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ABSTRACT

The Passional of Abbess Cunegund, 1312-1314, stands alone in medieval Czech art, valued for its well-preserved, finely-executed Gothic illuminations. It is little known internationally, although its art reflects trends that developed beyond the borders of the Kingdom of Bohemia. This thesis, the first study on the subject in English, seeks to establish an artistic heritage for the illustrations, based on comparative study, critical analysis and close observation. The hypothesis presented here is that the art of the Passional is connected with work emerging from the Westminster painting workshops in the early years of the fourteenth century and that the artist imported English artistic traits that may be identified in the Prague, Passional illustrations. The relevance of historical events unfolding in the peri-production period, both in Prague and abroad, is also considered alongside the apparent influence of the manuscript’s remarkable patron, the abbess/princess Cunegund. The Passional and its protagonists are introduced together with a thorough description of the manuscript’s contents. The dating of the manuscript is addressed. This is followed by a systematic examination of the long-standing argument over whether or not the artist and scribe were separate individuals. The problematic stylistic relationship between the Passional illustrations and manuscript art of late-thirteenth/early-fourteenth-century Bohemia and its neighbours is then addressed. The iconography of the Passional is examined in detail, concentrating on its more individual aspects. Reasons are considered for certain iconographic inclusions paying careful attention to the relationship between images and various texts: not only the Passional treatises and rubric titles, but other relevant sources. The final chapter sets out evidence for the hypothesis, through a series of detailed artistic comparisons with contemporary English examples including from the De Lisle, Queen Mary and Fenland Psalters, and artwork in Westminster Abbey, before drawing a final conclusion.
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JENNIFER SUSAN VLČEK SCHURR
INTRODUCTION

The ancient Basilica of St. George is situated within the Prague citadel, Hradčany, in proximity to the royal palace, and may be visited today.\(^1\) It was built under Vratislav I (c.888-February 13, 921), son of Bořivoj (c.852/853-888/889),\(^2\) the first Premyslide Lord and Christian ruler of the Czechs, and was consecrated in 925.\(^3\) (The Premyslide Lords held sway over the Czech Lands; in 1198, non-hereditary kingship was first conferred upon them by the endowment of the office of “Imperial cup-bearer”;\(^4\) dynastic, hereditary rights to rule were ratified by Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II, Sicilian Golden Bull, September 26, 1212.)\(^5\) Vratislav I’s wife, St. Ludmila of Pšov (c.860-September 15, 921),\(^6\) like her grandson St. Wenceslas (c.907-September 28, 929/935),\(^7\) was a national patron saint, and her relics became the basilica’s most precious possession, particularly following the awarding of papal indulgences in 1250.\(^8\) Consequently, St. George’s Basilica became an important pilgrimage destination. The right humerus of St. George, another national patron and to whom the basilica was dedicated, was also preserved there.\(^9\) Under the rule of St. Wenceslas’ nephew, Boleslav II (c.932-February 7, 999), a convent was founded in c.973, attached to the basilica. This was the first religious community to be established in Bohemia.\(^10\) Boleslav II’s sister, Mlada (c.930/935-April 9, 994), personally petitioned Pope John XII in Rome to institute her Benedictine convent in Prague, marking her Christian commitment by changing her name to Mary.\(^11\) Over a period of five centuries, a strong association continued to exist between the ruling family of Přemysl and the Basilica and the Convent of St. George.\(^12\) The latter provided a retreat for many royal females.\(^13\)

---

\(^1\) Appendix I.
\(^2\) Appendix IIa.
\(^3\) Ivan Borkovský, *Pražský hrad v době přemyslovských knížat* (Prague, 1969), 102.
\(^5\) Ibid., 40-41.
\(^6\) Abbess Cunegund’s great (x10) grandmother.
\(^7\) Pp.88-89, 94; Cunegund’s great (x9) uncle, known to us as “Good King Wenceslas”, whose coat-of-arms appear on fol.1v.
\(^12\) Appendix IIb.
\(^13\) Mlada, (930/935-9.4.994) foundress and first abbess; Ludmila (d.after 1100), nun, daughter of Vratislav II and sister of Žďár (see Václav Vladoj Tomek, *Dějepis města Prahy*, 12 vols. (Prague, 1855), 1:15; *Agnes* (d.7.6.1298), half-sister of King Otakar I, abbess; possibly followed as abbess by Hedwig, previously a nun in Gernrode Convent, the fourth child and youngest daughter of King Otakar I (c.1155-15.12,1230) by
Nothing remains of the medieval convent but the heavily altered chapel.\textsuperscript{14} From 1302-1321, the convent’s abbess was the highest-ranking Premyslide princess, Cunegund (January, 1265-November 27, 1321). She was devout and intelligent:\textsuperscript{15} during her incumbency she dedicated theological anthologies to the convent library, five of which survive.\textsuperscript{16} each with an inscription explicitly demonstrating Cunegund’s control over their content by declaring that she had “presented,” “gathered together,” “bound together,” or “commissioned to be written,” each volume.\textsuperscript{17} It was she who commissioned the unique manuscript, the so-called Passional of Abbess Cunegund,\textsuperscript{18} around which the following thesis is built. The Passional manuscript remained within the library of the Convent of St. George until the establishment’s closure, by imperial edict, March 7, 1782.\textsuperscript{19}

The following thesis sets out to examine thoroughly the illustrations of this remarkable codex, seeking to establish their artistic origin. It also aims to look at the manuscript within its rightful context – religious, spiritual and social – in order to grasp the artist’s full intent and to explain his, often unusual, iconographic choices. This study differs from many previous commentaries in providing close, critical and comparative analysis of the Passional illustrations, and it is the first, comprehensive examination of this manuscript in the English language. This is particularly significant since, for the first time, Westminster in the early years of the fourteenth century is offered as the possible location for the


\textsuperscript{14} Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, MS XIII.E.14c-1303; MS XIV.D.13-1306; MS XIV.E.10-1312; MS XII.D.11-1318; MS XII.D.10-1319; [MS XII.D.13-undicated and undated]; see Manuscriptorium, on-line manuscript catalogue and digital library, Národní knihovna České republiky, Prague, www.manuscriptorium.cz – viewed from 30.10.2007.

