



Swansea University
Prifysgol Abertawe



Cronfa - Swansea University Open Access Repository

This is an author produced version of a paper published in:

Speculum

Cronfa URL for this paper:

<http://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa38103>

Paper:

McAvoy, L., Skinner, P. & Tyers, T. (2019). Strange Fruits: Grafting, Foreigners, and the Garden Imaginary in Northern France and Germany, 1250–1350. *Speculum*, 94(2), 467-495.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/702738>

This item is brought to you by Swansea University. Any person downloading material is agreeing to abide by the terms of the repository licence. Copies of full text items may be used or reproduced in any format or medium, without prior permission for personal research or study, educational or non-commercial purposes only. The copyright for any work remains with the original author unless otherwise specified. The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder.

Permission for multiple reproductions should be obtained from the original author.

Authors are personally responsible for adhering to copyright and publisher restrictions when uploading content to the repository.

<http://www.swansea.ac.uk/library/researchsupport/ris-support/>

Strange Fruits: Grafting, Foreigners and the Garden Imaginary in Northern France and Germany, 1250-1350

By Liz Herbert McAvoy, Patricia Skinner, and Theresa Tyers (Swansea University)

ABSTRACT

The horticultural practice of grafting, inserting a shoot of one plant into the rootstock of another in order to benefit from the latter's established strength and growth, provided a rich metaphor for use in religious sermons and didactic literature from antiquity to the medieval period. St Paul's Letter to the Romans, 11:23 includes the admonition that the Israelites, 'if they do not continue in their unbelief, will be grafted in, for God has the power to graft them in again.' Yet grafting was, even in Paul's text, acknowledged to be 'contrary to nature', and a tension was thus set up between metaphor and practice that remained present and unresolved in medieval texts. This article explores one moment of that tension, reading the mystical works of Mechthild of Hackeborn (d.1298) and Gertrude of Helfta (d. 1302) in a northern European context where grafting was undergoing a transformation from a practice simply used for beneficial purposes – production of better fruit – to one that created pleasure and amusement for a growing aristocratic elite, for whom controlling nature on their landed estates was simply another manifestation of their power, as exemplified by the pleasure park at Hesdin in Picardy. It suggests that grafting – the penetrating of the natural rootstock with an alien scion – was a pliable concept with queer possibilities and that these playful elements came to the fore in northern Europe due to the influence of powerful men like Count Robert II of Artois (d. 1302), Hesdin's owner, and his daughter and successor, Mahaut (d. 1329). Robert brought north with him horticultural and other experts from southern Italy, importing ideas along with people to create his park. Read against this background, Mechthild's and Gertrude's use of grafting metaphors in their visionary writings is singular in its concerted queering of the practice by the authors' inscriptions

upon it of more female-coded associations, adapted as a ‘language’ with which to express their own equally singular, mystical – and also decidedly queer – relationships with God. We suggest that the ease with which they use grafting imagery represents a shift from tension to acceptance of a practice where even the results of ‘strange’ grafts could be viewed as God’s work, a view expressed also in the *Ruralia Commoda* of Pietro de’ Crescenzi, whose possible relationship with and influence over Robert and Mahaut is also explored.

INTRODUCTION

The horticultural practice of grafting, inserting a shoot of one plant into the rootstock of another in order to benefit from the latter’s established strength and growth, provided a rich metaphor for use in religious sermons and didactic literature from antiquity to the medieval period and beyond. St Paul’s Letter to the Romans, 11:23, for example, famously includes the admonition to the Gentile Christians of Rome, that the Israelites, ‘if they do not continue in their unbelief, will be grafted in, for God has the power to graft them in again.’ In Paul’s text, the practice of plant-grafting – here the grafting of the olive tree – is associated with religious conversion, where a ‘weak’ stock of unbelievers is incorporated into the root-system of a much ‘stronger’ Christian stock to create an altogether more fertile fruit-bearing capacity.¹ Yet, in spite of the horticultural benefits of this process, grafting was, even in Paul’s text, acknowledged to be, ‘contrary to nature’ (11:24). Here, Paul may have been drawing upon the type of anxieties about grafting practices later expressed more explicitly within Talmudic sources, especially those hinted at in the prohibition of Leviticus 19: 19, which mandates: ‘Thou shalt not make thy cattle to gender with beasts of any other kind. Thou shalt not sow thy field with different seeds’. Such sources make use of plant-grafting as a fluid metaphor to discuss issues of mixed marriage or else to liken ‘perfect’ offspring to non-grafted olive trees, rather than grafted hybrids.² Thus, there was clearly a pre-existing tension within attitudes towards grafting practices which remained present, and sometimes unresolved, in their complex metaphorical appearances in

medieval texts.³ This article explores one moment of that tension, reading the synchronous and collaborative mystical works of the Saxon nuns, Mechthild of Hackeborn (d. 1298) and Gertrude of Helfta (d. 1302), within a wider northern European context – where grafting was undergoing a transformation from a practice simply for the production of superior fruit to one that created pleasure and amusement for a growing aristocratic elite for whom controlling nature on their landed estates was simply another manifestation of their power, as exemplified by the pleasure park at Hesdin in Picardy. It will suggest, moreover, that grafting often retained concerted sexual association due to the slitting and penetrating of the ‘natural’ rootstock with an alien scion that then dominated the partnership and the production of offspring, fundamental to the practice. Indeed, as Jean E. Feerick asserts of the sexual and genealogical dimensions associated with the practice: ‘the graft could organize, regulate, and even expand social, sexual, and familial identities.’⁴ As will be demonstrated, the ambiguities of the relationship between rootstock and scion – especially the sexual connotations and the familiar gender identities associated with them – were adroitly re-appropriated, expanded, and frequently destabilized in some of the writings emerging from the nunnery of Helfta in northern Germany during the period, for whose authors the documenting of an intense pleasure shared with God in their visionary ‘gardens’ took up center stage. Further, this article hypothesizes that the practice of grafting for pleasure became popular in northern Europe due to the grafting-in of foreign expertise from southern Italy, notably in the entourage and among the connections of Count Robert II of Artois (d. 1302), owner of the extensive – and flamboyant – estate of Hesdin in Picardy, and his daughter and successor, Mahaut (d. 1329). Read against this background, Mechthild’s and Gertrude’s use of grafting metaphors in their visionary writings are singular in their concerted hermeneutical use of the practice, adapted as a ‘language’ able to express more accurately their own equally singular mystical relationships with a hybrid, Trinitarian God who also, at times, manifested as decidedly multi-gendered and queer.⁵ We suggest that the ease with which they deploy grafting imagery in their writings represents a shift from tension about ‘unnatural’ practices to acceptance of

a practice where even the results of grafts could be viewed as representative of God's work, and reflects the expansion of grafting's purpose from utility to delectation. Indeed, as mentioned, grafting provides a means of expressing the intense pleasure to be gained from encounters with God in those gardens that are everywhere apparent in their writings but, perhaps, is most clearly visible in the person of Mahaut herself, whose own expressiveness in terms of her connection with her gardens at Hesdin and elsewhere certainly approached the intensity expressed by her religious contemporaries. As one garden historian comments, '[I]t is in the translation from the purely utilitarian farm to the perfumed, colorful and exotic garden that the expressive function of gardens lies'.⁶ Going even further, but no less apt in his observations, the poet Rudolf Borchardt considers gardens as both 'a human statement' and, ultimately, a 'metaphor of love'. As Borchardt explains elsewhere: 'since speech itself is a metaphor, and expression itself is love – this makes the human race and the human individual inherently poetic and loving.'⁷ Such a concept of the garden as an articulation of the poetics of love is something that Gertrude, Mechthild and Mahaut certainly seem also to have well understood.

We suggest that all of the cases considered here were in some way experimental, challenging previous concepts and inventing a new idiom.⁸ Despite the difference in genre between the texts under discussion, they all reveal a thread of grafting imagery and a distinct shift in their presentation of grafting as an idea and practice, which by the late thirteenth century had mutated to provide a ready-made lexicon to articulate the deeply-rooted connection between God and humanity. We shall first consider the practice of grafting before exploring how grafting metaphors were used in the writing of Mechthild and Gertrude, whose lives in a Cistercian-identified (but ultimately independent) nunnery may have offered them access to relevant texts as well as direct and pleasurable inspiration from their own monastic garden.⁹ We shall then examine how gardening for pleasure was put into effect at Hesdin by Count Robert, whose southern Italian connections may have given him access to the latest ideas (for example, those of the writer Pietro de' Crescenzi) as

well as skilled staff. Finally, we shall consider the later history of Hesdin under Countess Mahaut, Robert's daughter, and suggest that her connection with her gardening work went beyond the bounds of simply demonstrating her status. Indeed, it came closer to the heartfelt language of the female visionaries whose lives overlapped with hers, reminding us, too, of Anne Whiston Spirn's observations that, just like a written text, landscape is 'pragmatic, poetic, rhetorical, polemical . . . a carrier of meaning. It is language.'¹⁰

GRAFTING: HISTORY AND PRACTICE

The process of grafting, in its simplest form, is to insert a part of one woody plant, the scion, into the rootstock of another, making a genetically composite plant.¹¹ However, the inserted scion will continue to dictate the outcome of flowering or fruiting. For example, a red rose scion grafted onto a white rose stock will still produce a red rose. The influence of the scion in the flowering and fruiting process means that slow-fruiting species can be propagated and their production sped up, especially if *mature* scions are grafted onto *immature* root stocks. In this case, the mature scion will continue to propagate, in spite of the juvenile status of the donor root-system. Although the physical evidence of gardening practices in the past is often elusive, Kathryn Gleason points out that representative evidence from ancient art and literature suggests not only the widespread use of exotic plants, but also the introduction of new varieties – and, in particular, what she terms 'ingenious ways of grafting, pruning and training vegetation.'¹² As early as the fourth century BCE Theophrastus (d. 287 BCE), for example, was suggesting experimentation in the cultivation of herbs that normally grew wild,¹³ but the type of tensions alluded to above were clearly evident by the time Pliny the Elder (d. 70 CE) came to write his *Naturalis Historia*, where he notes anthropomorphically in the context of the production of dwarf tree specimens: '[W]e have discovered the art of producing abortions even in trees'.¹⁴ Elsewhere, he describes the fruit of a plum scion grafted onto a nut tree as 'a particular piece of impudence', the fruit of which, he advocates, should be called a 'nut-plum'.¹⁵ The association

between grafting, abortion and impudence, of course, implies a ‘feminizing’ of the host tree by means of this grafting intervention *contra natura*. Yet the late antique author Palladius (early fifth century) seems to have had no such qualms: his *Opus Agricultura* sets out numerous examples of grafting that have as their aim the improvement and speeding-up of fruit production. Only in his poem *De Insitione* [*On Grafting*] does he deal playfully with the subject, focusing in particular on the domesticating function of the graft. Here, there is some strikingly gendered language: ‘Now [grafting] takes away the horrible arms of the hairy sisters, and teaches the untamed [trees] to place pears in their net’.¹⁶ This positions the rootstock as the ‘hairy sister’, to be tamed by the penetration of the scion, a sexual – and frankly androcentric – connotation largely lost in subsequent medieval copies of Palladius, which circulated from at least the ninth century and in which manuscripts featuring the *Opus* alone far outnumber those including the poem. Yet grafting as a type of imperfect – unnatural, even – ‘breeding’ practice found an echo in medieval Jewish texts, which left no doubt as to the sexual connotations bequeathed by plant grafting practices. No doubt familiar with these earlier sources, the philosopher Maimonides (d. 1204), writing in his *Guide for the Perplexed*, associated plant-grafting with those disparaged and feared pagan practices enjoyed in ancient fertility rites, for example.¹⁷ For this philosopher, the success of the plant-grafting process was ultimately dependent upon magical practices inherited from paganism whereby the scion was inserted into the incision on the host tree by a beautiful maiden engaging in sex with a man alongside the tree.¹⁸ As Michael Marder asserts of Maimonides’s stance: ‘To Maimonides, grafting is offensive both for its public display of raw vegetal and human sexuality and for the mixing of the species’.¹⁹ Against the context of rising Jewish-Christian tensions of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, then, this was just one more way to articulate anxiety about miscegenation.²⁰ Self-evidently, too, this ‘raw vegetal’ display was sometimes believed to incite human promiscuity and fornication – and, within the western imaginary, was associated with the carnality of fallen humanity, whether implicitly or explicitly.

Maimonides was not the only author worried about the strangeness of grafting and the dangers of miscegenation: the mid thirteenth-century work, *De Vegetabilibus* by Albertus Magnus (d. 1280), whilst entirely comfortable with the practice as a way to propagate plants (and itself heavily citing Palladius), nevertheless evinces discomfort about the mixing of species and likens it to the corruption of animals by cross-breeding, or fields that are invaded by different seeds (Albertus knew his Leviticus): he emphasizes that ‘the grafting [should] take place like for like, according to its kind.’²¹ Yet for him, the ends – that is to say, in practical terms, healthier, stronger, more productive plants – justified the actual or metaphorical interference with nature, provided it was done within certain boundaries. As we shall see, his text was used by others to test the boundaries of the ‘natural’ still further.

