Sommario

9  Tavole a colori

Alessia Adriana Aletta

17  Testo e ornamentazione nei corpora canonum bizantini del IX-X secolo

Beatrice Kitzinger

29  Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 960. Approaches to Ninth-Tenth Century Breton Gospel Illumination

Lila Yawn

43  Haste, Cost, and Scribes as Painters in Italian Giant Church Books of the Mid and Later Eleventh Century

Alessandro Varavallo

59  Libri di coro ad Arezzo nel secondo Duecento. Contesti e nuove prospettive interpretative

Ulrike Bauer-Eberhardt

70  Fragliche Miniaturen in München. Der sog. Jonathan Alexander Master

Giovanna Murano

75  Firme e monogrammi d’artista. R magister e Bartolomeo Tinti da Modena

Alison Stones

83  Illuminated Manuscripts of Popes Clement V and John XXII. Toulouse or Avignon?

Francesca Fabbri

95  Vizi e Virtù in due codici realizzati a Genova nel Trecento. Fra seduzioni d’Oriente e apporti toscani

Luca Salvatelli

107  Nuove precisazioni intorno al Borghese 353 della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Andrea Improta

113  Aggiunte alla miniatura napoletana del Trecento. I corali dell’Archivio Capitolare di Udine

Vittoria Camelliti

122  La Temperanza di Palazzo Minerbi-Dal Sale a Ferrara. Riflessioni sulla trasmissione di una tipologia iconografica

Enrica Guzzonato

137  Il codice D11 della Capitolare di Padova nella tradizione illustrativa del De re militari di Roberto Valturio

Erika Martini

148  L’organo a muro nei manoscritti miniati dei secoli XV e XVI

Isabelle Balsamo

161  Les Heures d’Urfé et la Trinité-des-Monts. Un grand décor romain pour une ’chapelle portative’

168  Recensioni a cura di Giuseppa Z. Zanichelli

185  Miniatura on-line a cura di Federica Toniolo

191  Restauri a cura di Massimo Medica

(vedi saggio A.A. Aletta)

Tav. II. Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale (Médiathèque du Grand Troyes), 960, Gospel book: *Crucifix*, f. 1r.

(vedi saggio B. Kitzinger)
The gospel codex MS 960 in the Bibliothèque municipale de Troyes represents a fixed point in the fluid field of manuscript attributions to ninth-tenth century Brittany. The manuscript has received just recognition for two features: its two colophons, and its Evangelist portraits. The former appear on ff. 1r and 71r, one incorporated into the frontispiece (pl. II), and the other following Luke’s prefatory matter. The first colophon dates the manuscript to 909; the second names the book’s donor, Matthias, his wife Digrenet, and the unknown church of Rosbeith to which they gave the codex. The Evangelist portraits, of which only Mark, Luke and John survive, are of the celebrated Breton ‘beast-headed’ type, full-figure and standing (figs. 1-3). Troyes 960 has been ascribed to the only established Breton scriptorium, at Landévennec – a reasonable, if not certain, attribution.

While attention has been focused on the Evangelists of Troyes 960, the manuscript’s frontispiece has received scant notice. The frontispiece, however, is of great significance to Troyes 960’s place in late-Carolingian era gospel illumination. Together with Angers, Bibliothèque municipale, 24; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Lat. 26; and Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, 45-1980, the manuscript numbers among four Breton (or very closely Breton-affiliated) gospel manuscripts that include an image of Christ on the cross. The paucity of crucifixion imagery internal to gospel manuscripts from the early medieval period renders this concentration in the western French realm particularly striking: the Breton gospel crucifixes make up approximately half the surviving evidence, with the remaining images equally divided in provenance between the Continental and Insular worlds. The significant variations among the Breton crucifixes in terms of their specific iconography and placement within the manuscripts is the subject for a longer study. Focusing upon Troyes 960 introduces that study’s major concerns and establishes the complexity of the manuscript’s conception. I propose here a reading of the frontispiece and Evangelist portraits as two halves of a unified program, followed by observations on Troyes 960’s participation in major intellectual trends of Breton gospel illumination. These communicate a fundamentally instrumental conception of the gospel book, in which images are used to position the manuscript and its reader within the sphere of the Church, and, in turn, to articulate the position of the Church between the Christian past and the end of time.