\textsuperscript{15} In the second half of the seventeenth century, the chapel was rededicated to St. Anne, and major alterations undertaken under Abbess Anna Schönweiss of Eckstein, Anežka Merhautová, Bazilika Svatého Jiří na Pražském hradě (Prague, 1966), 64, and Borkovský, Pražský hrad, 79 and 103. I suggest that the chapel was renamed to honour her patron namesake.

\textsuperscript{16} See Urbánková, 12, Pavel Vlček, et al., Únělecké památky Prahy 1, Pražský hrad a hradčany (Prague, 2000), 226-232.

\textsuperscript{17} See Urbánková, 12, Pavel Vlček, et al., Únělecké památky Prahy 1, Pražský hrad a hradčany (Prague, 2000), 226-232.
genesis of the art of the Passional. This carries with it some important implications for our understanding of both English and Czech medieval art.

The opening chapter provides a full description of the manuscript and, following a brief introduction to the protagonists and their association with the work, a detailed presentation of the contents is set down. The second chapter compares the style of the Passional illustrations with that of work produced in Bohemia and neighbouring countries at the turn of the century. This is necessary in preparing for a later appraisal of possible associations farther afield. The third chapter examines distinctive aspects of the Passional’s iconography, much of which is original and specifically shaped to meet the spiritual and religious tastes and needs of the work’s patron. In the final chapter, on the strength of the preceding analysis, I set out my hypothesis and proceed to address it through careful comparisons and argument. I hope to establish beyond doubt the connections between the art of the Passional, one of the most significant works of Czech art, and work produced in the court of Westminster, and in Westminster Abbey, at the beginning of the reign of Edward II, concluding that England was indeed the training-ground of the master artist responsible for the illumination of the Passional of Abbess Cunegund.
1. **ABBESS CUNEGRUND’S FLORILEGIUM – Description and contents**

The so-called Pasionál abatyše Kunhuty - Passional of Abbess Cunegund [fig. 1.1] stands out from the other surviving medieval codices found in the library of the Benedictine Convent of St. George, Prague [fig. 1.2]. It has long been recognised, since it first came to light in the eighteenth century, for its unique qualities. The greatest of these is, without doubt, the fine, narrative and devotional illustrations that accompany the text. The Passional was undertaken as a choice project: the personal commission of Abbess Cunegund (January, 1265- November 27, 1321) who, from 1306, was the most senior member of the long-ruling, Premyslide dynasty as the eldest daughter of the powerful King Otakar II (c.1233-1278) and his second wife, Cunegund of Hungary (c.1246-September 9, 1285). From 1302 until her death in 1321, the Convent of St. George was under her direction. Princess/Abbess Cunegund is introduced to the reader of the Passional in the magnificent, full-page, opening illumination: the *Dedication Illustration* (fol.1v). Beside her is the entire cast involved in the manuscript’s production and reception with the exception of the artist. The anonymous Passional artist would, however, have had no place amongst this gathering of intellectual and religious Czechs all of whom were intimately related with St. George’s Convent. He is nevertheless present, in a very real sense, in his illumination. The master, and his art, will be at the centre of the ensuing thesis.

Before presenting the codex as a physical object, I shall briefly expand on the introductions made on fol.1v for the role of the personnel involved in the Passional’s production is relevant to further discussions of the manuscript. Much information is provided by the rubric titles that accompany the *Dedication Illustration* and these will be considered first. Cunegund’s own rubric title reads: “Cunegund, the most serene abbess of the monastery of St. George in the citadel of Prague, daughter of His Majesty Otakar II the King of Bohemia.” (This title refers back to the rule of Cunegund’s Premyslide father. At the time of the creation of the Passional, Bohemia was governed by John of Luxembourg (August 10, 1296-August 26, 1346) and Cunegund’s Premyslide niece Eliška (January 20, 226).

---

20 Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, MS XIV.A.17; hereafter cited as the Passional. The manuscript’s illustrations are referred to by descriptive titles. Otherwise unqualified folio references refer to the Passional. For Passional illustrations, see [fig. 1.1], unless specifically directed to other figs. Czech names have been anglicised where appropriate.
21 Appendix I.
23 Appendix IIa-IIb.
24 “CHUNEGUNDIS / abbatissa monasterii / sancti georgii in castro / pragensi serenissimi / boemiæ regis domini / Ottacarii secundii / filia” title, fol.1v.
1292—September 28, 1330). Cunegund’s title is the first item to be read by the viewer since it is placed top-left of the page. It is provided with gilded capitals “CH”: a rare distinction in the manuscript where gold is almost exclusively reserved for haloes and crowns. (The only other gilded letter in the manuscript is the “E” that opens the dedication speech on the facing page, fol.2r.) The remainder of Cunegund’s name appears in alternate blue and red capitals that provide symmetry on the page, balancing the blue and red capitals that introduce the attendant nuns: “Prioress with her convent.” The nuns’ title is executed using letters in the same scriptorial hierarchy as Cunegund’s – the letters are even larger – which presents the sisters as important protagonists, presumably not only at the occasion depicted but also in the reception of the Passional. The prioress, however, is not specifically identified, leaving the viewer in no doubt of Cunegund’s pre-eminence in the convent. It may be assumed that these blue and red painted letters were provided by the artist on scribal instruction as was the custom of the time. Two other titles introduce the men pictured kneeling before Cunegund; both important protagonists of the Passional manuscript.