VISIONS OF GRAFTING: MECHTHILD OF HACKEBORN AND GERTRUDE OF HELFTA

‘Natural’ and ‘unnatural’ practices, then, were implicated in the Fall of humanity, and Mechthild of Hackeborn and her sister visionary, Gertrude of Helfta, certainly shared an understanding of grafting’s practical and hermeneutic utility, taking the metaphor to far greater heights than any previous or contemporary writers, reworking it ultimately to become a ‘language’ of some authority with which to speak of the divine.²² Mechthild and Gertrude were sister nuns at Helfta in Saxony during the latter part of the thirteenth century, having entered the nunnery as child oblates.²³ During their lifetimes, both women were privy to visionary experiences, and indeed there was a rich culture of visionary activity at Helfta: the much older beguine, Mechthild of Magdeburg (d. c. 1294), who joined them in 1272, also completed a book on her own visionary encounters, written both before and during her life at Helfta.²⁴

The writings attributed to Mechthild of Hackeborn and Gertrude of Helfta provide compelling visionary and literary models, shot through as they are with prolific and protracted garden imagery that frequently transforms the rurally-located Helfta into a reclaimed Eden or the

relocated *hortus conclusus* of the Song of Songs. As such, both texts are redolent with luscious fruit and flowers, particularly roses and lilies, which are just as likely to be associated with Christ as they are with Mary or the visionary herself in these texts.²⁵ In fact, the influence of the beauty of the wider geography of Helfta was recognized by the nineteenth-century editor of Gertrude's *Legatus*, Ludwig Paquelin, who, adding a note on one particularly vivid garden description, points out Helfta's original location as, 'occupying a shallow and gently sloping valley opening out into an extensive plain, both fertile and fruitful'.²⁶ As such, it forms a type of microcosm, the expressive possibilities of which were also not lost on Gertrude, who explains:

One day between Easter and Ascension I went into the garden before Prime, and, sitting down beside the pond, I began to consider what a pleasant place it was. I was charmed by the clear water and flowing streams, the fresh green of the surrounding trees, the birds flying so freely about, especially the doves. But most of all, I loved the quiet, hidden peace of this secluded retreat.²⁷

Here Gertrude's observations reflect what will become a prevalent hermeneutic, evoking too the comments of the renowned Cistercian exegete Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153) on the role of the Bride in the *hortus conclusus* of the Song of Songs: 'Consider therefore that the bride has retired to this solitude; there, overcome by the loveliness of the place, she sweetly sleeps within the arms of her bridegroom, in ecstasy of spirit'.²⁸ As nuns connected to the Cistercian order, of course, Gertrude and Mechthild were steeped in Bernard's writings (as discussed further below), but in Gertrude's account we see clearly the way in which personal experience is used to overlay Bernard's literary intertext: the small Helfta garden is reformulated as bridal chamber with Gertrude as Bride joyfully awaiting her lover, Christ. The material space of the Helfta garden therefore becomes a site of hybridity, animating both biblical precedent and Gertrude's own visionary life within a geography

that is simultaneously material and spiritual. In Gertrude's terms, it also forms a paradigm for the 'garden' of her own heart, which, she writes, is 'a dwelling most suitably appointed for you [Christ] from which no joys would be lacking'.²⁹

Gertrude's work appears always to have such multivalent locations in mind: from the start, the text is keen to draw such parallels between Helfta and the divine geography of Gertrude's many visions. The *Legatus* opens with musings on Helfta, its church (and, indeed, *the Church*) and Gertrude's own role within the monastery. Here she identifies as the 'white lily' planted within the 'perfumed garden of the church' which is also the 'chamber of holy religion'.³⁰ In this single introductory tableau, Gertrude manages to invoke Mary and her sacred virginity (as well as her own virginal purity), the mystical garden of the Song of Songs (and its allegorical associations with the virginal womb), and her own desired union with Christ, vivid and recurrent images which take up permanent residence within the 'garden' of the cloister – and the 'garden' of her heart. It is no wonder, then, that Gertrude's moment of visionary transformation should take place in Helfta's physical *hortus conclusus* which, in turn, becomes a synecdoche not only for the wider physical geography of the region so extolled by Paquelin, but also for Helfta's position within a *sacred* geography that superimposes itself upon the monastery's material being – transforming it into a heterotopic site: that is to say, a hybrid site of multiplicity that contests the apparent fixity of place by manifesting itself as simultaneously 'mythic and real'.³¹ Indeed, for Michel Foucault, the walled garden, in particular, is a heterotopia *par excellence*, a 'sacred space' which generates 'seemingly superimposed meanings.' Moreover, such an overlaying of meaning is very often identified with the feminine. In Foucault's terms, the *hortus conclusus* functions as an imaginary womb, its central fountain providing a sacred 'umbilicus' that renders it 'the navel of the world'.³² In these terms, then, the *hortus conclusus* always looks back wistfully to a lost 'maternal' realm, a safe, enclosed and 'protected' space where once all was well and where all may be well once more.

Such animated imagery, semiotic conglomeration of meaning, and their fusion are rendered even clearer in a later passage, where the medieval garden again stands in for complex articulation. Here, Gertrude tells of a vision given to her of Christ, once more stimulated by the material monastic garden:

The merciful Lord showed her a very small and extremely narrow garden, where flowers of various kinds were growing in a profusion. It was surrounded by a hedge of thorns and a feeble trickle of honey was flowing through it.³³

Here, when related directly to Christ, the thorn hedge, a staple of many medieval gardens, becomes a clear mnemonic for the crucifixion: combining both mechanics and poetics in a single image, the allusion to the seeping honey summons up Christ's shed blood and the 'sweetness' of the Eucharistic wine.³⁴ The garden setting, however, fuses this scene of crucifixion with the *hortus conclusus* of the Song of Songs, where the breasts of the Bride are 'better than wine', her lips 'a dropping honeycomb'.³⁵ In this way, the entanglement of feminine poetics dominating these horticultural displays always underpin the construction of a viable garden hermeneutics in Gertrude's writing.

The same can be said of Mechthild's work, which likewise configures the text around a complex series of garden hermeneutics in which she herself features as visionary nun, stand-in V/virgin and lover of Christ. On one occasion, for example, she records a vision granted within the monastic church, where Christ appears to her during the Maundy Thursday Mass. Here, rather than the traditional crucifixion vision we might legitimately expect at this point in the church calendar, Mechthild envisions Christ as an enormous tree rooted in the Helfta church and spreading its branches across the whole earth. Instead of heralding the forthcoming desolation of Golgotha, however, this tree prefigures the joys of the Easter Sunday to come, subsuming Christ's suffering

and death into a statement of the arboreal flourishing of a hybrid, Trinitarian God within the reclaimed Eden of the monastic church at Helfta:

[S]he again saw a beautiful tree growing in the middle of the church, so high and broad that it filled the whole earth. It grew out of three leafy boughs that had sprung up from the earth and curved back down to it. Under one bough, beasts were eating fruit that fell from the tree.³⁶

For Mechthild, Christ, the tree of life, puts down his roots within the *hortus conclusus* of the Helfta church, a positioning replicated in other appearances of this same tree; once as fruit-laden excrescences emerging from Christ's heart, and on another occasion as an enormous tree, spanning the entire world, the heavens *and* the purgatorial realm.³⁷ In the first instance, this 'beautiful tree' forms a vine rooted in Christ's heart, which, again like the garden of the Song of Songs and Gertrude's thorn-encompassed garden (invoking, too, the image of Christ-the-vine from John 15: 1-3), flows with wine and honey.³⁸ In the second instance, the transubstantiated host on the monastic altar during the Feast of the Nativity morphs, not into the sacrificial Lamb of orthodox theology but into a tree again rooted in the altar itself, bearing leaves inscribed with golden letters.³⁹ What is significant in this case is that Mechthild explicitly posits the vision's garden hermeneutics as substitute language for clearer articulation of the ultimately unspeakable mystical experience. As she takes pains to explain: 'his (Christ's) entire conversation was written in the tree', this arboreal language speaking, too, of 'Christ's divinity' in a way that ordinary, earth-bound language cannot.⁴⁰ Gertrude similarly echoes such sentiments, writing on one occasion:

With a heavy heart, I began to consider within myself how difficult, not to say impossible, it would be for me to find the right expressions and words for all the things that were said to me, so as to make them intelligible on a human level, without danger or scandal.⁴¹

What is eminently clear, however, is that both writers *do* achieve just such expression, drawing concerted on visionary gardens to find a means of articulating complex theological insights and the fusion with the divine upon which those insights are predicated.

This reaches a climax in both texts via recourse to a series of highly animated metaphors of grafting, an interactive and often reciprocal process whereby, like Christ in the ‘garden’ of Mary’s womb, the divine is implanted into the female ‘rootstock’ of his visionary ‘brides’ in order to improve their spiritual strength and fruitfulness. However, very often it is the fragile and *womanly* ‘scion’ that, in turn, is grafted onto the pre-established and nurturing ‘rootstock’ of the divine, again to generate ever more profitable ‘fruit’ for his worship. Gertrude, for example, represents herself several times as a scion grafted onto the ‘root’ of Christ’s wounded side, most notably in Book III, chapter 18 of the *Legatus*, where she recounts a number of vivid visions received whilst preparing herself for the joys of holy communion. After receiving some minor visions, she suddenly feels transformed into ‘a frail little plant’, fading into nothingness because of her own inadequacies.⁴² Christ’s response to this plant-like wilting is that of a ‘constant gardener’: first, he immerses Gertrude in the blood and water flowing from his side-wound in order to revive and refresh her; then, he inserts her as a scion into that same wounded side:

Her most loving Jesus seemed to draw her toward himself by the breath of love of his pierced heart, and to wash her in the water flowing from it and then to sprinkle her with the life-giving blood of his heart. With this action, she began to revive Afterward, when she had received the body of Christ, she beheld her soul, as was said above, in the likeness of a tree fixing its roots in the wound of the side of Jesus Christ; she felt in some new and marvelous way that there was passing through this wound, as through a root, and penetrating into all her

branches and fruit and leaves a wondrous sap which was the virtue of the humanity and divinity of Jesus Christ.⁴³

Whilst the sexual language frequently adopted within mystical discourse has received much attention, this language of grafting and other horticultural practices – all with their own sexualized undercurrents – has not.⁴⁴ Here, however, we see Gertrude evading the difficulties of the former and foregrounding the multiple possibilities of the latter by combining both hermeneutical sets into a hybridized linguistic agent.

Mechthild also adopts the same hermeneutic combination in her writing, presenting her heart on one occasion as the vineyard into which Christ-the-vine is transplanted, where he becomes the rootstock for the superior grapes grown on this vine, a merger that, in turn, produces ‘the purest wine, very sweet’, ‘strong red wine’, ‘excellent warm wine’ and ‘the noblest wine of all, like nectar’.⁴⁵ On another occasion, it is Christ’s own heart that transforms into the vineyard into which the ‘scions’ of humanity are transplanted, some flourishing and reaching towards the heavens, others failing and withering – literally – ‘on the vine’. In her exegesis of this vision, Mechthild identifies the flourishing scions as those who, like her, turn their thoughts to heavenly matters, and the failing scions as those who ‘lie low in the earthly dust of their sins’.⁴⁶ Elsewhere, she emphasizes the erotic connotations of such divine grafting, on one occasion describing the moment of ecstatic union with Christ in terms of a mutual engrafting via the ‘slits’ in both their sides over their hearts:

[It] seemed that the Lord bent over her in bed. He embraced her with his left arm, so that the wound of his sweet heart was joined to her heart.⁴⁷

Elsewhere, in another eroticized visionary encounter with a scion embedded in Christ’s wounded side, Mechthild lies down upon Christ, places her mouth to the wound on his side, removes the

delicious fruit growing on the scions engrafted there, and ingests them into herself as the material manifestations of his divine love:

She bent down to the wound in her only Savior's heart . . . There too she sucked out from Christ's honeyed heart the sweetest fruit, which she took from God's heart and put in her mouth. This signified the eternal praise that emanates from the heart of God.⁴⁸

Like Gertrude's own grafting narrative, the grape in Mechthild's mouth, sucked from the lush and flourishing scion growing from Christ's side and rooted in his heart, intensifies the sexual charge, leading Christ to profess to Mechthild that the only fruit *he* has ever desired is that she pour the delight of her heart into him.⁴⁹ Unlike Gertrude, however, who ultimately reins in the sexual charge and embeds it deep within the hermeneutic, Mechthild gives it full rein, rendering the synergy between grafting and sexuality overt, potent and deeply expressive of mystical fusion: as the sweet fluid from the fruit runs through her body, traditional language leaves her, leaving the horticultural language of the graft to do the job instead: 'Oh! Oh! Love, love, love!', she cries as the ecstasy consumes her.⁵⁰ For Mechthild, this tableau speaks more cogently than any human utterance to express the ultimately inexpressible and unquestionably queer. Indeed, such queerness is further emphasized by Mechthild as she has her heavenly Bridegroom, Christ, immediately morph from lover into nursing mother, telling Mechthild, 'my love⁵¹ will be your mother. Just as children suck their mother's breasts, you will suck inner consolation from her; unspeakable sweetness'.⁵² For both Gertrude and Mechthild, then, a range of sexualized and often gender-queer 'grafting' practices come closest to articulating the ineffable fusion possible between the selected 'scion' and its 'rootstock', interchangeable as holy woman, and divine lover/mother.⁵³

Where did such vivid imagery originate? As we have seen, Helfta itself had a physical garden that provided direct solace and inspiration for the nuns, but whether grafting had a place in this space

cannot be determined. Certainly, Gertrude's own responses to this garden, as discussed above, were redolent with its hermeneutic possibilities. Mechthild's text, however, prefers the garden's visionary correlates and does not mention the monastic garden that proved so inspiring to Gertrude. Indeed, it may well be that she experienced some anxiety about the immediacy of the sensory pleasures it provided, if her protracted and troubled response to a rare excursus outside the monastery is anything to go by. In Book II, she recounts how she and her sister nuns once walked out to meet the funeral procession of an important benefactor some distance from the monastery.⁵⁴ Struck by the wide, open landscape, which 'pleased her much', Mechthild was left unable to sleep, guilt-ridden that she had neglected her duty to pray for the dead by concentrating instead on the beauty of the surroundings.⁵⁵ In a subsequent interchange with Christ, he reprimands her gently for neglecting her duty⁵⁶ and teaches her how to see the wonders of the divine, including all the personified virtues, in the countryside and how to redirect those external pleasures incited by it towards internal contemplation of God's 'way'. As such, this episode can be seen as a paradigm for Mechthild's construction of a 'garden hermeneutic' based on a rechanneling towards God her own anxieties and responses to the natural world to form a statement of divine intent.