**The Form of the Frontispiece**

The frontispiece of Troyes 960 is badly damaged. Christ on the cross appears in the central space of a figure-eight mandorla, in which two lateral bulges aligned with the transverse arm of the cross augment the frame. The mandorla was originally filled in pink-orange minim, now entirely abraded except for traces at the bottom and on the left. The same ink was used for inverted triangles marking Christ’s cheeks, for the border of his halo, in the folds of his loincloth, and to inscribe three lines of text surrounding the crucifix: “[HS] XP[S]” above the cross; “[GO] / [UM]” flanking the upper vertical; and “A / ET W” flanking the lower. No nails are visible in Christ’s hands, with their distinctly raised thumbs, or in his splayed feet. Christ is depicted beardless, with staring open eyes, short curly hair, a tightly woven loincloth wrapped around prominent hips, and arms that extend at a sharp angle below his shoulders. Below the base, the cross extends in a thick thorn broken in the middle by two semi-

circular bulges. To either side of the lower part of the cross appears the badly damaged colophonic inscription in a hand closely comparable to that of the text. The form of the mandorla is uncommon. It is a variation on the figure-eight form used for the *Maiestas Domini* in ninth-century Tours manuscripts such as the Vivian Bible (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 1, f. 329v). The mid-section bulges may ultimately derive from a case such as the cover of the Codex Aureus of St. Emmeram (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14000), in which the long cushion on Christ’s throne extends horizontally between the lobes of the frame to create bumps between the upper and lower orbs. A Touronian case such as the incipit to Mark’s gospel in Laon, Bibliothèque municipale, 63 (f. 87r) offers another possible source: there the text is framed by an even quatrelobe that serves as the mandorla to a *Maiestas* through the depiction of the Living Creatures at the frame’s four corners. The lobed figure-eight mandorla has been specifically adapted to the disposition of the cross in Troyes 960. This particular form of mandorla does not appear again in Breton gospel manuscripts; the clean figure-eight design, however, does recur in the Breton context (cf. fig. 9). Christ’s stance is the half-crucifixion, half-orans type best known from the fifth-century wooden doors of Santa Sabina in Rome. The low setting of the arms occurs also in the eighth-century Irish crucifixions from Durham and St. Gall (Durham, Cathedral Library, A.II.17, f. 38v; St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 51, p. 266). Two further Breton examples exist, of which the ivory cross held in Milizac (near Brest), ascribed possibly to Landévennec or, speculatively, to St.
demulseret adulatora. Hic mundus esse praedicaret.

Hi ne rogatus principi se esset respondere. Quod omnispec-
cator ferumisset. Secundum Abraham sit caesar ex nena
uturum..

Manea scutum peditatione. Deambulans inempto se
appare unam. Ee dictur de lazarus resurrectione.

anapedes illum ipsum. S'cappus suas exerxerit. Hic super-
sum num sedet. Iothenabu great undere itum loquor de
zanto frunta quod interea mutatur. Iuxta decet adhuc.

1 equod meli exprimibus crediderit mihi. Sed propter phal-
risaeor non con siteretur

deis discipulae. Laco cessare traditio. Hoc mense no-
pede 

de dilectione fratrum. Quod sepem parte se so-
impso est. Deo suberendo mandeas paraclespsy.

Deinetae 

ocupabas. De dilectione. "Depromissione para-


Hic discipulus paet commenda: Audiatet 

alloquio

qui pate adiudaeoffs. devin iste 

debaraba

affinisque sepulchrum resurrecundum.

EXPLICIUNT CAPITULAE SCION JOHANNEM.
Matthew’s at Finistère, offers the best comparison to Troyes 960 (figs. 4, 5). The comparison extends to the tight wrap of the loincloth, the long face and flat nose closely abutting wide-open eyes, and to the soft definition of the breasts; but the parallel ends there, as the forms of the heads are quite distinct and the hair of the two figures follows two different traditions, one short and curly and the other flowing down the back. A second Breton instance of low-set orans arms appears as a blindpoint drawing scratched beside Mark 4:1 in Reims, Bibliothèque municipale, 8 (f. 49r). Here, a haloed, beardless figure in a flaring tunic appears in orans position in the right-hand margin.