The title introducing the Dominican Colda, kneeling nearest the throne, is in the same size script as Cunegund’s title but introduced by a blue “F” with simple red embellishment; lower in the hierarchy of initials. It informs the reader of his identity, from whence he came, and his role in the production of the Passional: “Brother Colda, lector from St. Clement of the order of preaching brothers, the distinguished dictator of this book.” Colda was from a noble Meissen family, Colda of Colditz, with estates in Bohemia. He declares himself within the pages of the Passional to have composed the first and third treatises, and is shown presenting his first offering to Cunegund. In his oration, he informs the reader that he had been well received in the court of Cunegund’s brother, King

25 Appendix IIb.
26 P.54.
27 “Priores/sa cum conventu” title, fol.1v. There is a correction to this title: remnants of a scratched out ✠, now replaced by “cum”, and a removal of the “S” at the end of the title. Originally, the text read “PRIORISSA ✠ CONVENTUS” (both in the nominative). This was altered to the present form, “PRIORISSA CUM CONVENTU” (nominative, cum + ablative). Perhaps this was considered more inclusive, grammatically correct or perhaps less clumsy: a title rather than two separate nouns.
28 P.76-77.
31 P.30.
Wenceslas II (September 27, 1271-June 21, 1305), and that he wished to extend his association with the royal family (fol. 2rb25-28 to 2va1-6). His relationship to Cunegund was as her possible mentor and confessor. A more modest rubric title introduces the scribe Beneš: the smaller script reflects his lower status. It wraps around his kneeling figure, declaring him to be: “Beneš canon of [the Basilica of] St. George the scribe of this book.” Beneš was one of nine canons: five secular priests, two deacons and two subdeacons, who were maintained by the Basilica of St. George. According to fragmentary accounts, the Fragmentum Codicis Praebendarum from St. George’s Basilica and Convent, which were compiled some thirty years after Cunegund’s death, Beneš also had responsibilities as vicar of “the living, the main part of which is on the estate of Přílepy…so Beneš took over that living.”

The rubric script within the speech banner that rises from Colda’s left hand in the fol. 1v Dedication Illustration informs the reader that Cunegund herself commissioned the first treatise. This declaration was written out in continuous prose; it is, however, poetic leonine pentameter:

Suscipe dictata de Regnum semine nata,
ad laudem Christi que / me dictare fecisti.
De sponsō plura sub militis apta figura.

This translates as, “Receive these dictated exercises, one born from the seed of Kings, which you made me write [meaning compose] in praise of Christ; many things about the

---

34 There is little doubt that Colda was Cunegund’s spiritual guide and confessor, Toussaint, 55. It is unimaginable that the confession of an abbess/princess would be taken by a member of her own, canonical staff. The duty of cura monialium (the sacerdotal and pastoral care of nuns and devout women), was allocated in 1267 to the Dominicans, as educators, by Pope Clement IV, Jeffrey F. Hamburger, “The Use of Images in the Pastoral Care of Nuns: The Case of Heinrich Suso and the Dominicans,” The Art Bulletin 71, no. 1, March (1989): 20–46, at 21.
35 “Benessius Canonicus Sancti / georgij scriptor eiusdem / libri,” title, fol. 1v.
36 See Tomek, Dějepis, 1:445.
37 Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, Fragmentum Praebendarum, Distributionum et Officiorum in Ecclesia S. Georgii Castri Pragensis, MS XIII.A.2; also, transcr. Dobner, 6:334-368. These fragmentary prebendarry accounts and contracts were compiled by a clerk Udalricus (note on front pastedown of MS) who, according to Dobner, 6:334 n. b, is referred to in John of Luxembourg’s Tabuli Regni, 1319. The accounts are contained in the second of originally three mid-fourteenth-century volumes saved from a fire in 1541; see also Tomek, Dějepis, 1:445, who gives a fascinating account of the duties and rewards, beyond their portion of the offering at the masses they administered, offered to the canons for their service not only in money but also in beer, wine, pork etc. and half the tithes gathered from their living.
38 “Ite in praebenda cujus corpus est in villa Przilep…cui Benessius in eadem praebenda successit.” NKČR MS XIII.A.2, fol. 6v23 and fol. 6v28-29; also, Dobner, 6:348; see p.41.
39 P.69,
40 Speech banner, fol. 1v.
41 This suggests that Colda is referring to the treatise as a spiritual exercise - a subject of my present research.
42 Dobner, 6:330, incorrectly transcribed semine, seed, as sanguine, blood.
bridegroom in the fitting guise of a soldier." It suggests that, as well as commissioning the treatise, Cunegund may have ordained the subject. Several other rubric titles in the Passional are similarly poetic and their important relationship to the images will become apparent in later discussion.

The artist leaves the viewer in no doubt of Cunegund’s elevated status as Premyslid princess and abbess. She is portrayed enthroned beneath an ornate, Gothic arch, dominating fol.1v’s patron image. Cunegund’s journey to becoming abbess of the Convent of St. George was complex and will be shown to have had a potentially important influence over the Passional’s artistic content. The following, necessarily brief summary of Cunegund’s life will prove to be a useful point of reference. In 1257, Richard Duke of Cornwall, in gratitude for Otakar II’s casting vote electing him as King of the Romans/Germans, granted Otakar II a privilegium securing female, royal inheritance rights. Cunegund was therefore heir to the throne of Bohemia from her birth in 1265 until the age of six when the future king, Wenceslas II, was born, September 27, 1271. On September 8, 1277, Otakar II placed his then-twelve-year-old daughter, Cunegund, with the Order of Poor Clares in St. Francis’ Convent, “Na Františku”, Prague [fig. 1.3], to avoid her marrying the son of his arch-enemy, Rudolph Habsburg. After spending fourteen years as a fully-committed nun in the Clarisse convent - under the care of her great aunt Agnes, later St. Agnes of Bohemia - Cunegund’s brother, Wenceslas II, withdrew her from enclosure. She was then twenty-six-years old. By arranging for Cunegund to marry Boleslav II, Count of Mazovia, Wenceslas succeeded in enhancing his claim to the Polish throne. Approximately a year later, in August, 1292, Wenceslas made