The bold, innovative lyricism of these writings led to much acclaim for both Gertrude and Mechthild in their own day. Indeed, Book V of Mechthild's *Liber* confirms such renown, relating the extent to which people travelled to the monastery to visit Mechthild for her counsel, not only local people, 'but also strangers, both religious and secular, who came from far away'.⁵⁷ The text therefore testifies to a procession of travelers from afar who visited the monastery to interact with its visionary inhabitants and partake of its miracles and marvels. No doubt this involved a series of interchanges, too: in return for the spiritual experience, those travelers would certainly have brought with them their own books and knowledge to augment those already present at Helfta and add to its renown as a repository of privileged learning and visionary insight. Such fame also meant that, upon the deaths of Mechthild and Gertrude in 1298 and 1302 respectively, their writings were circulated widely,

frequently travelling together in the same manuscript contexts, and would remain popular throughout Europe, often translated into vernacular contexts, until the late fifteenth century and beyond.⁵⁸

We should not discount the possibility, therefore, that the grafting visions emerged not only from Mechthild and Gertrude's physical surroundings, which were, after all, narrow and restricted, but from their reading practices, drawing on texts that presented grafting in all its possibilities. As we have seen above, the wealth and multivalence of their grafting imagery demonstrate that such imagery clearly went far beyond mere adaptation of the biblical edict of St Paul on grafting or that recorded in John 15: 1-3. As also mentioned, the Helfta women were highly conversant with the writings of Bernard of Clairvaux, who also made widespread use of imagery from the natural world (although not plant-grafting) in his writing, most famously unpacking the exegetical potential of the *hortus conclusus* of the Song of Songs in his *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum*.⁵⁹ Indeed, it may well have been that Mechthild already had a wider knowledge of grafting in her clear development, in the passage quoted above, of Bernard's conception in his Sermo LXXIX of a tree's branches needing to be grateful to its roots for sustenance, especially since Bernard also draws upon a breast-feeding mother to explicate the concept:

Let not the branches be ungrateful to the root, nor sons to their mother; let not the branches grudge the roots the sap they took from it, nor the sons grudge their mother the milk they sucked from her breast.⁶⁰

Although Mechthild here is clearly referencing Bernard, it is also apparent that the latter lacks the type of female-coding so evident in Mechthild's *Liber*, thus confirming the astute assessment recently made by Line Cecilie Engh that in his *Sermones* Bernard ultimately appropriates the cultural links between gardens and femininity to create a hermeneutic dependent upon 'a world without women' and one 'performed by men, for men'.⁶¹ Gertrude and Mechthild, meanwhile, populate their

own visionary gardens with themselves as gender-fluid, flesh-and-blood women along with those they resemble in that fluid fleshliness (Mary, Christ, the saints, deceased sisters from the community, to name but a few). Indeed, such enthusiastic gender-queer displays are often inscribed upon men *and* women to produce an understanding of God that is intensely generative and maternal and which fulfils entirely Borchardt's conception of the garden as 'a metaphor of love', cited at the start of this article.⁶² Thus, although the broader garden hermeneutic had long been visible in other monastic texts, as Bernard Fortomme points out, in the hands of different writers it underwent a transformation from identification with both the desert and paradise (for example, in the treatment of St Bruno of Chartres, d.1101) to a Franciscan image of a place for leisure and well-being; and it is the latter concept that seems to have spoken most cogently to these women, who may well have been driving this same conceptual shift.⁶³

But could the inspiration for the specific grafting imagery have also come from secular texts? As Margaret Hubrath has claimed, Helfta was 'an island of written and illuminated literary manuscripts in the Saxon-Thuringian region', but, as Nemes also points out, the Helfta convent was renowned for housing nuns from some of the most elite central German families, creating an intellectual climate ideally suited to superlative literary activity.⁶⁴ Was Helfta's library, therefore, filled with sacred *and* secular texts, or were biblical allusions to grafting – and perhaps limited personal observation – sufficient foundation on which to build? As mentioned, Helfta was certainly a centre of learning and literary activity whose reputation drew many visitors from near and afar. Indeed, as Anna Harrison and others have also shown, it was a hive of collaborative literary activity, with other, unnamed, nuns also being subject to visionary experiences during the period.⁶⁵ Additionally, Mechthild's sibling, the abbess Gertrude of Hackeborn (d. ca. 1291) is recorded in Mechthild's book as nurturing both deep learning and acute intellectual inquiry in the monastery, particularly via the nuns' familiarity with the 'liberal arts'. She also ensured that 'she bought her church all the good books that she could, or else had the sisters copy them'.⁶⁶ The term *bonos libros*

may have included a range of secular works implicated in a good grounding in the liberal arts, which would ultimately lead to a deeper understanding of theology.⁶⁷ As Mechthild recounts: ‘if zeal for learning were to perish, she used to say, once they no longer understood the divine Scripture religious devotion would perish too’.⁶⁸

Could one of these ‘good books’ have been Albertus’s *De Vegetabilibus*? After all, he does not confine himself to practical processes, but also thinks about the metaphysical implications of grafting. In Book V he reflects long and hard on the nature of the plant produced once scion and rootstock are united, and comes to the conclusion that ‘both the scion, and that into which it is inserted, retain their own essences, and separate, rather than unified, qualities and habits’.⁶⁹ Thus his vision of the ‘union’ is not quite that of the Helfta women, but as the Cistercian-identified house of Helfta was subject to the authority of the Dominican house at Halle, it is unlikely that the writings of such a prominent scholar were overlooked by the nuns.

It is not inconceivable either that Palladius’ *Opus Agriculturae* was known at Helfta in its own right, as well as in citations by Albertus. Here, too, the Cistercian setting is also key: Jean-Louis Gaulin notes evidence that the Cistercians combined ancient knowledge of horti- and agriculture with twelfth-century experimentation, and whilst their reputation for innovation has somewhat diminished in recent literature, their ability to *adapt* knowledge and pre-existing conditions is not in doubt.⁷⁰ Indeed, Nemes identifies the importance of close connections between Helfta and numerous other Cistercian institutions situated near the monastery, some of them also independent, that may well have allowed for the sharing of a wide variety of reading material.⁷¹ Of particular interest is the fact that Cistercian houses are known to have been responsible for the diffusion of many of the extant medieval copies and extracts of the *Opus Agriculturae*, which contains not only a month-by-month ‘to do’ list for the garden, but also detailed instructions for grafting of different species.⁷² Of the twenty-nine surviving copies known from the twelfth century, six came from Cistercian houses, and it seems the Cistercians also contributed to the diffusion of the *Opus* in Italy in the thirteenth

century – the five known copies here all have some connection with the version copied at Clairvaux and now held in Troyes.⁷³ Striking is a passage that Palladius claims to have learned from a ‘certain Spaniard’ – and thus positioning this knowledge as itself ‘strange’ – about grafting and training peach scions into a willow tree that is then curved towards the ground to produce an arch with peaches (here reminding us of Mechthild’s vision of the bending tree, discussed above).⁷⁴ Whether Mechthild and/or Gertrude had met this text or not, the ideas it included were certainly circulating in northern France and Germany by the end of the thirteenth century and, in the hands of others, were being put to material use.

GRAFTING IN PRACTICE: THE GARDEN AT HESDIN

At the same time as Gertrude and Mechthild were envisioning fusion with God in terms of grafting, some 300 kilometers to the west Count Robert II of Artois (d. 1302) was putting grafting to practice as he planted his new garden park at Hesdin. Its setting, on both sides of the river Canche, which meandered through the fertile lands and, after passing by the thriving artisanal town of Montreuil, flowed further on to join the sea, certainly evokes Paquelin’s description of Helfta. The forests and woods and another river, the Ternoise, which also formed part of the Count’s lands, offer an image of fertility and a land of plenty in this part of Artois. As Lestocquoy has noted, the place-name ‘Hesdin’ lent itself to over-imaginative writers who saw it as mythically associated with ‘Eden’ because of similarities in pronunciation.⁷⁵

Hesdin is a well-known site to scholars, famed for its automata, libidinous monkeys, mechanical party tricks, fountains and a hermitage, and it provided the inspiration for ballades and poems of chivalric love.⁷⁶ As such, it has attracted attention from Anne van Buren, Sharon Farmer and Ellie Truitt, among others,⁷⁷ with Truitt having focused on the origins of the garden’s novelties, particularly its automata.⁷⁸ Opinions, however, vary. Batistini suggests that Robert drew inspiration from Sicily.⁷⁹ However, whilst we know that the royal palace at Palermo did indeed have lovely

gardens,⁸⁰ it is debatable just how much time Robert spent on the island. Van Buren addresses the source of Robert's inspiration for the mechanical devices, but rejects any link with Sicilian, Islamic influences and instead finds models and expertise closer to home among the carpenters and engineers of the comital and royal armies.⁸¹ Farmer, meanwhile, explores the 'natural artifice' of creating a hunting park apparently populated by 'wild' animals for the pleasure of Robert and his contemporaries, and notes that Robert spent time in the southern Italian hunting parks created for Emperor Frederick II earlier in the century. For her, inspiration for the creation of Robert's own paradise might also have come from the literary culture of the period, focusing on the *Cléomades*, a French romance based on an Arabic model from the *1001 Nights*, one of whose earliest texts was dedicated to Robert himself.⁸²

We can, however, go further in exploring the southern connections of Hesdin. It has not gone unnoticed by previous authors that Robert, who was in Artois continuously from 1291 till his death, was helped in his new enterprise by staff from northern and southern Italy and Sicily, among whom was a certain John of Apulia ('Jehan de Puille'). John was not just an ordinary gardener – the Artois records show that his particular area of expertise was in grafting trees, and that he rose to become head gardener for Robert's daughter, Countess Mahaut.⁸³ Farmer lists him among the nine southern Italians and Sicilians who came north with Robert in 1291, including a university professor of medicine and logic, Palmerius de Riso,⁸⁴ but perhaps underestimates the potential of their presence thereafter, beyond noting that Robert's chamberlain, Rinaldo Cognetti of Barletta, was placed in charge of the renovations.⁸⁵ Indeed none of the main studies takes much notice of this intervention – one might say grafting-in – of outsiders as part of the process of creation of Robert's garden and its maintenance under his daughter, which may literally have broken new ground in horticultural practices in the north.⁸⁶

As noted above, the knowledge of grafting itself was long-established, but it seems to have taken on new impetus and purposes in precisely our period. The *actual* grafting we hear most about

in archival documents from southern Europe was of wild and domesticated olive trees, such as documented in land transactions from Calabria, southern Italy, in the eleventh century, for example.⁸⁷ These trees take some five to ten years to mature and to start producing fruit (although some modern cultivars are able to produce fruit within three years), and so the planting of an olive grove was – and still is – a major investment.⁸⁸ Grafting could therefore speed up production, as well as propagate healthy trees, and olives feature in Palladius' list of grafts.⁸⁹

Rebecca Krug highlights the specific interest in gardening and grafting of fourteenth-century authors Nicholas Bollard in England and his earlier contemporary Geoffrey of Franconia of Wurzburg, who in turn were influenced by *their* reading of Palladius. What is striking is that these two writers show little interest in common-knowledge practices, preferring to focus on specialized skills. Bollard refers to the pseudo-Aristotelian *Secreta Secretorum*, and the focus of both works is on creativity – producing fruit without cores, with mixed tastes and colours, for example – in short, to perform the astonishing in the garden. In this context, Krug suggests that grafting was a 'utilitarian skill' that was transformed into a creative art by these writers.⁹⁰

Yet the evidence of Robert of Artois's project at Hesdin suggests that we need to push back the onset of innovative garden design by at least two generations – why else recruit a specialist to an entourage to graft the plants if it was a 'utilitarian skill'? Was John recruited in the south by Robert specifically to bring *new* ideas (or at least, newly-rediscovered knowledge) to gardening practices in the north? He is a shadowy figure, but the toponymic surname Apuliensis occurs in documents from the Salerno region, and Robert had spent considerable time in and around that city.⁹¹ Hesdin's purpose was as a statement of Robert's power and wealth (which he passed on to his daughter Mahaut).⁹² Farmer comments that, 'Hesdin served as a powerful reminder that as a ruling count Robert dominated both human society and the natural world'.⁹³ Such omnipotent displays could include the patronage of specialist staff with new knowledge, as well as the physical results of their work.⁹⁴ It is possible that John's expertise was 'displayed' in the same way: whilst Hesdin is better

known for its mechanical wonders, he, perhaps, also created some (un)natural wonders by means of his grafting skills. Although Farmer focuses on the introduction and management of livestock and fauna, rather than on the planting and landscaping itself, those same animals – in this case, deer – are recorded as chewing up the grafted trees (*arbrisiaux*), provoking the insertion of fences and gates.⁹⁵ The recorded grafting taking place during Mahaut's time was of fruit trees.⁹⁶ This does not exclude the possibility that both she and Robert were also interested in creating visual impact with grafted plants, for example different-coloured roses or mixed fruits on the same stem. The possibilities, after all, were not just for improvement of the plant stock.⁹⁷

PIETRO DE' CRESCENZI: PROPAGATING KNOWLEDGE?