I know of no match in pictorial media for the particular form of the cross in Troyes 960. The thorned ‘Steckkreuz’ form recurs in many early contexts (cf. fig. 6); notably for us in the two crosses that appear in the Breton (or closely Breton-affiliated) Angers 24. The lateral bumps of the Troyes 960 cross represent an unusual modification of the iconography. These are both most logically and most significantly read as an admittedly clumsy frontal view of a sphere. A ball positioned beneath the lower terminus is a common feature of metalwork cross-objects. Most such spheres currently attached to medieval cross-objects are later additions, the original installation apparatus having been lost. Ample pictorial evidence and some material evidence, however, exist to suggest that the configuration was common in the early middle ages. The Troyes crucifix corresponds in form to a metalwork cross-object whose tang runs through its stabilizing ball and emerges on the other side – a point to which we shall return below.

The Ecclesiastical Evangelists and the Extended Maiestas

The three surviving Evangelist portraits in Troyes 960 belong to the type of beast-headed Evangelists common to a prominent subset of the Breton gospel corpus. Marianne Besseyre noted Troyes 960’s participation in a further Breton trend: the representation of the Evangelists as clerics. The surviving Troyes Evangelists each wear a long stola with tassels at the ends, and hold a small book in the right hand, gesturing to it with the left. Each is framed in a mandorla of the same shape as that of the crucifix, and each bears four wings, two draped across the shoulders and two erect behind.

The four wings identify the sacerdotal Evangelists specifically with the Living Creatures in the vision of Ezekiel (1:6). Visually linked together by the repetition of the unusual mandorla frame, the elements of a Maiestas Domi-
are effectively spread across the illuminated pages of Troyes 960\textsuperscript{19}. The specifically apocalyptic nature of the Evangelists’ form, moreover, ties into the eschatological emphasis expressed in the frontispiece through Christ’s words: “Ego sum alpha et omega”\textsuperscript{20} (Revelation 1:8). These words paired with the crucifix combine reference to Christ’s first and second advents. Christ appears at the conceptual (if not the compositional) center of an extended \textit{Maiestas} in a form that emphasizes the juridical context of the Second Coming, where his identity as Judge is predicated upon his role as the Crucified\textsuperscript{21}. The coherence of the illustrative program – a \textit{Maiestas} unlaced and distributed throughout the codex – establishes the gospels’ unity as a single entity active in this Judgment context: the repetition of the distinctive frame and the consistency of eschatological reference bind all the Evangelist portraits to the initial crucifix and create a statement of gospel harmony when the codex is considered as an entity.

The colophon preceding Luke, highlighted in yellow, articulates the importance of the manuscript as a unit in this apocalyptic light:
The colophon names the donors of the manuscript and the church to which they gave it, anathematizing its removal with a curious exception for students’ purposes of writing and reading.

Further, the colophon defines Matian and Digrenet’s motive for the gift – “for their souls” – and describes what the codex contains, what it is properly called (evangelium) and what it is as an object: a portable book containing the inscription (literule). The repetition of definite pronouns underscores the specific force of the text. In the context of the general Judgment laid out in the frontispiece and reinforced at the opening of each gospel, Matian and Digrenet’s book-

gift is designed as a particularized help for particular souls.

The first colophon, wrapping around the thorn of the cross on f. 1r, furthers the specificity of the volume by naming a year and, again, by emphasizing the presence of the book at hand, “hoc evangelium”. Although we cannot glean more information from the damaged script, the position of the note at the base of the cross is worthy of remark. The text was deliberately written within the frame of the mandorla, hugging the lower terminus of the cross. Knowing that the manuscript has been cut down, we can be confident that there would have been room for the inscription at the top or the base of the page. Instead, the text was cramped around the foot of the cross: a charged position in the context of donation and supplication. Any individuals named or implied in the inscription – the makers of the manuscript, and possibly again its donors – have been placed in an established position of subordinance and reverence towards the cross.