---

43 Speech banner, fol.1v (English translation).
44 Chapter 3.
45 Pp.70-71.
46 Pp.72-73.
47 P. 51. Žemlička, Století, 128-129.
48 Appendix I.
50 St. Agnes (St. Agnes of Bohemia) (c.1211-6.3.1282).
51 Karel Stejskal, Pasionál Premyslovny Kunhuty – Passionale Abbatissae Cunegundis, Ema Urbánková and Karel Stejskal (Prague, 1975), 21-146, at 35, gives the date of her removal as 1291; Tomek, Dějepis, 1:209, states, 1290.
52 Not aged eleven, as stated by Alfred Thomas, “Between Court and Cloister - Royal Patronage and Nuns’ Literacy in Medieval East-Central Europe,” in Nuns’ Literacies in Medieval Europe - The Hull Dialogue, ed. Virginia Blanton, Veronica O’Mara, and Patricia Stoop (Turnhout, 2013), 207-221, at 214.
53 Žemlička, Století, 178.
his victorious entry to Krakow.\textsuperscript{54} He became King of Poland in August 1300.\textsuperscript{55} It is recorded that Cunegund bore her husband a daughter, Euphrosyne (1292-1324), and a son, Wenceslas (c.1293-1316).\textsuperscript{56} In 1302, Cunegund, then aged thirty-seven, seemed determined to complete her life as a nun. She applied to the pope and, presumably recognising her marriage to have been a matter of political expediency, Boniface VIII granted its dissolution in 1302,\textsuperscript{57} and simultaneously ratified her position as Abbess of St. George’s Convent in Prague.\textsuperscript{58}

It should be noted that a second daughter, Perchta, may have been born c.1295-1301 prior to Cunegund’s return to Prague. This is suggested by an ambiguous rubric title running along the inner fold of the manuscript and accompanying the illustration of a diminutive nun on the far right of the \textit{Dedication Illustration} on fol.1v. The title reads: “Nonna [P]erchta domingae abbatissae filiae regis gnatta [or gnana]”, translated as, “the nun Perchta, daughter [or dwarf] of the Mistress Abbess [who is herself] the daughter of the King.” Since the nineteenth-century, published debate between the philosopher, ethnographer and literary historian, Ignác Jan Hanuš (November 28, 1812-May 19, 1869), and Jan Vocel (August 23,1802-September 16, 1871), poet, dramatist and cultural commentator, the identity of this little figure has been a point of argument.\textsuperscript{59} This centred around the ambiguously scribed gnatta – daughter - as transcribed by Jan Gelasius Dobner,\textsuperscript{60} or perhaps gnana – dwarf, as suggested by Hanuš.\textsuperscript{61} General opinion today

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{54} Soukupová, 183.
\textsuperscript{55} Following the deaths of Prince Leška the Black of Krakow, 1289, and his heir Henry IV of Warsaw, 1290, the Premyslide Wenceslas II ruled Czech and Polish Lands, ibid., 209.
\textsuperscript{56} Oswald Balzer, \textit{Genealogie Piastów} (Krakow 2005), 735, 743 (and Tablica IX, Linia Mazovowiecka I) 781. Balzer includes Perchta on the family tree.
\textsuperscript{57} Boleslav II died April 20, 1313, the year following presentation of the first Passional treatise, ibid., 781.
\textsuperscript{60} Dobner, 6:330.
\textsuperscript{61} Hanuš, in Hanuš and Vocel, 227, read gnana – dwarf; Vocel, gnatta – daughter. Hanuš considered Perchta’s small stature and out-lying position inappropriate for Cunegund’s possible daughter. Children under seven were considered dependent, education commencing at this age, Marc Morris, \textit{A Great and Terrible King – Edward I and the Forging of Britain} (London, 2009), 7, and Paul Crossley, “The Politics of Presentation: The Architecture of Charles IV of Bohemia,” in \textit{Courts and Regions in Medieval Europe}, eds. Sarah Rees Jones, Richard Marks, and Alistair J. Minnis (Woodbridge, 2000), 99-172, at 112. The infant would have to travel to Prague with Cunegund. If so, Perchta could have been as young as ten or eleven in 1312, her small size therefore an expression of youth, just as Cunegund’s size is exaggerated to convey her importance. The Rule of Benedict imposed strict hierarchy (Chapter LXIII: 7, dictates that members of the community, “take their places according to the time of their coming to the monastery”, St. Benedict of Nursia, \textit{The Rule of St. Benedict}, trans. Abbot Parry OSB (Leominster, 2003), 101), therefore Perchta’s position at the edge of the company may indicate that she was the most recently admitted to the convent. There are many examples of children raised in convents, including Cunegund herself, and her niece Eliška, the future Queen of Bohemia. It would have been wholly appropriate for Cunegund’s daughter to have been
\end{footnotesize}
seems to rest with the transcription gnana.\textsuperscript{62} The letters are ambiguous but I remain unpersuaded. I regard gnatta as still worthy of consideration. Albert Derolez, points out that it is common for the shaft of the letter \textquote{t} to be the same height as the smaller letters.\textsuperscript{63} this can be seen in the \textquote{t} of \textquote{Perchta} and \textquote{abbatissae} in this very rubric title. He also remarks that short ascenders with triangular strokes at their tops are a frequent feature of Central European script: again, we may refer to the examples in this rubric.\textsuperscript{64} The triangular tops are, no doubt, diminished in this word but this title is written in very small script, lies close to the inner margin and shows marked signs of wear. Note, the comparable \textquote{t} of the title \textquote{latro} – brigand - on fol.3v’s second image. If \textquote{n}, the second and uncontested letter in the fol.1v word, is compared with the letter(s) under scrutiny, it may be observed that in the latter both ascenders, particularly the second, curve markedly forward quite unlike the strong straight ascenders of the former. Further, I offer as evidence for the existence of Perchta, as a daughter of Cunegund, the remarkable presence of two skulls in Cunegund’s grave; one larger than the other.\textsuperscript{65}