Krug's study of the type of novel planting practices we have been discussing here focuses on fourteenth-century treatises. Rather overlooked in her survey, however, is another treatise with direct connections with Robert and his relatives, the *Ruralia Commoda* of Pietro de' Crescenzi, lawyer and intellectual of Bologna, that may have provided inspiration for 'strange' grafting at Robert's – and subsequently Mahaut's – pleasure-giving garden. In particular, Books VI and VIII of this treatise on agriculture, perhaps intended as a 'mirror for princes' and demonstrating good statecraft and moral order through the metaphor of the well-tended estate, focus on the cultivation of gardens.⁹⁸ Though sometimes dismissed as a direct plagiarism of classical and medieval works (Book VI in particular, draws almost *verbatim* from the *Circa Instans* produced in Salerno c.1120, whilst Book VIII draws extensively on Palladius and Albertus), the popularity of the text not only captured the *zeitgeist* and fashion for gardening for pleasure, but offered new ideas for conspicuous horticultural practices that would have resonated with its elite readers.

Pietro's text has been the focus of some scholarly attention, and a recent edition of the Latin text has clarified further the relationship with earlier authors.⁹⁹ Robert Calkins, moreover, has provided a partial English translation, drawn from the French version, of the more 'original' chapters

of Book VIII, where Pietro reflects on different-sized pleasure gardens for different classes of landowner.¹⁰⁰ Pietro dedicated his work to Charles II of Anjou, son of Charles I of Sicily and Robert II of Artois's cousin, and prefaced it with a letter to his friend, the Dominican master Aymericus of Piacenza. This links him in to two powerful, potential patronage networks. Although the ideas expressed in Book VIII seem to have inspired multiple copies for the use of elite owners in the fifteenth century, there has been little consideration of the possible application of Pietro's ideas during or soon after his lifetime. Was he the inspiration for Robert's transformation of his estate at Hesdin? On the face of it, there is no concrete evidence to tie the *Ruralia* directly to Hesdin. Since Robert died in 1302, and the *Ruralia* is known not to have been completed before 1304 x1309, any putative transmission of ideas between the two *men* would necessarily have been in oral exchanges, or earlier drafts of Pietro's text, or even, perhaps, a lively correspondence. Evidence of none of these survives, but the timeline of their movements certainly suggests a shared intellectual, and possibly physical, environment inhabited by both.¹⁰¹

The first point to note is that both men were extremely mobile during the course of their careers, played out against the complex politics of France, Italy and the South. Charles I of Anjou (1226/7-1285) was the younger brother of King Louis IX of France, and took over the Kingdom of Sicily (including much of southern Italy) in 1263-8 by papal invitation.¹⁰² Robert I of Artois (d. 1250), father of the Robert (II) who concerns us here, was his older brother and died on crusade with Louis. Sicily was lost to the Crown of Aragon in 1282, but Charles continued to fight on in southern Italy, often leaving his nephew Robert II as his representative whilst he went on recruiting tours in Provence and France.¹⁰³ Robert was called upon to be regent of the Kingdom of Naples on Charles's death in 1285,¹⁰⁴ a role that no doubt enabled him to recruit talented individuals to his own personal retinue. Rinaldo Cognetti of Barletta, for example, came from a family of money-changers and other financial officials already in service to the royal court, and became Robert's 'garde de sa tere'.¹⁰⁵

Pietro, meanwhile, was a respected lawyer who was frequently called to provide legal advice to the leaders of several northern Italian city-states. To that end, he frequently travelled, and shows up in local records of the places he visited, as well as in the Bolognese archive.¹⁰⁶ However, the gaps in the documentary trail relating to him in the 1270s and 1280s have never been investigated. Is it possible that he was in the south during these absences? The now-lost collection of chancery documents from the Angevin court have been published in register form, based on antiquarian transcriptions. The only occurrences of the name Petrus Crescentii in the Angevin registry right up until the end of the currently-published volumes are one in 1273-4, discussed below, and three from 1283-5.¹⁰⁷ But they present difficulties: it is apparent that the first two entries from the 1280s refer to the same man, and that he is likely to be a local, given that he seems to be acting in concert with identifiably Neapolitan and Amalfitan partners. It is possible that the third reference, too, is to the same Peter, yet the language used to describe him – ‘traitor’ – hardly suggests a respected professional. Yet, tantalisingly, a ‘Petrus de Cressentio’ *does* appear much earlier in Angevin records, in 1273-4, again when our Pietro is invisible in northern records. Since the context here was an inquest by Charles I into the legality of marriages (about which Petrus ‘said nothing’), it is possible that he was called in for his legal opinion but was unable to give one, given the complex legal world of the south.¹⁰⁸

Even if none of these entries refer to him, it would not be surprising to find Pietro drawn to the Neapolitan court at some point in his life, for it was a magnet for intellectuals and offered the benefits of access to scholarship and patronage. Pietro himself says in his preface that he completed his work in retirement back in Bologna, and that the *Ruralia* was based on reading ‘many books of ancient and modern wise men’.¹⁰⁹ Whilst these could equally well have been available to him on his return to the university city of Bologna, there is a strong case for preferring Naples as the source for some of his work, not least his dedication of the work to Charles II, which has never satisfactorily been explored.

King Charles I, according to Jean Dunbabin, took an ‘uncommon interest’ in medical science and law,¹¹⁰ and Robert clearly followed his uncle’s example as a patron of knowledge and culture. If Pietro *was* attracted to the south in the 1270s or 1280s, the intellectual world he found may well have inspired him to start work on his treatise. Whilst the *Circa Instans* underpinning Book VI of the *Ruralia*, for instance, was by this time nearly a century old and widely diffused (Iolanda Ventura calls it a ‘medieval best-seller’), it had its origins in Salerno.¹¹¹ And other parts of Pietro’s work drew upon the rather newer *Hippiatrica* (‘Horse Medicine’) of Jordanus Ruffus of Calabria (d. ?1256).¹¹² Horse-breeding, we know, also formed another part of Robert’s innovative work at Hesdin.¹¹³ The *Ruralia Commoda* as a whole, then, may have had numerous southern Italian sources of inspiration, and its dedication to Robert’s cousin suggests that Pietro was seeking patronage from the powerful Angevin house.¹¹⁴

HESDIN, *RURALIA COMMODA* AND ELITE PLEASURES

If we are to link Pietro and Hesdin through a mutual southern Italian connection, then his discussion of gardens designed for ‘kings and other illustrious and wealthy lords’, is surely key, for this is where Pietro diverges sharply from his sources, Palladius and Albertus, in their discussions of gardens and grafting. What is most striking is his language, for he describes the gardens suitable for a king as including ‘a construction with walks and bowers made entirely of leafy trees, in which the king and queen with the barons and lords may sojourn under cover without rain.’¹¹⁵ What this construction entailed will be discussed presently, but the language of ‘barons’ again strongly situates Pietro’s Latin text in the southern Italian kingdom where the feudal *Catalogus Baronum* had been compiled just a century earlier. One particular manifestation of such influence is the presence of *gloriettes* or pavilions in northern European locations, including Hesdin, which Farmer has suggested may have been influenced by Robert’s (and Edward I of England’s) familiarity with La Zisa in Sicily.¹¹⁶ Robert had already, in the early autumn of 1299, created an enclosed garden known

as ‘le petit paradis’, positioned close to the castle and embedded within the lushness of the valley and its woods and forests. This was in an area enclosed by walls where flowering fruit trees were cared for and cultivated, along with grapevines, roses and lilies – all also staples in the type of visionary texts we have been discussing above, of course.¹¹⁷ Indeed, the accounts associated with the estate reveal that both roses and lilies appear to have taken on an especial significance for Mahaut, in particular, pointing towards spiritual resonances inserted into the garden landscape at Hesdin that have been almost entirely overlooked to date. The pleasure to be had from such spaces surely chimes with the vision that Pietro had of the elite culture which he could only hope to join as part of a retinue.

Pietro includes instructions for grafting and shaping plants that quotes Palladius’s instructions to use cherry trees on which to graft vines, and thereby obtain sweeter grapes, or mixing white and black grapes on the same vine, again reminiscent of the wines produced from the mixed fruit on those visionary vines recounted by Mechthild, as discussed earlier. Palladius is also the source for grafting apples on willow and poplar trees, and vines on elm trees and mulberry trees.¹¹⁸ Whether such novelties were put into practice at Hesdin is unclear, but Robert’s recruitment of a specialist grafter, John, from Apulia, suggests that the expertise required at Hesdin went beyond existing local practices. John continued to work for Countess Mahaut, and her accounts not only include measures to make sure the grafts [*entes*] prospered when plants grown here were themselves ‘strangers’ brought from far afield, but also document extensive purchases to replenish the stock.¹¹⁹ It is notable that one ‘Baude Coignet’ was responsible for the buying-in by 1310. His surname suggests he was a relative of Robert’s treasurer, Rinaldo, yet Rinaldo himself had almost immediately after Robert’s death been accused by Mahaut of causing damage to Artois through his financial transactions, to the extent that she felt it necessary to write to Charles II. The letter, which survives in the Artois archives, notes that Rinaldo had ‘committed all kinds of exactions’, and that she had summoned him

to answer for his actions. Rinaldo had instead fled, and Mahaut requested Charles not to give the fugitive sanctuary back in the Kingdom of Sicily.¹²⁰

Given this evidence of direct, early and apparently friendly contact between Mahaut and Charles (who was of course her father's cousin), it is plausible to suggest that a copy of Pietro's *Ruralia* may have reached Hesdin quite soon after its completion and dedication. Calkins' English translation of the *Ruralia*, cited above, draws upon the French vernacular version, but Pietro's Latin refers to 'the king and queen with their barons and ladies'.¹²¹ His specific inclusion of the 'ladies' in this pleasure park positions his text as one that would have appealed not only to Robert but also to Mahaut.¹²² That is, whilst the possibility of the two men crossing paths is tenuous, and the chronology does not allow for Robert to have read the completed book, the likelihood of Pietro's *text* travelling northwards to Mahaut's growing library (and even that of Helfta) is certainly not beyond the bounds of possibility. Indeed, comparing what we know of Hesdin's layout against Book VIII, there are some striking congruences that suggest direct transmission.

Specifically, Pietro goes beyond the previously-available grafting advice in texts to suggest ways of applying this knowledge to novel constructions, one of which is a 'living pavilion' in the garden:

It will be speedier and easier to make the aforementioned palace or house of wood, and plant vines all around it and cover the whole building. They can also make great marquees of dry wood in the garden or cover them with green trees and vines. Much greater delight will be obtained if wonderful and diverse grafts are made in these same trees, which the conscientious planter of the garden will easily know how to do from the [instructions] given in more detail later in this book.