The position beneath the cross evokes the actual practice of reverence before a cross that is explicitly depicted in images such as the late ninth-century Crucifixion added to the Psalter of Louis the German (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Theol. lat. fol. 58, f. 120r, fig. 6). Alternate traditions place a protagonist in a permanent position of subordinance to the cross without being explicitly descriptive of reverential action toward it: donor inscriptions on the tangs or lower arms of crosses offer one such instance. Another example of this “iconography of position” appears in the ninth-century gospel book Wolfenbüttel, Herzog-August Bibliothek, Guelf. 16 Aug. 2º, where a small roundel appears below the transverse of the cross formed by the interlaced L and I at the beginning of Matthew (f. 5r, fig. 7). Within this frame appear the silhouettes of a genuflecting priest bringing a book to an enthroned archbishop. This act of offering – referring, perhaps, to the genesis of the book at hand – takes place in the shadow of the cross. That this cross was formed by the letters of the book creates a spiral of reference between the creation and the use of objects that present sacred signs, and the power of those signs to protect their makers and users.

On this score, a great deal has been invested in Troyes 960. Matian and Digrenet’s manuscript is designed to frame their donation in a clear eschatological context bound up in a
Church-centered spirituality that forms a leit-motif through many Breton gospel books. The clerical characterization of the Evangelists identified by Besseyre is a key component of this larger trend. Another is a pronounced emphasis on the gospel book-as-codex. The frontispiece to Fitzwilliam 45-1980 (fig. 8), for example, participates in both these ideas. Here, a Maiestas has been modified to self-reflexive ends in the presentation of the gospel to follow. Shod, unhaloed, dressed in clerically-styled robes and depicted in a singular dynamic posture, reaching out to touch the books of Mark and John, the central figure

takes Christ’s place within a *Maiestas* composition. Carl Nordenfalk proposed an identification as Jerome, by far the most satisfactory solution. Especially read as Jerome, the central figure of the Cambridge frontispiece embodies an approach to gospel illumination deeply concerned with integrating the Christian past, present and future. Jerome’s act of translation is the pre-condition for the activities of scribes, and his compilation of prologue texts set the terms for the exegesis of the gospel history as a unified entity. In the *Plures fuisse*, Jerome presents the gospels as the object of interpretive reflection, relative both to their unity and to their individual symbolism. His appearance among the four symbols in Cambridge amounts to a visual iteration of the prologue text, while his appearance as a cleric and his interaction with Mark and John’s codices assert a characterization of the Gospel-as-gospel book: a tangible instrument of the Church with its source in the past and its utility oriented toward the end of time.

The form of the cross in Troyes 960 is part and parcel of the recurring Breton concerns with instrumentality and liturgical spirituality that I have posited here. The evocation of a metalwork object in the tang and ball of the *Maiestas* cross should not be ascribed simply to a provincial artist’s odd conception or slavish reliance on a crucifix model to hand. Each of the four Breton crucifix images employs a variation on the theme of an articulated cross in a materialized form: Angers 24’s two crosses bear tangs, while Fitzwilliam 45-1980 and Bodleian Laud Lat. 26 present, respectively, a gold-colored and a gemmed cross upon stepped bases. I elaborate upon the ramifications of this formal choice elsewhere. In brief, as in the Psalter of Louis the German, where the cross-tang is depicted as the eminently tangible means by which the cross mediates the kneeling Arnulf’s prayer to the Crucified, the cross of Troyes 960 appears in a form that emphasizes the instrumentality of manufactured cross objects. No one handles the cross in Troyes 960, of course, but the inscription around its base integrates the cross with a context of supplication in view of the Second Coming verbalized later by the inscription naming Matian and Digrenet. The materialized form of the cross is one aspect of a recurring interest in the forms and figures of the Church in Breton manuscripts, which we have also seen in the priestly Evangelists and the Cambridge Jerome. This ecclesiological emphasis ultimately applies to the gospel book itself. The codex is presented as an instrument on par with the manufactured cross-object and with ecclesiastical personnel: an entity proper to the present, with its roots in the Christian past and a direct connection to the anticipated era beyond that of the Church. A final aspect of this Church-centered approach to gospel illumination worth noting here is a certain emphasis on the figures of Mark and Luke in Breton programs. That extra attention should be given to Luke appears logical in the certain knowledge of Breton interest in incorporating the Crucified into the fabric of gospel illumination: established exegetical traditions equate Luke’s bovine symbol with Christ’s sacrifice, and Luke himself with the sacrificial priesthood. Three Breton gospels exhibit a marked interest in Luke and his clerical attributes. These seem linked to Brittany’s Insular-derived traditions rather than to central Carolingian conventions, where Luke’s priesthood is most often asserted through Zacharias. In Boulogne-sur-Mer, Bibliothèque municipale, 8, Luke alone of the Evangelists appears as a full-page portrait (fig. 9): Matthew, Mark and John appear to the left side of their prologue texts, whose initials are small, and sparsely ornamented. Luke’s portrait faces his prologue text, which begins with a large, generous *L*, and his is the only portrait given a figure-eight mandorla frame, backed in yellow. In Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 85, the Evangelists follow the same figure-type as in Boulogne but are more equitably distributed, each framed in a figure-eight border. Luke’s halo, stola, and part of the book he carries, however, were painted with gold. In Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D.2.16, only Luke among the three surviving Evangelist portraits is standing and wearing a stola: the other two are seated, writing, and not dressed specifically as clerics.