Cunegund was admired in her day as a benefactress. The five surviving florilegia, referred to above, which were specifically compiled and gifted by her to her community, reflect not only her wish to expand the nuns’ theological knowledge but also her own personal intellectualism and pious tendencies.\textsuperscript{66} Near-contemporary evidence survives, written some thirty years after her death, of Cunegund’s generosity towards her convent, and of their affection and good opinion. (Underlining has been added for clarity):

\begin{quote}
After the founder, Mistress Cunegund, the daughter of King Přemysl is foremost in the memories and prayers of people of the present day, who enriched the abbesses who succeeded her and the nuns subordinate to her, surplus to her dues, serving as an example of pious, monastic demeanour and reverence, in time of barren years
\end{quote}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{62}Urbánková, 12, and Gia Toussaint, \textit{Das Passional der Kunigunde von Böhmen – Bildrhetorik und Spiritualität} (Paderborn, 2003), 44-46, hereafter cited as Toussaint, refers to the eighteenth-century history of the convent, Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky MS XVI.B.2/a, fol.173v-174r, to a Moorish dwarf brought as Cunegund’s companion from Mazovia. It has been used as evidence by Urbánková and Toussaint, 44-46. The manuscript refers to a red gravestone, similar to others in the convent chapel, which was traditionally thought to be that of Cunegund’s dwarf-companion (fol.174r). This account was written 400 years after the event, and could arguably be an apocryphal explanation for the Passional image and its ambiguous rubric.
\textsuperscript{63}Derolez, 93.
\textsuperscript{64}Ibid., 79.
\textsuperscript{65}First presented in a paper: “Cunegund - ‘Bartered Bride’ and ‘Bride of Christ’”, in the section \textit{The Construction of the Other in Medieval Europe}, at the 11th Congress of Czech Historians, Olomouc, October 2017.
\textsuperscript{66}P.5.
and of wars, seeing ahead to sustain life from the royal estate, particularly her dowry: and also with books, sacred vessels, panels,\(^\text{67}\) jewels, liturgical garments, and also possessions given with abundant largesse. She also augmented support for the sacristan and those who tend to the tables and the featherbeds of the infirm, and also the holder of the office of housekeeper. She had it instituted, enduring for all time, that the canons, however, had two feasts with food and drink and eight evenings [dinners or free time?] as said above of the aforementioned funds, and it is pronounced in the covenant records, and for the abbesses who succeed her, the women or men in authority who will be responsible for the convent.\(^\text{68}\)

This document provides a unique window onto the extent of patronage, and the quality of the woman who commissioned the artist to paint her Passional. In addition, she purchased villages for the benefit of both the convent and her soul, indicating the degree of financial independence she enjoyed: “Abess Cunegund later, in 1320, bought in her own name the villages of Strīmelice,\(^\text{69}\) Zvánovice\(^\text{70}\) and Hacky near Čslavsko\(^\text{71}\), and gave them to the convent so that yearly memoria for her soul would be provided from their income.”\(^\text{72}\)

Perhaps she was already ill when she made these preparations: she died November 27, the following year, 1321, aged fifty-six, and was buried in the convent Chapel of the Virgin Mary, situated in the southeast corner of the convent cloister.\(^\text{73}\)

* The so-called Passional of Abbess Cunegund appears to have gained its mistaken title from archival cataloguing: it is not a “Passional”,\(^\text{74}\) despite having Christ’s Passion as its main theme. Stuck to the front cover of the work is what remains of an almost indecipherable, library classification label. This was linked by Ema Urbánková, the former chief librarian of the Národní knihovna České republiky, to an entry in the archive catalogue of 1692,\(^\text{75}\) added in an eighteenth-century hand, which describes the manuscript as Liber de Passionis

\(^{67}\) This may have included painted altarpieces etc.- no longer extant.

\(^{68}\) “Primum quidem post fundatorem / ut in memoria est praesentium hominum Domina Cunegundis filia regis Przemysl prædicta // ultra ea bona per quæ suæ successores abbatissas eft sibi subditas moniales sancte / conversationis et religiosi exemplò et tempore steriliæ annorum et gesserum proviso/ ne sustencionis vitae de bonis regalis propriæ dotis: ac librorum Sanctuariorum Tabularum Clendodiorum sacrorum vestium ac possessionem copiosa largicione dìtavit / custodice et quæ servat mensalia et pluminacis pro infermis et si datur camera/ ræ officia impinguavit. Canonicus vero duas refecciones et bibliociones / viiij vespergnes, ut supra dicitur de bonis supradictis et in litteris testamen/i expressum est / instituit fieri perpetuus temporalibus duraturum et per suas successors abbatissas / rectices vel rectores monasterij servaturum.” NKČR MS XIII.A.2, fols.9r-30 - 9v9.

\(^{69}\) Identified as Kostelní Střímelice, c.47km SE of Prague.

\(^{70}\) Zvánovice is en route to Kostelní Střímelice, c.35km SE of Prague.

\(^{71}\) Čslavsko lies farther along this route, c.87km SE of Prague.

\(^{72}\) “Abatyše Kunigunda kaupila později ze svého jmění vlastního wsi Strīmelice, Zvánovice w Kauřímsku i Hacky w Čslavsku (1320), a darovala je klášteru, aby z příjmů jejich opatřená byla wýroční památká za její duši.” Tomek, Déjepis, 1:444.

\(^{73}\) P.5; Kronika Zbraslavská – Chronicon Aulae Regiae (Prague, 1952), 573; Ivan Borkovský, Svatojiřská bazilika a klášter na Pražském hradě. Prague, 1975), 101.

\(^{74}\) A catalogue of saints, chronicling their deaths and matrydoms.

\(^{75}\) Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, MS XVII.E.48, fol.4v.
Domini - a book of the Lord’s Passion. This book title, she reasonably suggests, gave rise to the manuscript’s misnomer. Dobner, writing towards the end of the eighteenth century, does not refer to the manuscript as the Passional, but by 1865 it is named such by Hanuš and Vocel. There is no doubt that “Passional” has a more of a ring to it than the more accurate description of a “Collection of Treatises and Sermons”. The manuscript is best described by Jeffrey Hamburger as “an illustrated florilegium”. Florilegium is defined in the Oxford English Dictionary as, “lit. A collection or selection of flowers: hence transf. an anthology.” The Florilegium of Abbess Cunegund would, therefore, seem a fitting title: a gathering together of pious writings, with a hint of the exquisite. It is a unique and enigmatic, devotional manuscript which is set apart from all other Bohemian manuscripts by the high-quality of its distinctive illuminations. For the purposes of this study, however, I shall adhere to the accepted nomenclature “Passional”.