The point of these grafts, as Pietro makes clear in the same section, was to combine them with other methods to form living walls and a roof to the garden house:

And in place of the walls fruit trees can be planted, if it pleases, which will grow easily, such as cherries and apples and elms, and through grafts and posts and wicker and ties over a number of years their growth can be procured in such a way that the walls and roof will form from them.¹²³

Mahaut's accounts reveal details of the maintenance of such a landscape in which the pavilion looms large. Although there is no direct evidence to suggest the presence of this type of 'living pavilion' there, crucially, unlike other 'pavilions' in literary works that refer to tented enclosures, hers involved the work of carpenters, suggesting that the structure itself was indeed, as Pietro had intended, a more permanent addition to the landscape.¹²⁴

These records also reveal that Mahaut maintained and built upon her father's work on the gardens, and purchased enormous quantities of roses to plant there, including four hundred bushes in 1324.¹²⁵ In Mahaut's hands, the garden moved further towards that envisaged by her monastic contemporaries – that is, a healing space and sanctuary.¹²⁶ Perhaps this was why, when faced with a challenge to her power as Countess from her nephew in 1313, including chopping down the trees in her woodlands at Tournheim and Monjardin, it was not the economic value of his acts of destruction that concerned her so much as the destruction of the beautiful – and ultimately spiritual – environment. From her claim for damages we can see these meant much to her:

And it is with great doubt that the woods and the forest which were so beautiful will ever grow back such was the manner in which they were cut down.¹²⁷

Farmer has cited the increasing food shortages of the early fourteenth century as a likely background to resentment of the emparkment of Hesdin, removing arable resources and developing the gardens as an expression of power. But this managed landscape was vulnerable to attacks by those who wished to dishonour its owners.¹²⁸ Mutilation of animals was a known sign of defiance by the twelfth century (e.g. of Thomas Becket's horses), but mutilating the carefully-crafted landscape (particularly cutting down trees) might have equally visible and dishonouring effects.¹²⁹

A possible legacy of the importation of southerners and their knowledge we have been arguing for here appears in the accounts of the Clos des Galées at Rouen, instigated by Philippe IV (d.1314), which include an intriguing entry dated 1380:

Acknowledgement of payment of 105 *sous* paid by Guillaume d'Arrablay, master of the garden of the Clos de Galée at Rouen, to Jehan Hebert, called Pouois [Apulian], gardener, as salary for the work he did in pruning and straightening the *trailles* of the gardens of the said Clos, remade the arbors and pavilions, straightened and built up the seats in the said arbors and pavilions... and delivered this at his own costs and expense, through purchases made, all the wooden beams, wicker pieces, seeds and other things belonging and necessary for the said gardens.¹³⁰

This John 'called Apulian', with his gardening skills by appointment to royalty, was surely a relative of Robert's John, and the striking similarity of the type of 'pavilion' built at Clos de Galées (apparently necessitating wooden beams and wicker-work) to that requiring the work of carpenters at Hesdin points to a legacy of innovative landscaping practices in which 'southerners' – by now in name only – continued to be involved.

CONCLUSION

Like the literary gardens of the Helfta visionaries, then, the experimental ‘marvels’ of the Hesdin garden, with its grafted trees, spectacular automata and places of sheltered repose, fulfil exactly the criteria posited by Foucault for the realization of the type of heterotopic spaces mentioned above – spaces that signify simultaneously in a number of different ways, both materially and mythopoeically. Heterotopic spaces are, therefore, necessarily contradictory, yet they also appear strangely synthetic – offering a sense of ‘place’ where differences and oppositions are seemingly resolved, grafted onto one another, so to speak, to create a new ‘reality’. Whilst manifesting as recognizable ‘sites’ (in this case, a garden), they also function as ‘counter-sites’, therefore: that is to say ‘places . . . absolutely different from all the sites that they reflect and speak about and yet functioning in ways that are ultimately ‘real’ and ‘connected’.¹³¹ The sense of expansive wonder at the strangeness of unfamiliar objects destabilizing a once-familiar world in the park at Hesdin was central to the power displays of both Robert and Mahaut of Artois. Thus, in Foucauldian terms, at Hesdin, as in the Helfta cloister, the garden as ‘the smallest parcel of the world’ was simultaneously ‘the totality of the world’ for those experiencing it.¹³²

So, what can we learn by considering these very different, but almost contemporary, discourses of grafting asserting themselves in northern Europe at this time? Certainly, both in religious and secular contexts the possibilities of grafting as spectacle and hermeneutic were just as current as its more practical applications. Like gardens more generally, grafting had clearly taken up a place within a northern imaginary that sought to exploit its potential, both for pleasure and for piety. Additionally, as Borchardt takes pains to remind us, by far the largest preponderance of figurative expressions employed within human language is drawn from the plant world. As a result, ‘metaphors on vegetation course everywhere through human speech and form the hidden scaffold that supports the whole of its imaginary.’¹³³ As we have also seen, neither language nor speech needs necessarily to be verbal; indeed, the ‘marvels’ at Hesdin spoke as cogently to their ‘readers’ as did

the literary hermeneutics of the Helfta texts regarding possibilities that lay seemingly beyond human understanding. Moreover, the type of cross-pollination that took place in the circulation and consumption of both religious and secular texts belies any notion of hermetically-sealed cultural divides between the secular world and its religious institutions. At Helfta, the practicalities of functional grafting were put to use to express the mystical and the miraculous; at Hesdin the ‘miraculous’ belied the practicalities of its own construction, all built on networks of knowledge that were co-existent in the secular and clerical worlds by this time; and, whilst these two versions of grafting literature most likely had very different roots, nevertheless by reading them against one another it emerges that by this time, grafting, whilst still novel, was no longer deemed to be ‘unnatural’. A ‘wonder’ it may still have been, but it was a wonder clearly endorsed by God. For Pietro, the explicit purpose of grafting – following models drawn from Palladius and Albertus Magnus – was to develop and improve upon nature. The underpinning knowledge for this practice – Palladius’ text – had travelled into Italy with the Cistercians and was now being re-exported northwards with the popularity of the *Ruralia*. Yet Pietro’s innovative *use* of grafting to create novelties in garden structures reflected a new culture of leisure and amusement among the elites of fourteenth-century Europe. Pietro’s completion and dedication of the work to Charles II coincides almost precisely with the aftermath of Robert’s death, a chronology that, at the very least, is suggestive of a pre-existing relationship with Charles’ family. Perhaps the universal – and elite – language of gardening gave him privileged access to the texts he needed to compile his work. And, as we have seen, this was not such a different language from that of the two women visionaries at Helfta. After all, Pietro completes his introduction on the kingly garden with the following statement:

In such a garden therefore the king is not simply delighted, but sometimes, when he must complete serious and necessary affairs, he will be refreshed in it, glorifying and delighting in God in excelsis, who is the foremost cause of all good and permissible things.¹³⁴

The authors wish to acknowledge their gratitude to the Leverhulme Trust for their generous support of the research informing this article.

¹ Here, Paul is referring to the Israelites as the ‘scion’ to be grafted back into the ‘faith’, that is, the now established ‘root-stock’ of the wider Christian community. The meaning of Paul’s words has been subject to much debate, for which see, for example, Mark Reasoner, *Romans in Full Circle: A History of Interpretation* (Louisville, 2005).

² See, for example, Talmud Bavli Pesachim 29a which states a scholar should never marry the daughter of an illiterate man since ‘this may be compared to the grafting of grapes of a vine with berries of a thorn bush, which is a repulsive and unacceptable thing.’ Similarly, the Yerushalmi Kilayim 1:7 (commenting on Psalm 129: 3: ‘Thy wife as a fruitful vine, on the sides of thy house. Thy children as olive plants round about thy table’) specifies that it is only non-grafted olive shoots that can make for ‘perfect’ children. For a brief discussion of these and other Talmudic sources within the history of grafting, see Ken Mudge *et al.*, ‘A history of grafting’, *Horticultural Reviews* 35 (2009): 437-93 (251-2).

³ There has been very little scholarly discussion of the use grafting as a metaphor in medieval texts, although attention to the literary use of this metaphor is more concerted within early modern studies, where it equates to issues of miscegenation and the mixing of race. See, for example, Jean E. Feerick, ‘The Imperial Grafts: Horticulture, Hybridity and the Art of Mingling Races in *Henry V* and *Cymbeline*’, in *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Embodiment: Gender, Sexuality and Race*, ed. Valerie Traub (Oxford, 2016), 211-27. For a more philosophical overview of grafting as a

practice and a human metaphor, See Michael Marder, *Grafts: Writing on Plants* (Minneapolis, 2016).

⁴ Feerick, 'Imperial Grafts', 212.

⁵ For a succinct discussion of the queer elements to the tripartite deity, see Robert Mills, 'Jesus as Monster', in *The Monstrous Middle Ages*, ed. Bettina Bildhauer and Robert Mills (Cardiff and Toronto, 2003), 28-54.

⁶ D. Fairchild Ruggles, *Islamic Gardens and Landscapes* (Philadelphia, 2008), 44.

⁷ Rudolph Borchardt, *The Passionate Gardener* (Kingston, NY, 2006), 11 and 32.

⁸ One of the first documented uses of grafting as a literary metaphor in the Middle Ages is in the Middle High German romance, *Tristan and Isolde*, written by Gottfried von Strassburg (d. c. 1210). Here, Gottfried identifies poetry written by some of his predecessors in the German vernacular as a branch grafted onto the Latin 'rootstock' of classical tradition (*Gottfried von Strassburg: Tristan and Isolde*, ed. and rev. G. Gentry, trans. A. T. Hatto, rev. Francis G. Gentry (New York, 2003), 66.

⁹ For a discussion of this Cistercian 'affiliation' (and an argument for Helfta's ultimate independence), see Laura M. Grimes, 'Theology as Conversation: Gertrude of Helfta and her Sisters as Readers of Augustine', Unpublished doctoral dissertation at the University of Notre Dame (2004), especially 1-7.

¹⁰ Anne Whiston Spirn, *The Language of Landscape* (New Haven and London, 1998), 15.

¹¹ The following discussion utilizes Mudge *et al.*, 'A history of grafting'.

¹² K. Gleason, 'Introduction' to *ead.*, ed., *A Cultural History of Gardens in Antiquity* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 35.

¹³ Kelly D. Cook and Rachel Foulk, 'Gardens and the larger landscape', in *Cultural History of Gardens in Antiquity*, ed. Gleason, 177-96 (179). Lena Landgren, 'Plantings', in *ibid.*, 75-98 (94), refers to 'breeding' with myrtle to produce different shapes and colours, which seems also to refer to grafting.

¹⁴ ‘...quonium arborum etiam abortus invenimus’: Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia*, ed. Karl Friedrich Theodor Mayhoff (Lipsiae, 1906), XII.6: available online at: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:1999.02.0138>. Accessed 05.04.17. All quotations will be taken from this online edition and translation.

¹⁵ ‘peculiaris inpuentia’; ‘nucipruna’: Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia*, XV.13.

¹⁶ ‘Nunc rapit hirsutis horrenda sororibus arma/ et docet indomitas ponere tela piros’: Palladius, ‘De Insitione Liber’, ll. 57-8, in *Palladii Rutili Tauri Aemiliani Viri Inlustris Opus Agriculturae, De Veterinaria Medicina, De Insitione*, ed. Robert E. Rodgers (Leipzig, 1975), 296.

¹⁷ For a useful discussion of Maimonides’s use of the garden and plant hermeneutic more widely, see Michael Marder, *The Philosopher’s Plant: An Intellectual Herbarium* (New York, 2014), 97-112. On grafting, see 108-9.

¹⁸ Moses Maimonides, *Guide to the Perplexed*, III.37, trans. M Friedländer (New York, 1956), 337; the sexual motif has earlier, Islamic roots: Ruggles, *Islamic Gardens*, 32, cites the *al-Filahat al-nabatiyya* of the Iraqi writer al-Wahshiyya, a copy of which is known in Al-Andalus from the tenth century and ‘was probably the catalyst for new agricultural manuals there’.

¹⁹ Marder, *Philosopher’s Plant*, 108.

²⁰ See Patricia Skinner, ‘Sexuality’, in *A Cultural History of Western Medieval Empires*, ed. Matthew Gabriele (London, in press).

²¹ *Alberti Magni ex ordine praedicatorum de Vegetabilibus Libri VII*, ed. E. Meyer and C. Jessen (Berlin, 1867), Lib. VII, tract. I, cap. 10, §92 (olives); Lib. I, tract. ii, cap. 10, §196 (winter). Note here the care to undertake the procedure whilst the plant was effectively dormant. On like species: ‘insitio fiat similium in similia secundum genus’: *ibid.*, Lib VII, tract. I, cap. 10, §78, 79.

²² Whilst we consider both Gertrude and Mechthild as ‘authors’ and ‘makers’ of their own writings, the deeply collaborative nature of their literary endeavours, as testified to often explicitly in their work, must also be acknowledged. Clearly, their monastic lives at Helfta were intensely communal

and the evidence points towards the communal nature of much of the literary activity that took place there. For a detailed appraisal of communal collaboration in the context of both Gertrude's and Mechthild's writings, see Grimes, 'Theology as Conversation', especially 51-76. See also Balázs J. Nemes, 'Text Production and Authorship: Gertrude of Helfta's *Legatus Divinae Pietatis*', in *A Companion to Mysticism and Devotion in Northern Germany in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. Elizabeth Andersen, Henrike Lähnemann and Anne Simon (Leiden and Boston, 2014), 103-30 (especially 115-20). In our discussion of Gertrude's and Mechthild's writing here, for clarity of expression we follow convention by identifying each writer with the work that has long been attributed to her (including in the Middle Ages), for which, see n. 23 below. For further detailed discussion of the provenance of the Helfta writings and the collaborative nature of their authorship, see Anna Harrison, "'Oh what treasure is in this book?'" Writing, Reading, and Community at the Monastery of Helfta', *Viator* 39.1 (2008): 75-106.

