone (South Tyrol), cathedral cloister, third arcade (Wolfsgruber, *Dom und Kreuzgang von Brixen*, 31); elephant, Death of Eleazar, wall painting, workshop of Leonhard of Brixen, c. 1480. Klerant/Cleran (South Tyrol), filial church of St. Nicholas.

Unfamiliar and strange animals were also used together with familiar fauna – as indispensable for depicting the totality of living creatures: for instance, the entirety of animals created by God at the beginning of the world (in this case, of birds and water animals; fig. 10[21]) or the ones having fled into Noah's arch. There, familiar and unfamiliar animals had to be shown together to visualize the meant collectivity and totality.

Fig. 10: The Creation of the birds and the water animals:
a collection of familiar and unfamiliar species.

Familiarity and unfamiliarity of represented animals and their functions and meanings also have to be seen in context within the broad field of animal

[21] Creation of the Animals (represented by birds and water animals), wall painting, John of Kastav, 1490. Hrastovlje (Slovenia), Trinity church. See Marijan Zadnikar, *Hrastovlje: romanska arhitektura in gotske freske* (Hrastovlje: Romanesque architecture and Gothic frescoes), 2nd ed. (Ljubljana: Družina, 2002). Concerning birds in medieval art, see Brunsdon Yapp, *Birds in Medieval Manuscripts* (London: The British Library, 1981); Gertrud Roth-Bojadzhiev, *Studien zur Bedeutung der Vögel in der mittelalterlichen Tafelmalerei* (Cologne and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1985).

symbolism.[22] In a number of cases and concerning specific, often unfamiliar animals, one may be confronted with a variety of different messages that they contained and proclaimed directly or indirectly. The application of contrast patterns occurs regularly.[23] Important examples in this context are, for instance, monkeys that turn up in a number of inter-related contexts. Monkeys are generally rather unfamiliar in medieval Central Europe and, therefore, sometimes used for the classification of situations depicting strange phenomena or far-away origins. The Three Magi, for example, came from far-distant lands. It seems clear that a far-away animal like the monkey would have fit well with their characterization and the depiction of their journey.[24]

Fig. 11: The Monkey and the Fool.

[22] Concerning the variety of symbolic meanings and values of animals, see, e. g., L. A. J. R. Houwen, ed., *Animals and the Symbolic in Mediaeval Art and Literature* (Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1997).

[23] For the functions and application of contrasts in late medieval society, see, e. g., Gerhard Jaritz, ed., *Kontraste im Alltag des Mittelalters* (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000).

[24] See, e. g., Journey of the Three Magi, wall painting, John Aquila, 1387. Velemer (Hungary), Roman Catholic church [Dénes Radocsay, *Wandgemälde im mittelalterlichen Ungarn* (Budapest: Corvina, 1977), 180]; Journey of the Three Magi, wall painting, 1504. Sv. Primož (Slovenia), filial church St. Primus and St. Felician [France Stele, *Gotsko stensko slikarstvo* (Gothic wall paintings) (Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1972), cxxx-cxxxii]; Journey of the Three Magi, wall painting, 1420-1430. Morter (South Tyrol), filial church of St. Stephen in Obermontani [Edmund Theil, *St. Stephan von Obermontani bei Morter*, 3rd ed. (Bozen: Athesia 1986)].

Monkeys were not mentioned in the Bible. Their use in medieval textual and visual evidence developed, on the one hand, towards their closeness to humans and, on the other hand, often in context with their manlikeness, towards symbols of a negative character: of malignity, mischievousness, friskiness, of 'monkey-ing around'. Therefore, they could closely conform to visions of the fool (fig. 11[25]). They also moved towards *superbia*, to haughtiness, as indicated by the mirrors that they were shown holding (fig. 12[26]).

Fig. 12: The Monkey and the Mirror.

However, such negative attributes and their representation would certainly have demanded perhaps originally not expected and, therefore, surprising positive contrasts as, for instance, also with regard to hogs, bears, dogs, cats and foxes, etc.[27] Thus, monkeys or apes could be moved into very familiar and positive spaces. The female monkey from a comparative Flemish example concentrates on spinning and the upbringing of her offspring, these being

[25] The Monkey and the Fool, marginal manuscript illumination, prayer book of Barbara of Cilli, Vienna, 1448. Vienna, Austrian National Library, cod. 1767, fol. 257r. Concerning the taking over of bestiary images into the marginalia of psalters and bibles from the 13th century onwards, see Debra Hassig, "Marginal Bestiaries," in *Animals and the Symbolic in Medieval Art and Literature*, ed. L. A. J. R. Houwen (Groningen; Egbert Forsten, 1997), 171-188.