The most singular Breton emphasis on Mark has yet to be satisfactorily explained: the iconography of his animal figure is remarkably flexible. Although Mark is labeled “Marcus Leo” in Troyes 960, his portrait does not correspond to traditional leonine forms. With its long nose, small pointed ears and bristly ridge of hair, the Troyes Mark corresponds better to a Breton trend in which Mark is represented with the head of a horse. Jeanne
Laurent first suggested the affinity of the name Marcus and the Old Breton word for horse, Marc’h, as the source of this idiosyncrasy. Louis Lemoine expanded on the unconventionality of Breton Mark portraits, reading those of Troyes 960, Bodleian Auct. D.2.16, and the Milizac cross as dog-headed, rather than horse-headed, in their clear departure from standard forms.

Breton distinction for Mark is evident in other, varying manifestations. In Boulogne 8, Mark is the only Evangelist to hold his right hand in a Greek gesture of blessing, with thumb and ring finger joined. In Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 13169, Mark was the only Evangelist depicted in the manuscript. The portrait was planned in blind-point but never executed in ink, conceived to fill the space remaining below the Marcan prologue (f. 51v). The Evangelist was imagined in similar fashion to Troyes 960, with small, pointed ears and a long snout in profile. In Angers 24 as well, Mark was the only Evangelist selected for representation. There he appears in human form, again placed in the half page remaining below the end of the chapter list. A comparable space could have hosted a portrait following Luke’s chapter list (f. 61v) but was not so utilized; it is probable that no other Evangelist portraits were planned.

In New York Public Library, 115, the only gospel book firmly attributed to Landévennec, the beast-headed portraits of Mark, Luke and John are extant, and a Maiestas composition replaces a Matthew portrait. Mark’s portrait is the smallest, inserted below the explicit of his chapter list, in order to have it face the beginning of the Evangelist’s text (fig. 10). While in this respect provisional, Mark’s portrait is simultaneously the manuscript’s most elaborated. Like the other Evangelists in New York Public Library 115, Mark holds a tablet proclaiming the resurrection of the Lord, but alone among them, Mark also holds an upright palmette. An echo of this frond appears in a sprig held by Christ in the Maiestas. Mark’s portrait is further distinguished by its setting between two trees at foot level, and between two signs framed in violet at
These signs are otherwise unparalleled in the manuscript, and resemble a simplified version of the Chi-Rho monogram. The grounds for emphasis on either Mark or Luke in Brittany are not readily explained. No parallel has been found for the pericope listed for the Feast of St. Luke on October 18 (Luke 19:12) in New York 115, suggesting a locally-crafted liturgy for the day that departs from the generally-observed pattern of Roman and Insular-influenced readings in the Breton liturgical year. Records show only a dedication to Matthew among the four Evangelists as the patron of a major Breton monastery in the Carolingian period. In the particular case of New York 115, the most likely explanation for a special characterization of Mark may relate to the inscriptions of the Evangelists’ books: the monogram-like signs in combination with the palmette and the pair of trees indicates a strengthened identification of Mark as the harbinger of Christ’s resurrection. This in turn reflects an interest in theGregorian tradition of four-symbols exegesis that may also support a Lucan-related emphasis on the crucifixion.