The Passional manuscript is relatively large, measuring 30 x 25cm. It is outwardly undistinguished, being bound between simple, wooden, leather-clad covers in a manner typical of the period and which Urbánková judged to be original. The leather of the spine would originally have been integral with that covering the boards but has been replaced. The boards are bound to the manuscript using a short lacing pattern, a method employed across Europe from the twelfth to the fourteenth century and described by Szirmai as Romanesque. On the inside of the covers, the lacing channels are hidden by pastedowns. The pastedown under the front cover is created by the companion leaf of fol.1 which carries the Dedication Illustration on its verso. That on the back cover is created by the reuse of old parchment: a common expedient.

---

76 Urbánková, 13.
77 Dobner, 6:334-368.
78 Hanuš and Vocel, 227-240, 297-303.
81 This concurs with dimensions given by Urbánková, 19; also, Manuscriptorium, on-line manuscript catalogue and digital library, Národní knihovna České republicy, Prague, www.manuscriptorium.cz – viewed from 30.10.2007. Toussaint, 13, offers the dimensions 29.5 x 25cm, also given by Antonín Matějček, Pasionál abatyše Kunhuty (Prague, 1922), 9; the largest of the volumes donated by Cunegund, NKČR MS XIV.D.13, Bonaventura, Speculum Beatae Mariae Virginis, donated 1306, measures 30 x 20cm.
82 Urbánková, 16.
83 J.A. Szirmai, The Archaeology of Medieval Bookbinding (Aldershot, 1999), 140-169; see also Christopher De Hamel, A History of Illuminated Manuscripts (London, 2004), 106.
84 Appendix III.
The bifolium which provides the pastedown at the back of the codex is created of poorly-prepared parchment with several flay holes. It is, however, of considerable interest: the free leaf (fol.37) presents an interesting challenge. At the head of fol.37r, partially trimmed-away, are lines from the rubric text of the fol.1v executed in a cursive hand. On the left can be read the second half of the contents of the fol.1v speech banner: “...ad laudem Christi que me dictare fecisti / de sponso plura sub militis apta figura.”86 The preceding words were penned above but have been sliced away, only the lower portions of some words remaining. To the right are the words of fol.1v’s administering angels, “mundum sprevisti regnum / terrestre liquisti / felici dono iam te praemiando / corono”.87 Blažena Rynešová believed the manuscript to have been worked on over several years, but never actually presented to Cunegund, the scribe having been surprised by her death.88 She considered the entire manuscript to have been wrapped in this parchment during its preparation and prior to its being bound posthumously.89 This hypothesis was accepted by Urbánková who considered the lines of text to be a draft.90

I propose an alternative explanation for the presence of the fol.1v titles on the fol.37r parchment. Manuscripts of a single gathering, or quire, were frequently tacketed together and protected by parchment covers referred to as limp bindings, often untreated and therefore becoming brittle with age: several examples are preserved in the library at Fulda.91 The first treatise is a single quinion (a gathering of five bifolia and one of the most common quire sizes)92 plus the extra bifolium which created the pastedown and fol.1.93 Together, they make up a sexternion and perhaps in this form, in 1312, the first treatise was protected in a limp binding for use prior to the binding of the completed work in 1314. A suggested time-line for the production of the manuscript is set out below,94 and consistent with the arguments presented there, it is credible that, in the intervening two years between the presentation of the first treatise and the completion of the later works, the first treatise existed alone as a functional object for devotional use in a temporary, parchment wrapper of which this end-bifolium is a fragment.

86 P.9, for full title and translation.
87 P.71, for full title and translation.
89 Ibid., 33-34.
90 Urbánková, 16.
92 Clemens and Graham, 14. Today fol.3 is a singleton as the other half of the bifolium was removed some time after the end of the seventeenth century.
93 Appendix III.
94 Pp.29-32.
The collation demonstrates the somewhat haphazard nature of the Passional’s construction: I² (1 as pastedown), II¹⁰ (wants 9), III⁸ (+ bifolium after 1), IV⁸, V⁶, VI² (2 as pastedown). The first treatise fills gathering II and, as has been observed, is a quinion (five bifolia). Gathering III carries the whole of the second treatise (fols.11-17) and the beginning of the third treatise (fols.18-20). It is clear that this quire was intended as a quaternion as the scribe provided eight leaf signatures “a-h” found centrally at the foot of fols.11v and 14v-20v. Had an error not occurred, gathering III would have ended on fol.18v, gathering IV would then have run from fols.19-26, and V from fols.27-34: three, neat consecutive quaternions. Gathering IV is a quaternio (entirely taken up by the third treatise, which starts at the end of III, continues through IV and ends midway through V, on fol.31v). Gathering V is an unusually short quire of three bifolia, a ternion, carrying the end of the third treatise and the entire fourth (fols.32r-34r). The fifth treatise, an apparent after-thought, was then squeezed onto the verso of the last folio of V (fol.34v), and completed on an additional bifolium VI (fols.35 and 36). As it stands, the Passional ends awkwardly with a ternion; a supplementary bifolium; and then the final bifolium, VII which includes the pastedown.

The unassuming appearance of the codex today may be misleading. It is likely that, when completed, the nuns would have provided this precious and expensive manuscript with an embroidered chemise. Although standard for the time (some fifty chemises were listed in Avignon’s papal library archives), few survive as they were generally made of perishable cloth: silk, velvet or brocade. Historically, the nuns of St. George’s Convent were recorded as proficient needlewomen, winning praise from Pope Eugene III in 1151 for the sewing of altar linens. Needlework, just as spinning and weaving, was a traditional female activity, and would have represented an important element of nuns’ Opus Dei: part of their Benedictine duty of faith that was structured around ora et labora and for which they would have taken as their model the apocryphal accounts of the Virgin Mary.