[26] The Monkey and the Mirror, marginal manuscript illumination, Bible, Austrian (?), c. 1450. Vienna, Austrian National Library, cod. 1228, fol. 82r.

[27] Concerning animals representing examples for and mirrors of human behavior and values, see, e. g., Voisenet, *Bêtes et Hommes*, 255-283; Joyce E. Salisbury, *The Beast Within: Animals in the Middle Ages* (New York and London: Routledge, 1994), 103-136.

important positive activities that needed to be learned by women as indispensable parts of their obligations in family life (fig. 13[28]). The didactic message and moral is obvious: Look, how well even the normally so negative monkeys live and behave. Take their example and behave in a similar way!

Fig.13: The monkey as a positive example of good family life.

* * *

In conclusion, it should be emphasized that familiar as well as unfamiliar fauna and their visual representation played an important role in late medieval society. Both familiarity as well as unfamiliarity could be applied and were used to address audiences and beholders in various ways to mediate specific religious and secular messages. Images of strange animals as well as of ordinary ones offered a variety of possibilities for communication in a number of areas.

[28] The female monkey as a positive example for women, taking care of children's up-bringing and doing the spinning; marginal manuscript illumination, Prayer Book of Charles the Bold (Book of Hours of Mary of Burgundy), Flanders, 1466-1477. Vienna, Austrian National Library, cod. 1857, fol. 17r [photo out of *Stundenbuch der Maria von Burgund (Gebetbuch Karls des Kühnen). Faksimile-Ausgabe*, Codices Selecti, vol. XIV (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1968)].

In all these cases, one has to be aware of important networks but also differences with regard to the space in and for which visual or also textual information about animals was created. There was the scientific zoological space – certainly referring to medieval 'symbolic zoology', and not the 'realistic' zoology that we are used to nowadays. In close context and relation to this zoological space, one has to be aware of the indispensable religious-theological range of ideas. There was also the broader public space meant for 'everybody' that may have concentrated both on didactic religious and secular contents.

In this way, familiar as well as unfamiliar animals and their context-bound visual representations were used to mediate easily understandable religious and secular messages as well as highly complex discourses that required extensive background knowledge to comprehend. Animal images could contain general and simple information about right and wrong but also embody difficult analogies. – One such analogy should finally be mentioned. Parrots were said to die when their feathers got wet in the rain (fig. 14[29]). This example was then used for characterizing Saint Elizabeth of Hungary (fig. 15[30]) who was never touched by a drop of rain, – meaning that no "lust coming from any kind of worldly drop" had ever dishonored her heart, body, and spirit.

Fig. 14: The parrot killed by raindrops.

[29] The parrot dies when its feathers get wet from rain, manuscript illumination, *Concordantiae Caritatis*, c. 1350. Cistercian house of Lilienfeld (Lower Austria), monastic library, cod. 151, fol. 226v: *Pluvia si tangis psitacum male mortibus angis* (Rain, if you touch the parrot, you force him to death). See Munscheck, *Die* Concordantiae caritatis, 430.

[30] Ibidem: Deathbed of Saint Elizabeth of Hungary. See Munscheck, *Die* Concordantiae caritatis, 430.

Fig. 15: Deathbed of Saint Elizabeth,
never touched by a drop of lust during her life.

All photos (if not mentioned otherwise): Institut für Realienkunde des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit, Austrian Academy of Sciences, Krems (Austria).

.