In more general terms, a pattern of interest in Mark and Luke concurs with the emphasis on the priesthood and the Church evident in various aspects of the Breton gospels. In his commentary on Matthew, Jerome distinguished between the sources of the four gospels: Christ himself for Matthew and John; Peter and Paul for Mark and Luke. Mark and Luke represent the apostolic tradition, the Evangelists working already within the Church. It seems possible to understand the distinction given to Mark and Luke in the Breton examples in light of the more general involvement with the instruments and figures of the Church evident in other aspects of Breton gospel illumination, such as the priestly Evangelists, the materialized form of the cross, and the utility ascribed to the gospel codex.

Beyond the purview of gospel books, surviving Breton manuscripts reflect an ecclesiastical culture concerned with learning, and with both the practice and the theory of clerical offices. Production included books designed for study and reflection on the ministry, the organization of the Church and its liturgy. The prevalence of ecclesiastical emphasis that we see in Breton gospel illumination testifies to a culture that prized and cultivated the relationship of its Church to a larger ecclesiology, and drew celebratory attention to the actions and instruments of Church rite. In a similar vein, Julia Smith has described a broad pattern of reverence in the region for the secondary relics of holy men – particularly their books, crosses, and bells. A concurrent reverence appears for the apostolic, broadly conceived. The relics of Pope Marcellinus held at Brittany’s Redon Abbey turned the region into a kind of Roman outpost and a stop along papally-ordered penitential tours. Daoulas was a monastery devoted to Saint Jaoua, one of the companions of Paul; and a late ninth-century dedication to Saint Peter is known for a rich foundation near Redon. The very prevalence of gospel book production in Brittany may be considered part of this larger...
apostolic picture\textsuperscript{39}. Troyes 960 offers a rich example of the way in which the visual program of Breton gospel books may illuminate the character of a religious community concerned with defining itself and its artistic productions within the sphere of the Church, as seen with a view toward the eschaton; and with crafting a distinctive visual language to do so\textsuperscript{44}.


5) Seven known fully-realized internal gospel crucifixions datable to the eighth and ninth centuries survive: two Insular (Durham, Cathedral Library, A.II.17 and St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 51), one from St-Amand in Paris (Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 257), and our four from western France. Two more are supposed from the crucifixion pages probably original to Cologne, Diözesanarchiv, 14 (sometimes itself considered a Breton affiliate), and the Irish Book of Kells (Dublin, Trinity College, A.I.6 [58]). Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de
France, lat. 258 is a gospel attributed to tenth-century Fécamp that includes the added drawing of a crucifix before the canon tables and a resurrected Christ after them.

6) I refer the reader to my dissertation, Cross and Book: Late-Carolingian Breton Gospel Illumination and the Instrumental Cross, Harvard University 2012 (in preparation for publication).

7) Prior to the addition of Bouhier’s ex libris on f. Ar, the first folio had been pasted down. The parchment is badly abraded and stained by the adhesive, and much of the colored ink is lost. A fine linen layer adheres to all the pages of Quire 1.

8) The inscription as published in SAMARAN – MARICHAL, Catalogue des manuscrits cit. omits the ‘Ego sum’.

9) Upon close inspection, it is evident that the pupil of Christ’s proper right eye is formed oblong and straight while the pupil of his proper left is set at a slant.

10) For a transcription of the partially illegible text, see the Catalogue général cit., pp. 394-395. The first line (broken at the cross) reads: “IN VI CVIII / d cccc viiiii”.


12) Fundamentally on crucifix stances: R. HAUSSEHRR, Der tote Christus am Kreuz, zur Ikonographie der Gerokreuzes, Bonn 1963, p. 203, briefly on the Santa Sabina doors.

13) R. BARRIE – Y.-P. CASTEL, La croix d’ivoire de Milizac, in Landévennec et le monachisme breton cit., pp. 155-166. The authors date the cross to the late eighth century. A ninth-tenth century date seems more probable, based on comparison of the crucifix with Troyes 960 and the Evangelist figures with Brem 85, New York 115, and Bodleian Auct. D.2.16; and also remarking the pearled border for the cross, which BARRIE – CASTEL acknowledged to be a Carolingian trait (p. 163).

14) These two traditions are evenly represented among the Breton ‘crucifixion gospels’: Angers 24 and Bodleian Laud Lat. 26 adopt the long-haired, bearded Christ, while Troyes 960 and Fitzwilliam 45-1980 depict the short-haired, beardless Christ.