---

95 Appendix III.
96 P.32.
97 A likely cause is discussed pp.43-44.
98 De Hamel, A History, 106, 166. Leather chemises survived better than those of fabric and Szirmai, The Archaeology, 165, observed that 20 of the 110 Romanesque-type bindings he had studied had overcovers.
99 Tomek, Dějeň, 1:96 n. 58.
embroidering and weaving. An embroidered chemise would have endowed the manuscript with a sumptuous appearance, worthy of the care given to its creation, of its obvious personal value to the Abbess, and of the fine illuminations enclosed within.

Despite its slight appearance, immediately upon opening the covers of the Passional it becomes obvious that this is an exceptional manuscript. The quality and quantity of the manuscript’s exquisite illuminations demonstrates how the artist was vital to the realisation of the Passional project. His images not only support the message of the text but raise the manuscript to a standard far above the other, unillustrated, compilations in the library collection. The illuminations adorn twenty-six of its seventy-one pages. The majority present narrative scenes, set in tiers of two or three, filling an allocated outer marginal space beside the text (fols.3v, 5r-6r, 7v, 8v-9r, 14r-15v, 17r). Where more significant and emotive images were required, larger, individual figures or scenes accompany the text (fols.4r-4v, 7r, 11r, 16r, 17v, 18r). The imaginative compositions on fols.17r and 18r stand out among the illustrations in this latter group. Finally, the manuscript boasts five, finely-executed, full-page illuminations (fols.1v, 3r, 10r, 20r, 22v). All the illustrations are executed in a developed, Gothic style.

The codex comprises five treatises. The first is a parable and lecture advocating the use of Christ’s Arma Christi, the Instruments of the Passion, to ward off evil (fols.3r-10r). It is introduced by the striking, and informative, fol.1v patron image. Facing this, the scribe has recorded Colda’s didactic, dedication speech (fol.2), presumably delivered at the presentation ceremony immortalised on fol.1v. Both the first and third treatise, which is on the heavenly mansions (fols.18r-31v), were composed and claimed by the Dominican lector Colda. Between Colda’s two works lies the second treatise: an unattributed Lament of the Virgin Mary (fols.11r-17v). The fourth, and shortest, contribution to the manuscript is the “Sermon of Pope Leo on the Lord’s Passion” (fols.32r-34r). This is followed by the fifth and last treatise which is another anonymous lament: on this occasion with Mary

---

103 Chapter 3.
104 Chapter 2.
105 This treatise was written, illustrated and presented to Cunegund in 1312. Despite secure evidence within the manuscript for dating Passional from 1312-1314, an inordinate variety of dates have been offered. The rationale behind the dating is discussed in chapter 2.
106 P.33.
107 Toussaint, 21 n. 24, identifies this as Sermon VII, initially attributed to St. Leo the Great, but considered not to be by his authorship.
Magdalene as the subject (fol.34v-36v). For ease of reference, therefore, the contents may be summarised as follows:

PART 1: fol.1v Full-page image, *Dedication Illustration.*
fol.2r-2v Dedication oration, date, and title of fol.3r image.
fol.3r Full-page image, *Arma Christi.*
fol.3v-9v TREATISE by Colda: Parable of the Invincible Knight. [Lost folio between present-day fols.9-10. Final section of treatise + devotional prayers, preserved in late seventeenth-/early eighteenth-century, German translation. ²⁰⁸]
fol.10r Full-page image, *Man of Sorrows with Instruments of the Passion.*

PART 2: fol.11r-17v TREATISE Lament of the Virgin Mary.

PART 3: fol.18r-29v TREATISE by Colda: Heavenly Mansions.
fol.20r Full-page image, *Heavenly Mansions of the Immortal.*
fol.30r-31v Eulogy to Cunegund with dating of work.

PART 4: fol.32r-34r TREATISE “Sermon of Pope Leo on the Lord’s Passion”.

PART 5: fol.34v-36r TREATISE Lament of Mary Magdalene.²⁰⁹

The first treatise is distinguished from the others, being marked up in red plummet: this indicates that the manuscript was designed as a lavish production.²¹⁰ The remaining four treatises were ruled in standard, grey leadpoint, suggesting that they were conceived as subsidiary works. The opening speech on fol.2, addressed directly to Abbess Cunegund, is presented in two equal columns. Elsewhere in the manuscript, the text is in a single column with space for illustrations provided in the outer margins dictated by the vertical rulings. Although the text columns vary in width, this arrangement continues throughout the manuscript even when illuminations are absent. On fol.3v, the ratio of illustration to text is approximately equal: allocating more space to the important series of illuminations that accompany Colda’s *parabola.* In the remaining pages of the first treatise, this ratio is approximately 0.7 [8:11]. In the second treatise this changes to approximately 0.8 [8:9] and continues at this ratio throughout the third treatise until fol.21r where a little more space is

²⁰⁸ Pp.22; Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, MS XVI.E.12, fols.20v-24r, transcr. Toussaint, 193-196.
²⁰⁹ Appendix III.
²¹⁰ Derolez, 35.
given to the text space. There are no marginal illustrations from fol.18v onwards; the images of the heavenly mansions on fols.20r and 22v are full-page illustrations. Despite the fol.18v illumination’s dramatic and unexpected encroachment into the body of the text, the general ratio of approximately 0.8 [8:9] is nevertheless respected. Another unusual disposition of text and illustration occurs on fol.22v where the scribe fills the spaces on either side of the scene of the Coronation of the Virgin in the Heavenly Mansions of the Blessed.111 From fol.23r onwards, despite the absence of illuminations, the ratio between the blank, outer-marginal space and text space does not alter greatly. This led to the suggestion that the work was unfinished.112 From fol.21r to fol.34v, the ratio is approximately 0.7, as in the first treatise, varying between [7:9.5], and from fol.29r [7.5:9.5]. From fols.35r and 36v, the scribe increased the text-area, presumably conscious that space was running short, working in a ratio (blank to text area) of approximately 0.6 [6.5:11].