ANIMAL DIVERSITIES

Edited by

Gerhard Jaritz and Alice Choyke

MEDIUM AEVUM QUOTIDIANUM

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON GERHARD JARITZ

SONDERBAND XVI

ANIMAL DIVERSITIES

Edited by

Gerhard Jaritz and Alice Choyke

Krems 2005

GEDRUCKT MIT UNTERSTÜTZUNG DER ABTEILUNG
KULTUR UND WISSENSCHAFT DES AMTES
DER NIEDERÖSTERREICHISCHEN LANDESREGIERUNG

niederösterreich kultur

Cover illustration:
The Beaver,
Hortus Sanitatis (Strassburg: Johannes Prüm the Older, c. 1499),
Tractatus de Animalibus, capitulum xxxi: *Castor.*

Alle Rechte vorbehalten
– ISBN 3-90 1094 19 9

Herausgeber: Medium Aevum Quotidianum. Gesellschaft zur Erforschung der materiellen Kultur des Mittelalters, Körnermarkt 13, A–3500 Krems, Österreich. Für den Inhalt verantwortlich zeichnen die Autoren, ohne deren ausdrückliche Zustimmung jeglicher Nachdruck, auch in Auszügen, nicht gestattet ist. – Druck: Grafisches Zentrum an der Technischen Universität Wien, Wiedner Hauptstraße 8-10, 1040 Wien.

Table of Contents

Preface 7

Aleksander Pluskowski, Wolves and Sheep in Medieval Semiotics,
Iconology and Ecology: a Case Study of Multi- and Inter-disciplinary
Approaches to Human-Animal Relations in the Historical Past 9

Alice M. Choyke, Kyra Lyublyanovics, László Bartosiewicz,
The Various Voices of Medieval Animal Bones 23

Grzegorz Żabiński, Swine for Pearls?
Animals in the Thirteenth-Century Cistercian Houses
of Henryków and Mogiła ……..... 50

Krisztina Fügedi, Bohemian Sheep, Hungarian Horses, and Polish Wild Boars:
Animals in Twelfth-Century Central European Chronicles 66

Hilary Powell, Walking and Talking with the Animals:
the Role of Fauna in Anglo-Latin Saints' Lives .....……. 89

Gerhard Jaritz, Oxen and Hogs, Monkeys and Parrots:
Using "Familiar" and "Unfamiliar" Fauna
in Late Medieval Visual Representation .....……..... 107

Sarah Wells, A Database of Animals in Medieval Misericords …….. 123

Zsofia Buda, Animals and Gazing at Women:
Zoocephalic Figures in the Tripartite Mahzor .....……... 136

Taxiarchis G. Kolias, Man and Animals in the Byzantine World ……..…. 165

Ingrid Matschinegg, (M)edieval (A)nimal (D)atabase:
a Project in Progress ……..… 167

Preface

Over the last two decades, interests in animals and the relationship between humans and animals in the past have increased decisively. This is also true particularly for the research into the Middle Ages. A variety of perspectives and approaches can be traced concerning

- the questions asked;
- the used source evidence: zooarchaeological, textual, visual;
- the embedding of the analyses into the wider fields of the study of the history of nature, environment, economy, religion and theology, signs and symbols, social history, and so on;
- the degrees and levels of the application of interdisciplinary and comparative methods;
- the level of consciousness of the diversities of use and functions of animals in medieval society, on the one hand, and of the contextualized networks of their meanings, on the other hand.

Such a consciousness of animal diversities and, at the same time, of animal networks has been the basis for this volume of collected essays. They originate from a number of international research collaborations, communications, and presentations at international meetings, such as the annual Medieval Conferences at Kalamazoo and Leeds. All the contributors have aimed to show individual aspects of human-animal relations and have also been interested in the social contexts animals occur in. Therefore, the book is meant to represent *Animal Diversities* but certainly also, in particular, the indispensable *Animal Contexts* and *Contextuality*: from zooarchaeological evidence to zoocephalic females in visual representations of Ashkenazi Jews; from the economic function of animals in Cistercian houses to the role of their representations in Gothic misericords; from animals in chronicles or hagiographical texts to their images at different levels of late medieval visual public space.

Some recently initiated projects, two of them introduced in the volume, others referred to in the contributions, will hopefully also open up possibilities for new insights into the variety of roles and functions that were played by and constructed for all kinds of fauna in the Middle Ages.

"Zoology of the Middle Ages" may then perhaps be seen, in general, as one of the model fields for representing the importance of relations and connections between the sciences and humanities, economy and theology, daily life

and symbolic meaning, nature and culture, intention and response, as well as construction and perception, …

December 2005 Gerhard Jaritz

.