15) In the lower margin of the page appear two further drawings in ink: a coin, and the figures of an Entombment scene. The Entombment bears important comparison to the illumination of Angers 24, as does one of its additional texts, helping knit together the corpus of western French manuscripts.


17) Christ holds a staff-cross with a ball on the front panel of the Golden Altar of Sant’Ambrogio in Milan (c. 840). Another clear example appears in the tenth-century Chartres Gospels on a cross-staff held by the Lamb (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 9386, f. 13v). The deep roots of the tradition are evident in the sixth-seventh century chalice from the Attarouthi Treasure held at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York (1986.3.10).


28) The garment seems best described as a form of a chasuble, corresponding to Joseph Braun’s description of a Roman type with roots in late antiquity: J. BRAUN, Die liturgische Paramente in Gegenwart und Vergangenheit: ein Handbuch der Paramentik, Freiburg i. Br. 1924, p. 100. The under-robe is executed in mottled blue and yellow wash, with the over-robe in blue.

29) WORMALD, An Early Breton Gospel Book cit., p. 8, n. 1. Conceptual, if not formal, Touronian parallels appear in the Jerome frontispieces of the Vivian Bible (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 1, f. 3v) and the Bible of San Paolo fuori le Mura (Roma, Biblioteca della basilica di San Paolo fuori le Mura, s.n., f. 2v). An author portrait of the writing Jerome introduces Cologne 14 (f. 1v).

30) The remaining program of Fitzwilliam 45-1980 represents one of the most extensive historical Passion sequences in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Mark and a Crucifixion in Luke, while a missal sequence in gospels from the period: a Betrayal survives in Martin von der sulz, und yellow wash, with the over-robe in blue.


47) Gospel books make up the bulk of manuscripts ascribed to Brittany. Julia Smith has broken the remaining manuscript production into three useful groups: texts “of practical value for priests”, medical manuscripts, and texts for study. J.M.H. SMITH, Province and Empire: Brittany and the Carolingians, Cambridge – New York 1992, p. 171.
48) Such volumes include the Libellus sacerdotalis of Liomsmonoc, several copies of Amalarius’ Liber officii, Ambrose’s De officiis ministrorum, penitential and canonical material inherited from Ireland, and commentaries on the gospel readings of the liturgical year.
49) One might cite in this context the frontispiece to a Breton collection of canon law dated c. 800 (The Hague, Museum Meermanno-Westreenianum, 10 B 4, f. 1v), ascribed to Brittany. Julia Smith has broken the remains of these two Evangelists, where Matthew’s portrait contains no additional element and John alone is flanked by hanging crowns. A sprout of vegetation that eludes ready explanation in a similar fashion to New York 115’s appears above the writing hand of Mark; a similar frond is given to Luke.
52) DEUFFIC, Le ‘monachisme breton’ cit., pp. 100 and 109.
54) J.J.G. ALEXANDER, La résistance à la domination culturelle carolingienne dans l’art breton du IXe siècle: le témoignage de l’enluminure des manuscrits, in Landévenneec et le monachisme breton cit., pp. 269-280 describes the distinction of Breton illumination in a political light.
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Abstract
Troyes, Bibliothèque municipale, 960 e l’illustrazione dei Vangeli nella Bretagna del IX-X secolo
Il manoscritto 960 della Bibliothèque municipale di Troyes è noto soprattutto per il suo colophon, che lo data al 909, per i ritratti degli evangelisti, del tipo a testa di animale comune nei Vangeli bretoni del IX-X secolo, e per le stori di cui le figure degli evangelisti sono rive- sitte. In questa sede, il frontespizio del codice è analizzato quale componente integrale del programma visuale del manoscritto e vengono esaminate alcune tendenze comuni ai Vangeli bretoni, compreso quello in questo questione. Sono quindi affrontate le caratteristiche del crocefisso rappresentato sul frontespizio e il suo rapporto con i ritratti degli evangelisti, nonché la rilevanza accordata a Marco e Luca, e al crocefisso stesso, in numerosi Vangeli assegnabili alla Bretagna tardocarolingia. Viene sostenuta una concezione ‘strumentale’ dei Vangeli nella produzione bretoni dei manoscritti, concezione che nel Troys 960 è evidenziata dalla forma del frontespizio, dall’iconografia dei ritratti degli evangelisti e dal testo dei colophons.