²³ Mechthild of Hackborn has been discussed in some length by Rosalynn Voaden in 'The Company She Keeps: Mechthild of Hackeborn in Late-Medieval Devotional Compilations', in *Prophets Abroad: The Reception of Continental Holy Women in Late Medieval England*, ed. Rosalynn Voaden (Cambridge, 1996), 51-70. On both women, see also Mary Jeremy Finnegan O.P, *The Women of Helfta: Scholars and Mystics* (Athens, GA and London, 1991). See also the introduction to the Paulist Press translation of Gertrude's book, *Legatus Memorialis Abundantiae Divinae Pietatis: Gertrude of Helfta, The Herald of Divine Love*, trans. Margaret Winkworth (Mahwah, NY, 1993), 5-44; the introduction to the Middle English translation of Mechthild of Hackeborn's *Liber Specialis Gratiae: The Booke of Gostlye Grace of Mechthild of Hackeborn*, ed. Theresa A. Halligan (Toronto, 1979), 1-59; and the introduction to the new modern English translation of Mechthild's *Liber*, also published by Paulist Press (and the first for over 600 years, as the translator points out), *Mechthild of Hackeborn: The Book of Special Grace*, trans. Barbara Newman (Mahwah, NY, 2007), 1-34 (32). The original Latin texts have been edited together by Ludwig Paquelin in the nineteenth century:

Revelationes Gertrudianae ac Mechthildianae, ed. Dom Ludwig Paquelin, 2 vols (Paris, 1875-77).

All references to the Latin texts will be to these editions, cited as *Liber* and *Legatus*, respectively.

Translations from *Herald*, ed. Winkworth and *Liber*, ed. Newman will be cited by page number in parenthesis after the Latin citation. Omissions in Newman's translation (which is abridged) or suggested modification will be addressed by use of our own.

²⁴ Mechthild of Magdeburg's text, *Das Fließende Licht der Gottheit*, was written in Middle High German, later translated into Latin as the *Lux divinitatis* and edited alongside the works of Mechthild of Hackeborn and Gertrude of Helfta by Paquelin in volume 2 of his edition of the *Revelationes*, 423-643 (see n. 23, above). For a modern English translation of the text, see Mechthild of Magdeburg, *The Flowing Light of the Godhead*, trans. Frank Tobin (Mahwah, NY, 1998). For an informative discussion of the text's transmission and impact, see Sara S. Poor, 'Transmission and Impact: Mechthild of Magdeburg's *Das Fliessende Licht der Gottheit*', in *Companion to Mysticism and Devotion*, ed. Andersen, Lähnemann and Simon, 73-96.

²⁵ See, for example, Mechthild's descriptions of Christ's mouth or heart manifesting as a rose, able to be picked, smelt or kissed (*Liber*, 2.viii, 143 [124]; 3.ii, 197-8; 3.xvii, 217 [154]); or Mechthild's own heart presenting as a rose in the hands of Christ (2.xviii, 155); or Mary's saffron and green garments embroidered with red and gold roses (2.1, 136 [120]). So, too, in the *Legatus*, Gertrude presents Christ's good works as 'evergreen and flourishing' ['cum vernanti florentia'], depicting them also as embroidered roses and lilies sprinkled over his garments (III. L.xix, 248 [232]).

²⁶ 'Helftense monasterium situm erat in valle non profunda et leni collium undequaue deflexu in planitiem extensa: jucunda quippe et frugifera': Gertrude, *Legatus*, II.iii, p. 62n. 1.

²⁷ '[D]ie quodam infra Resurrectionem et Ascensionem, cum ante Primam, curiam intrassem, et prope piscinam sedens, intenderem amoenitatem loci illius, qui mihi placebat ex aquae praeterfluentis limpидitate, circumstantium arborum viriditate, circumvolantium avium et specialiter

columbarum libertate, sed praecipue ex absconsae sessionis secreta quiete’: Gertrude, *Legatus* II.iii, 62-3 (97).

²⁸ ‘Ecce elongavi fugiens, et mansi in solitudine. Non fuit contentus exire, nisi et longe se faceret, ut posset quiescere’: Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones super Cantica Canticorum* 52.III.6. The modern English translation is taken from Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs*, trans. Kilian Walsh and Eileen M. Edmonds, 4 vols (Kalamazoo, MI, 1979, repr. 2008), 3, 54. Johanna Lanczkowski examines Bernard’s influence upon Gertrude’s writings in particular in ‘Gertrud die Grosse: Mystik des Gehorsams,’ *Religiöse Frauenbewegung und Mystische Frömmigkeit im Mittelalter*, ed. Peter Dinzelsbacher and Dieter R. Bauer (Köln, 1988), 153-64.

²⁹ ‘omni amoenitate praerucunda tibi cor meum praerberet in habitationem’: Gertrude, *Legatus* II.iii, 62-3 (97).

³⁰ ‘candens lilium’; ‘horto ecclesiae inter areolas aromatum’; ‘thalamo sanctae religionis’: Gertrude, *Legatus*, I.i, p. 7 (52). On lilies and roses, both highly perfumed plants, in the gardens at Hesdin discussed in more detail below, see *Trésor des chartes d’Artois: Inventaire sommaire imprimé par J.-M. Richard, 1878-1887*, 2 vols (pour A 1-A 1013), complété par P. Bougard et C. Dhérent (pour A 1014-A 1027) (Arras: Archives départementales du Pas-de-Calais, 1967) [hereafter *Trésor*], A290 1312 ... Manouvriers, terrassements, ‘pour rosiers a planter prins a S. Jore [Sanctus Georgius juxta castrum Hesdin, Saint Jore de Héding] et pour semenche d’oignon de lis et de passes roses X s.’: http://archivesenligne.pasdecals.fr/console/ir_visu_instrument.php?PHPSID=uef61e4v708luj9597s6o22th6&id=11346&l=1366&h=728 [accessed 25/4/17]; and Theresa L. Tyers, ‘A *Delite* for the Senses: Three Healing Plants in Medieval Gardens, the Lily, the Rose and the Woodland Strawberry’, in *Medieval and Early Modern Gardens in Britain: Enclosure and Transformation c. 1200-1750*, ed. Patricia Skinner and Theresa L. Tyers (New York, in press).

³¹ Michel Foucault, ‘Of Other Spaces’, *Diacritics* 16. 1 (1986): 22-7 (here at 24).

³² Foucault, ‘Of Other Spaces’, 25.

³³ ‘Benignus Dominus, compatiens demonstravit illi hortulum valde parvum nimisque angustum, qui diversorum florum vernantia plenus, spinis erat circumseptus, et modicum mellis erat fluens in ipso’: Gertrude, *Legatus* III.iv, 122 (158).

³⁴ For a detailed treatment of visionary women’s use of Christ’s blood and Eucharistic transubstantiation in their writings, see Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Fast and Holy Feast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Holy Women* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1987), especially chapter 5, 150-86. See also her treatment in *Wonderful Blood* (Philadelphia, 2007), where she claims that Gertrude’s and Mechthild’s treatment of Christ’s blood tends to focus on its ‘nourishing and cleansing’ properties, rather than its morbidity (14).

³⁵ Song of Songs 4:11.

³⁶ ‘Vidit in medio Ecclesiae arborem pulcherrimam proceritate, et latitudine sua totam terram implentem, quae ex tribus frondibus de terra insimul ortis excreverat; et fronds arcuatae et reflexae erant ad terram. Sub una frondium erant bestiae, quae vescebantur ex fructu qui de arbore cadebat’: Mechthild, *Liber* I.xvii, 50 (68).

³⁷ Mechthild, *Liber* I.xxx, 104 (108); I.ix, pp. 30-1(54).

³⁸ ‘I am the true vine; and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he will take away: and every one that beareth fruit, he will purge it, that it may bring forth more fruit.’

³⁹ In Harrison’s estimation, the preponderance of such lettering appearing regularly in Mechthild’s visions, demonstrates the way in which Christ insists on being present to his people in words (‘Oh! What treasure’, 98). What Harrison overlooks, however, is that the most active (in her words, ‘vivifying’) and dynamic verbalisation of Christ is produced via Mechthild’s words as cipher for both the words of Christ and Christ as Word.

⁴⁰ ‘tota conversatio ejus habebatur in arbore scripta’; ‘Christi divinitatem’: Mechthild, *Liber* I.ix, 30. Here we have used our own translation, considering ‘conversation’ as best relaying the language hermeneutic at play here in the use of the term *conversatio*.

⁴¹ ‘Unde gravata in memetipsa pertractare coepi quam difficile vel etiam impossibile mihi foret talem invenire sensum sive verba, quibus sine scandalo ad humanum intellectum saepe dicta produci possent’: Gertrude, *Legatus* II.x, 79 (109).

⁴² ‘plantulam parvam’: Gertrude, *Legatus* III.xviii, 151 (176).

⁴³ ‘Ipse amantissimus Jesus per vaporem amoris sui vulnerati Cordis eam sibi attrahere videbatur, et abluere in aqua inde profluneti, deinde irrigare ipsam in sanguine vivificante sui Cordis. Ad quod illa ex minutissimo carbone convalescens . . . Post haec dum illa corpus Christi sumpsisset, et, ut supra dictum est, animam suam, in similitudine arboris conspiceret radicem habere fixam in vulnere lateris Jesu Christi, per ipsum vulnus tamquam per radicem, novo quodam mirabili modo sensit se quasi per singulos ramos simul, et fructus, atque folia penetrari a virtute humanitatis simul et divinitatis’: Gertrude, *Legatus* III.xviii, 152 (176-77.)

⁴⁴ One of the most illuminating studies of the ways in which the female mystics use sexualized language to articulate the mystical fusion is Amy Hollywood, *Sensible Ecstasy: Mysticism, Sexual Difference and the Demands of History* (Chicago, 2001). Also important is Luce Irigaray’s essay, ‘La Mystérique’, in *Speculum of the Other Woman*, trans. Gillian C. Gill (Ithaca, NY, 1985), 191-202, to which Hollywood partially responds in her book. But see also the essays collected in *Intersections of Sexuality and the Divine in Medieval Culture: The Word Made Flesh*, ed. Susannah Chewning (New York and London, 2005).

⁴⁵ ‘vinum purissimum et dulce’; ‘vinum rubeum et forte’; ‘vinum fervens et valde’; ‘nobilissimum et nectareum vinum’: Mechthild, *Liber*, I.xxii, 79 (89).

⁴⁶ ‘ad coelestia erigunt’; ‘in terrae pulvere peccatorum suorum jacent’: Mechthild, *Liber*, II.ii, 137 (121).

⁴⁷ ‘Dominus in lectum juxta eam reclinaret, sinistro eam brachio amplectens, ita ut vulnus Cordis ejus dulcissimi suo Cordi jungeretur’: Mechthild, *Liber*, II.xxxii, 177 (138).

⁴⁸ ‘Illa vero reclinavit se ad vulnus melliflui Cordis Salvatoris . . . Ibi etiam de Corde Christi suavissimo esuxit fructum dulcissimum, quem assumens de Corde Dei in os suum posuit: per quod significabatur illa aeterna laus, quae de corde Dei procedit’: Mechthild, *Liber* II.xvi, 150 (128-9). Here, we have modified Newman’s translation of *esuxit* (which she renders ‘ate from’) according to the verb’s more frequent meaning in medieval Latin and because it also incorporates the idea of ‘suckling’, to which Mechthild will allude towards the end of the chapter (see *sug/o* in the *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British and Irish Sources with Supplement*, ed. R. E. Latham [London, 1999], 463). Similarly, we have also emended Newman’s translation of *procedit* as ‘proceeds’ to the more poetic, visually evocative and ultimately standard theological term ‘emanates’, in keeping with another medieval usage, testified to from 1250 (see *procedo* in *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List*, ed. Latham, 374).

⁴⁹ ‘Ut omne cordis tui delectamentum in me solum effundas.’ Mechthild, *Liber* II.xvi, 150 (129).

⁵⁰ ‘Eia, eia: Amor, amor, amor!’: Mechthild, *Liber* II.xvi, 150 (129).

⁵¹ The femininity of Christ’s love is compounded here by the fact that Mechthild also refers to it as *Minne*, a strong, female personification popularized by the women of the *devotio moderna* movement in the thirteenth century. *Minne* was a figure who combined the eroticism of a courtly lady with the qualities of a personified *Caritas* popular within monastic writings, for a discussion of which see Barbara Newman, *God and the Goddesses: Vision, Poetry and Belief in the Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 2003), 11-12 and 138-89. Significantly, the writings of Mechthild of Magdeburg (see n. 24 above), who spent most of her adult life as a beguine within the world, are redolent with representations of *Minne* and it may well be that Mechthild of Hackeborn was influenced by these at this point in the text. Interestingly, the Middle English translation of the *Liber*, entitled *The Booke of Gostlye Grace*, dating from the first part of the fifteenth century, fails to grasp the meaning of the term and the translator has erroneously rendered the phrase, ‘Tu matrem tuam nominabas MINNE’, as ‘Powe schalle nem[p]e thy moder only *in me*’ (our emphasis). See *The Booke of Gostlye Grace of*

Mechthild of Hackeborn, ed. Theresa A. Halligan (Toronto, 1979), 353. This edition is only available on microfiche /CD, although a new edition is currently being prepared for publication by Anne Mouron and Naoë Kukita Yoshikawa.

⁵² ‘amor meus erit mater tua; et sicut filii sugunt matres suas, sic et tu ab eas suges internam consolationem, suavitatem inenarrabilem’: Mechthild, *Liber* II.xvi, 150 (129).

⁵³ Whilst a concerted queer reading of medieval mysticism is outside the remit of this article, see, for example, Karma Lochrie’s discussion in ‘Mystical Acts/Queer Tendencies’, in *Constructing Medieval Sexuality*, ed. Karma Lochrie, Peggy McCracken and James A. Schultz (Minneapolis, 1997), 108-200. Bynum also discusses the disrupting of androcentric symbols by medieval holy women in *Holy Feast, Holy Fast*, 290-1 but does not identify the practice as queer. However, she does argue that this disruption is definitively *not* mere inversion but an inscription of ‘androgyny’ that refuses the delimiting aspects of the imagery.

⁵⁴ Paquelin suggests that this episode took place in 1294 after the premature death of one of the monastery’s primary benefactors, Burchard XII of Mansfeld (Mechthild, *Liber*, 161n.1).

⁵⁵ ‘multum sibi complacuit’; ‘dormire non posset’: Mechthild, *Liber* II.xxii, 161-62.

⁵⁶ ‘Contra obedientem fecisti’: Mechthild, *Liber* II.xxii, 164.

⁵⁷ ‘sed etiam exteri, et de longe venientes religiosi et saeculares’: Mechthild, *Liber* V.xxx, 365.

⁵⁸ On this, see Dennis D. Martin, ‘Carthusians as Advocates of Women Visionary Reformers’, in *Studies in Carthusian Monasticism in the Late Middle Ages*, ed. Julian M. Luxford (Turnhout, 2008), 128-53; Ernst Hellgardt, ‘Latin and the Vernacular: Mechthild of Magdeburg – Mechthild of Hackeborn – Gertrude of Helfta,’ in *Companion to Mysticism and Devotion*, ed. Andersen, Lähnemann and Simon, 131-35.

⁵⁹ Bernard wrote two works of exegesis of the Song: *Brevis Commentario in Cantica*, edited by J-P. Migne in *Patrologia Latina* (Paris, 1844-45), 184: 407-36; and *Sermones super Cantica Cantorum* (the better known of his treatments), in *Sancti Bernardi Opera Omnia*, ed. J. Leclercq, C. H. Talbot,

and H. M. Rochais, 2 vols (Rome, 1957-58). All quotations will be taken from this edition, cited by sermon number and section. Translations will be taken from Bernard of Clairvaux, *On the Song of Songs*, 4 vols (Kalamazoo, 1980), cited by volume and page number.

⁶⁰ ‘Non rami radici, non matri filii ingrati sint. Non rami radici invidiant quod ex ea sumpserunt: non filii matri quod de ejus succere uberibus’: Bernard, Sermo LXXIX.5 (iv.5,142).

⁶¹ Line Cecilie Engh, *Gendered Identities in Bernard of Clairvaux’s Sermon on the Song of Songs* (Turnhout, 2014), 408 and 407.

⁶² See n. 7, above.

⁶³ Bruno’s description of his monastery in Calabria in turn drew from the work of St John Chrysostom: see Bernard Forthomme, ‘Le goût du Paradis: jardins cartusiens et franciscains’, *Antonianum* 83.2 (2008): 279-307, at 280n.

⁶⁴ Margaret Hubrath, *Schrieben und Erinnern. Zur “memoria” im Liber Specialis gratiae Mechthildis von Hakeborn* (Paderborn, 1996), 30 (cited in Nemes, ‘Text, Production and Authorship’, 111, n. 37); Nemes, ‘Text, Production and Authorship’, 111.

⁶⁵ Harrison, ‘Oh what treasure’, as before. See also n. 22, above.

⁶⁶ ‘in liberalibus artibus’; ‘omnes bonos libros quos poterat, ecclesiae suae comparabat, aut transcribi a sororibus faciebat’: Mechthild, *Liber VI.i*, 374-5 (204).

⁶⁷ The liberal arts consisted of the *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric and dialectics) and the *quadrivium* (arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy). For a discussion of the role of these in medieval educational contexts, see David Leslie Wagner, *The Seven Liberal Arts in the Middle Ages* (Indiana, 1983).

⁶⁸ ‘si studium scientiae deperierit, cum amplius divinam Scripturam non intellexerint, Religionis simul cultus interibit’: Mechthild, *Liber VI.i*, 162 (204).

⁶⁹ ‘tam insita quam ea, cui fit insitio, proprias animas retinent, et virtutes et operationes inconfusas, et non unitas’: *De Veg.* Lib. V, tract. I, cap. 4, §33.

-
- ⁷⁰ Jean-Louis Gaulin, 'Agronomie antique et élaboration médiévale: de Palladius aux *Préceptes cisterciens d'économie rurale*', *Médiévales*, 26 (1994): 59-84.
- ⁷¹ Nemes, 'Text, Production and Authorship', 111-12. Here he draws upon the work of F. Schrader, 'Die Zisterzienserklöster in den mittelalterlichen Diözesen Magdeburg und Halberstadt', *Cîteaux* 21 (1970): 265-78.
- ⁷² Palladius, *Opus Agriculturae*, ed. Rodgers: Grafting: lib. III, xvii-xviii; grafting vines: lib. IV, i; grafting olives 'and others': lib. V, ii; grafting apples: lib. X, xiv. On siting the garden, lib. I, xxxiv; monthly jobs from January onwards: lib. II, xiv; III, xxiv; IV, ix; V, iii; VI, v; VII, iv; VIII, ii; IX, v; X, xiii; XI, xi; XII, vi; XIII, iii.
- ⁷³ Gaulin, 'Agronomie', 66-7.
- ⁷⁴ Palladius, *Opus Agriculturae*, lib. III, xvii in *Palladii* ed. Rodgers, 84.
- ⁷⁵ J. Lestocquoy, 'Les origines d'Hesdin-le-Vieux', *Revue du Nord*, 32.126-127 (1950): 94-104.
- ⁷⁶ Abigail P. Dowling, 'Landscape of Luxuries: Mahaut d'Artois's (1302-1329) Management and Use of the Park at Hesdin', in *Rural Space in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: The Spatial Turn in Pre-Modern Studies*, ed. Albrecht Klassen (Berlin/Boston, 2012), 267-388.
- ⁷⁷ Sharon Farmer, 'Aristocratic power and the "natural" landscape: the garden park at Hesdin, c. 1291-1302', *Speculum*, 88.3 (2013): 644-80. See also Anne Hagopian Van Buren, 'Reality and literary romance in the park of Hesdin,' in *Medieval Gardens*, ed. Elizabeth McDougall (Washington D.C, 1986), 115-34.
- ⁷⁸ On the automata, see Elly Truitt, *Medieval Robots: Mechanism, Magic, Nature and Art* (Philadelphia, 2015); *ead.*, 'The garden of earthly delights: Mahaut of Artois and the automata at Hesdin', *Medieval Feminist Forum: A Journal of Gender and Sexuality*, 46.1 (2010): 74-9.
- ⁷⁹ A. Batistini, *Il giardino nel medioevo fra sacro e profano* (Firenze, 2012), 132.
- ⁸⁰ The gardens had been established earlier, and were a particular favourite of Emperor Frederick II: Runciman, *Vespers*, 13.

⁸¹ Van Buren, ‘Reality’, 118, 125, 127.

⁸² Farmer, ‘Aristocratic power’, 669 and 678.

⁸³ Van Buren, ‘Reality’, 125 n.23. Mahaut’s accounts note other gardeners on the payroll as well: e.g. *Trésor*: A315 piece 2 1314: ‘a Guillaume Roste gardignier madame en son manoir sur sen loier de l’anée ou il doit avoir XVIII lb. et I robe.

⁸⁴ Palmerius’s documented history begins when was licensed to practise medicine at Naples in 1278/9: *Registri della Cancelleria Angioina XXI (1278/9)*, ed. R. Filangieri (Naples, 1967), 304, entry 364. He lived in exile from Sicily after the Aragonese takeover of the island in 1282. In 1285 a document of the Aragonese King James, preserved in the Hospitaller monastery of Jerusalem in Messina, terms him a ‘traitor’ whose property had been confiscated to the fisc: *Bibliotheca scriptorum qui res in Sicilia gesta sub Aragonum imperio retulere*, ed. G. Rosarius (Palermo, 1792), 500; see also Jean Dunbabin, *The French in the Kingdom of Sicily, 1266-1305* (Cambridge, 2011). His loyalty to the Angevins was however rewarded in 1283, when Charles I’s eponymous son, the Prince of Salerno, assigned 12 ounces of gold per annum as a pension to Palmerius de Riso, described as ‘professor of logic and medicine at the University of Naples’, to compensate him for the damage done to him by the ‘Messinese rebels’: *Reg. Canc. Ang. XXVII pt. 1 (1283-5)*, ed. J. Mazzoleni and R. Orefice (Naples, 1979), 136, entry 22.

⁸⁵ Farmer, ‘Aristocratic power’, 644 n.2 and 645.

⁸⁶ Xavier Hélyary, ‘Robert d’Artois et les Angevins (1274-1302) d’après le chartrier des comtes d’Artois’, in *Les comtes d’Artois et leurs archives: histoire, mémoire et pouvoir au Moyen Âge*, ed. Alain Provost (Artois, 2013), 119-132, focuses on Robert’s political ties, with a brief discussion of Renaud Coignet [Rinaldo Cognetti], and does not mention the garden works at all.

⁸⁷ *S. Jean-Théristes (1054-1264)*, ed. A. Guillou (Vatican City, 1980), 45, no 2 (1088/9).

⁸⁸ Mudge *et al.*, ‘History’, 441-2, discusses the undesirable and uneconomic ‘juvenility’ of plants.

⁸⁹ Palladius, *Opus Agriculturae*, Book V.2, in *Palladii*, ed. Rodgers, 143. Ross Balzaretto, ‘Chestnuts in Charters: Evidence for Specialised Production in Tenth-Century Genoa and Milan’, in *Italy and Medieval Europe: Studies presented to Chris Wickham*, ed. Ross Balzaretto, Julia Barrow and Patricia Skinner (Oxford, in press), makes a compelling case for the grafting of chestnut trees, which take even longer to mature.

⁹⁰ Rebecca Krug, ‘Plantings’, in *A Cultural History of Gardens in the Medieval Age*, ed. Michael Leslie (London, 2013), 57-73 and 194-6, at 60-3. On the two authors see W. L. Braekman, ‘Bollard's Middle English book of planting and grafting and its background’, *Studia Neophilologica*, 57 (1985): 19-39; *id.*, *Geoffrey of Franconia's Book of Trees and Wine* (Brussels, 1989).

⁹¹ On the earlier history of the *Apulienses* at Salerno see Patricia Skinner, ‘Daughters of Sichelgaita: the women of Salerno in the twelfth century’, in *Salerno nel XII Secolo*, ed. Paolo Delogu and Paolo Peduto (Salerno, 2004), 126-9. It is unclear whether this is the same John as the Jehan de Barlete recorded in the Artois rentals as holding land at Aubigny: *Le rentier d'Artois, 1298-1299 suivi du Rentier d'Aire 1292*, 2 vols, ed. Roger Berger, Bernard Delmaire and Bernard Ghienne, 2006), ii, 178.

⁹² The extent of Robert's estates is represented in the records of payments into his treasury from tenants and others: *Rentier*, ed. Berger.

⁹³ Farmer, ‘Aristocratic power’, 647.

⁹⁴ The impact of the Count's work might also be reflected in the surname ‘des Gardins’ that recurs in records of rental payments: *Rentier*, ed. Berger, ii, 118 (Simon); 120 and 124 (Laurens); and the fact that the town of Hesdin itself had a ‘rue des Gardins’: *ibid.*, 126.

⁹⁵ Farmer, ‘Aristocratic power’, 655 n. 45.

⁹⁶ Species represented in an account entry for 1311 include: ‘merliers qui vinrent de Saint-Venant et pour desplanter et replanter pumiers (apple trees), peskiers, (peach trees), frans mouriers, (mulberries) cornilliers (dogwood), pruniers (plum trees) et coigniers (quince), sêmeries, travaux

divers, furniture de cordes, cuves, clous. oeuvres de Jakème le fèvre. Somme : 483 l. 9 s. 3 d.

(Ascension 1311)': *Trésor*, A281 piece 1.

⁹⁷ On various types of grafting in medieval contexts see Laura Reinart, 'A Middle English text on planting and grafting in CTC O.5.26', *ANQ: A Quarterly Journal of Short Arts, Notes and Reviews*, 19 (2006): 9-16. See also *Trésor* A378 1320: 'a Guillaume le concierge de Conflans pour rosiers rouges et blans pour planter ou jardin de Conflans XX s' – the French leaves ambiguous whether these are 'red-and-white' rose bushes, i.e. grafted plants, or red and white varieties of bush.

⁹⁸ The impetus for its creation as an agricultural manual should not be excluded, however, given that the early fourteenth century was experiencing a crisis in food production that would culminate in the famine and misery of the Black Death, for which see William Chester Jordan, *The Great Famine: Northern Europe in the Early Fourteenth Century* (Princeton, 1996).

⁹⁹ Will Richter, ed., *Petrus de Crescentiis (Pier de' Crescenzi) Ruralia Commoda: das Wissen des vollkommenen Landwirts um 1300*, with introduction by Reinhilt Richter-Bergmeier, 4 vols (Heidelberg, 1995-2002); Robert G. Calkins, 'Piero de' Crescenzi and the medieval garden', in *Medieval Gardens*, 156-74.

¹⁰⁰ Calkins, 'Piero de' Crescenzi', 173.

¹⁰¹ Lino Sighinolfo, 'Pietro de' Crescenzi nella storia della cultura nazionale', in *Pier de' Crescenzi (1233-1321): Studi e documenti*, ed. P. Tommaso Alfonsi (Bologna, 1933), 87-131.

¹⁰² Steven Runciman, *The Sicilian Vespers* (Cambridge, 1958), 57, 65-77, for the protracted negotiations.

¹⁰³ The claim of the Aragonese was through Peter's marriage to Manfred's daughter Constance: Runciman, *Vespers*, 55.

¹⁰⁴ *Reg. Canc. Ang. XXV (1280-2)*, ed. R. Filangieri (Naples, 1978), 99, entry 40; Dunbabin, *Charles I*, 186.

¹⁰⁵ He rose from being a judge to appearing in the 5th register of Charles II, as Portulano and Procurator of Puglia and the Abruzzi from 1284-1288: *Reg. Canc. Ang. XXIX*, ed. B. Mazzoleni (Naples, 1969), *passim*. And see Dunbabin, *French*, 114. As ‘Renaud Coignet’ he is visible in the Artois rentals collecting receipts and granting out lands: *Rentier*, ed. Berger, ii, 18, 20, 188 and 245. The Cugnetti family is heavily-visible in documents from Barletta throughout the thirteenth century: *Codice Diplomatico Barese VIII: Le Pergamene di Barletta, Archivio Capitolare, 897-1285*, ed. F. Nitti di Vito (Bari, 1914), 259-60 (document 206, 1214: John Cugnetto in a boundary clause); 352-6, 383-7 and 400-404 (document 277, 1257: Robert Cugnettus testifies in his capacity as a money-changer in Barletta about contested payments to the Teutonic hospital of St Mary in Barletta, repeated in documents 289, 1267 and 298, 1271); *Codice Diplomatico Barese X: Pergamene di Barletta del R. Archivio di Napoli (1075-1309)*, ed. R. Filangieri di Candida (Bari, 1927), 232-41: a copy of the dispute involving Robert Cugnettus’s testimony, document 139 (1287).

¹⁰⁶ For his biography see Alfonsi, *et al.*, *Pier de’ Crescenzi (1233-1321)*.

¹⁰⁷ *Reg. Canc. Ang., XXVII parts 1 and 2 1283-1285*, ed. R. Filangieri, J. Mazzoleni and R. Orefice, 2 vols (Naples, 1979-80), i, 92 and 126; ii, 378.

¹⁰⁸ *I Fascicoli della Cancelleria Angioina vol 2: Le Inchieste di Carlo I in Basilicata, 1273-4*, ed. Stefano Palmieri (Naples, 2009), 121, has witnesses in Calvello: ‘Petrus de Cressentio iuratus et interrogatus de omnibus nichil dixit’. The inquest was about whether women who had married in Basilicata after Charles I came to throne had had royal permission or not.

¹⁰⁹ ‘... multosque libros antiquorum et novorum prudentum perlegi’: Richter, ed., *Petrus de Crescentiis*, I, Prologue c. 3, 24.

¹¹⁰ J. Dunbabin, *Charles I of Anjou: Power, Kingship and State-Making in 13th-Century Europe* (London, 1998), 11. Runciman, *Vespers*, 72, notes his personal liking for poetry and the arts alongside his respect for learning, and quotes his troubadour Peter of Castelnaud, 117.

¹¹¹ Iolanda Ventura, ‘A medieval medical bestseller: the *Circa instans*’,

<http://blog.wellcomelibrary.org/2017/02/a-medieval-medical-bestseller-the-circa-instans/> [accessed 08.03.17]; Iolanda Ventura, ‘Il “Circa instans” attribuito a Platearius: trasmissione manoscritta, redazioni, criteri di costruzione di un’edizione critica’, *Revue d’Histoire des Textes* 10 (2015): 249-362.

¹¹² Sunny Harrison at Leeds University is currently conducting research into the text and its later reception. The text has been edited as *Nelle Scuderie di Federico II Imperatore ovvero L’Arte di Curare il Cavallo*, ed. Maria Anna Causati Vanni (Viareggio, 2000).

¹¹³ His accounts also show how his stables were managed: Ludovic Notte, ‘Les écuries de Robert II, comte d’Artois (vers 1292-1302)’, *Revue du Nord*, 81.331 (1999): 467-88. He also seems to have borrowed money from Italian bankers to support his stables: *Trésor*: A151 1299: ‘Mêmes lettres concernant *unum roncinum morellum balsamum duobus pedibus posterioribus marcatum in crure destra tali marco* (figure). (19 avril) aux maîtres de sa terre d’Artois de payer à Ernoul Bieke et Philippe Perruche, marchands de Florence “de la compagnie des Perruches” 735 l. 15 s. 6 d. p., reste des 5 695 l. 6 d. p., qu’il leur avait dûs précédemment (18 mai).’

¹¹⁴ Tax records from later in his life in Bologna see him pleading poverty. Whilst this might simply be a tactic to avoid being assessed for too much tax, it might equally well suggest a failure, ultimately, to secure the patronage he sought from Robert and/or Charles (II). Robert certainly took northern Italians into his service as well as southerners, and there is a cluster of tenants at Hesdin with the surname ‘Le/Li Boulenisien’ recorded in the rentals: *Rentier*, ed. Berger, ii, 87-135, entries 378 (Raoul); 401, 432 and 521 (Martin); 930 and 1006 (Robers [*sic*]). These seem to be distinguished in the records from tenants named ‘de Boulogne’, suggesting that they may indeed have hailed from Bologna.

¹¹⁵ Calkins, ‘Piero de’ Crescenzi’, 171. The construction is described as a ‘palatium cum caminatis et cameris de solis arboribus: Richter, ed., *Petrus*, VIII.3.iv, 15. On its users, however, see below, note 121.

¹¹⁶ Sharon Farmer, ‘La Zisa/Gloriette: cultural interaction and the architecture of repose in medieval Sicily, France and Britain’, *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 166.1 (2013): 99-123.

¹¹⁷ It is documented later in the Hesdin accounts, when repairs and renovations were underway including stepping stones for the pathway that led down to it: *Trésor*: A441 piece 5 1325: ‘...Scieurs d'ais, maçons pour faire les pas a le voie si que on va au petit paradis...’

¹¹⁸ Richter, ed., *Petrus*, VIII.6.ii (cherries and vines); VIII.6.vi (black and white grapes); VIII.7.iii (apples and willows, vines, elms and mulberries, citing also Albertus).

¹¹⁹ *Trésor*: A260 1310 piece 2: ‘Pour I boistel d’avoine mis es rachisnes des entes qui furent aportées de Bourgoigne quant on les planta VI s’; *ibid.* A277 1311: ‘entes acatées à Beauvois par Baude Coignet, premièrement II c d’entes que priers que pumiers VIII d. le pieche valent VI lb. XIII s. III d; Pour fouir lesdites entes et pour XVI entes acatées XII s., plantation d’autres entes et de pommiers venus d’Arras; cordes; clous; ouvrages de forge, clefs, serrures, chaînettes pour retenir les huis, etc. Somme: 225 l.10 d’; *ibid.* A410 piece 2 1323 2°: ‘Neuf manoir. Manouvriers; transport de fumier, plantation d'entes...’

¹²⁰ Hélyary, ‘Robert d’Artois et les Angevins’, 132.

¹²¹ ‘rex vel regina cum baronibus vel dominabus [our emphasis]’: see above, note 115. Calkins, ‘Piero de’ Crescenzi’, 171, bases his translation on BNF Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal MS. 5064 and Pierpont Morgan MS 232 ‘which differ in only insignificant variations’. However, Arsenal f. 204v clearly features ‘le seigneur et la dame at les barons *et les damoiselles* [our emphasis]’, retaining the female presence in the garden that Calkins’ translation curiously overlooks: Pierre des Crescens, *Livre des prouffitz champestre et ruraulx* (1470-1475), online at <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b7100618w.r> [accessed 05.05.17].

¹²² Richter, ed., *Petrus de Crescentiis*, III, Book VIII.3.iv,15

¹²³ ‘Velocius vero et facilius poterit palatium sive domus praedicta fieri de lignamine et undique circa ipsam plantari vites et universum aedificium operiri. Poterunt etiam in ipso viridario fieri tentora magna de lignamine sicco vel arboribus viridibus et vitibus operiri. Amplius multam afferet delectationem, si in viridario fiant insitiones mirabiles et diversae in eisdem arboribus, quas diligens viridarii cultor facile scire poterit ex his, quae in secundo maxime libro dicuntur’; ‘...et in locis parietum plantentur arbores fructiferae, si placet, quae facile crescant, ut sunt cerasa et mali vel ulmi et tam incisionibus quam palis et perticis et vinculis per plures annos eorum procuretur augmentum in tantum, quod parietes et tectum formentur ex eis’: Richter, ed., *Petrus de Crescentiis*, III, Book VIII.3.v, 15; *ibid.*, III, Book VIII.3.iv, 15.

¹²⁴ Truitt, *Medieval Robots*, 124; *Trésor*: A281 piece 1 1311: ‘pour refaire l'entalement de le fontaine du pavillon et refaire le solement de le maison de le bove du pavillon’, réparations d'entretien’; *ibid.* A441 piece 5 1325: ‘Compte de Pierre Cornille des oeuvres faites à Hesdin... Pour tailler parpains et caperons a remachonner les crestiaus de entour le fontaine du paveillon et pour rasseir les gres des sieges de entour le dicte fontaine’, murs du parc. Pour couvrir au paveillon ou parc et sur le bersoire. Abateurs, fagoteurs et faiseurs de leigne’.

¹²⁵ Jules-Marie Richard, ‘Thierry d'Hireçon, agriculteur artésien (13.-1328)’, *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, 53 (1892): 383-416 at 414.

¹²⁶ On the healing potential, see Tyers, ‘A *Delite* for the Senses’, as before.

¹²⁷ ‘Et si est grant doute que li bois et les foreiz qui mult bèles estoient , ne reveignent jamais, en tele manière les ont-il copez’: Antoine le Roux de Lincy, ‘Inventaires des biens meubles et immeubles de la comtesse Mahaut d'Artois, pillés par l'armée de son neveu, en 1313’, *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, 13 (1852) : 53-79 at 68.

¹²⁸ Farmer, ‘Aristocratic power’, 647-8.

¹²⁹ Andrew G. Miller, ““Tails” of masculinity: knights, clerics and the mutilation of horses in medieval England’, *Speculum* 88 (2013): 958-95.

¹³⁰ ‘Quittance donnée à Guillaume d’Arrablay, maistre et garde du close des gales de Rouen, par Jehan Hebert, dit Pouois, jardinier, de 105 s.t. pour sa paine et salaire d’arvoir taille et redrecié les trailles des jardins, dudit lose, refait les tonnelles et aveillons, redrecié et monté les sieges dediz tinnelles et paveillons... comme pour avoir baillié et livre a ses propres coux et despens, par marchié fait a lui, tout le merrien, osier motes, semences et autres choses appartenans et necessaires a yceulx jardins’ :*Documents relatifs au Clos des galées de Rouen et aux armées de mer du roi de France de 1293 à 1418*. Série 8, Tome 1, Volume 11, ed. Anne Chazelas. Paris, 1977-1978, 266.

¹³¹ Foucault, ‘Of Other Spaces’, 24.

¹³² Foucault, ‘Of Other Spaces, 26.

¹³³ Borchardt, *Passionate Gardener*, 11-12.

¹³⁴ ‘In tali itaque viridario non semper delectetur rex, sed aliquando, cum seriis et necessariis satisfecerit rebus, renovetur in eo, glorificans deum excelsum, qui omnium bonarum et licitarum delectationem principium est et causa’: Richter, ed., *Petrus*, Book VIII, 3, vi.