The two columns of text on the fols.2r and v run over twenty-eight lines finishing fol.2vb8. The date follows, double-spaced, followed by the title for the Arma Christi on the facing page. The first treatise runs for twenty-nine lines on each page; the second treatise, with the exception of fols.12 and 13,113 runs over twenty-eight lines, and ends with nine lines on fol.17v, allowing the artist additional room to fill with original images;114 the third treatise starts on fol.18r and closes on fol.31v with twenty-eight lines of text but covers twenty-nine lines on the intervening pages; the fourth treatise continues with twenty-nine lines of text to a page, ending on fol.34r with twenty. In a dash to the finish, the densely packed script of the final treatise is squeezed into the twenty-nine-line format except on fol.35r where thirty lines are covered, the last three lines stretching into the outer margin and where six words drop below to form a partial thirty-first line; again, on the last page (fol.36v), the closing three words fall below the thirtieth line.

For the most part, the text of the Passional is neatly scribed by Beneš in a Northern Gothica Textualis Formata, sub-group semiquadratus, exhibiting several Central European

111 P.44-45.
112 Pp.33-34; Matějček, Pasionál, 10.
113 Fol.12r-27 lines; fol.12v-26 lines; fol.13r-25 lines; fol.13v-24 lines; appendix III.
114 P.159-163.
traits. Examples of these characteristics lie in the strong bifurcations at the top of the ascenders, the small bow beneath the line on the letter “g”, and in the use of the double-bowed “a” which is a typical feature of Bohemian, Moravian and Austrian manuscripts (as opposed to the “kasten “a”). I am grateful to Derolez for pointing out that, for example, the spelling of *wineribus* in the penultimate line of the title on fol.2vb22 is specifically German or Central European and not French. The rubric titles are added in Beneš’s hand proving him to be the text’s rubricator as well as scribe. These rubrics vary in purpose. Sometimes they provide single-word descriptions of objects, people or actions; elsewhere they provide titles; sometimes they convey the direct speech of the protagonists illustrated; most significantly, some appear designed to direct the viewers’ devotion by offering a particular interpretation of a scene.

The ensuing discourse will offer a brief overview of the contents and structure of the Passional with particular emphasis on the artistic programme, following the manuscript’s chronological presentation. As has been noted, the fol.1v *Dedication Illustration* stands alone on a separate bifolium; this is followed by the oration which sets out instructions for Cunegund, and by extension her sisters, to fight off evil by contemplation of the Instruments of Christ’s Passion (fol.2). Having provided the reader with an introductory, patron image, the artist opens the first treatise with a dramatic *Andachtsbild* of the *Arma Christi* on fol.3r. *Andachtsbilder* were aptly described by Erwin Panofsky as providing “the consciousness of the individual who is contemplating the subject the possibility of sinking contemplatively into the content they are considering, ie. allowing the subject to as it were mentally meld with the object.” Cunegund and her nuns might employ the Passional *Andachtsbilder* in their devotional contemplation and prayer, using the visual cues to channel and amplify their spiritual experience, creating a communion between image and on-looker: envisaging Christ’s suffering by realising it in the imagination and
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115 See Derolez, 86.
116 September 24, 2008, email correspondence. This might call into question Stejskal’s assertion that the form and accomplishment of Beneš’s writing was comparable with contemporary Northern French script, and that, therefore, Beneš had studied in Paris, Stejskal, *Pasionál*, 24.
117 Arguments around Beneš as artist are addressed in chapter 2.
118 E.g., fol.10r.
119 E.g., fol.6r.
120 E.g., fol.7v, see Chapter 3.
121 E.g., fol.4v, see Chapter 3.
122 P.15.
thus aiming to achieve a mystical union with Christ which was the objective of every Bride of Christ.\textsuperscript{124} \textit{Andachtsbilder} are crucial elements in the Passional’s artistic programme with fol.3r providing the first of the two major programmatic, full-page examples, both illustrated in the first treatise (fol.3r, 10r). (Fols.11r and 16v offer examples of minor \textit{Andachtsbilder}.)\textsuperscript{125} The fol.3r image of \textit{Arma Christi}, presented as a “heater”\textsuperscript{126} shield divided into four fields by the Crucifix, recalls the red crosses on the shields of St. George on fol.1v and Christ the Lover-knight on fol.3v. The Instruments of Passion laid out as Christ’s armorial bearings. Three small perforations at the head of the page - one directly in line with the vertical of the cross and one on each side in line with the shield’s outermost edges - were used to construct the drawing. The fol.3r \textit{Arma Christi} is the only image to be unannotated: perhaps therefore less distracting to the contemplative nun. It has, nevertheless, a significant and lengthy rubric \textit{titulus} provided on the facing page (fol.2v), introduced by a large, blue initial “H” and liberally dotted with majuscules.\textsuperscript{127} The fol.3r image forms “book-ends” with another mnemonic \textit{Andachtsbild}: the \textit{Man of Sorrows with the Instruments of the Passion} on fol.10r. Colda’s first treatise is sandwiched between these two, complimentary images, both of which provide the reader with visual prompts, easily recognisable as having been designed to direct the pattern of devotion. As indicated in the fol.2r text, these are the “weapons” with which to ward off the Devil.

The text of Colda’s first treatise opens on fol.3v with a \textit{parabola} telling of a virgin who, on the brink of marriage to a nobleman, is seduced away, ravished and incarcerated but then rescued by her betrothed who restores her to reign with him. This well-rehearsed metaphor, set out by Colda on the following fols.3r-6r, appears in both secular and sacred medieval texts, presenting Christ the lover-knight as saviour of “\textit{rationalis anima}” (fol.3r10): the rational, human soul.\textsuperscript{128} The parable’s text is strikingly illustrated by a set of sequential, allegorical pictures running down the broad, left-hand margin of the page.\textsuperscript{129} Unusually, the artist strays beneath the lower margin order to include the culminating image of coronation and salvation. Four images depicting the Fall of Man (fols.4r-5r), together with an \textit{Annunciation} and \textit{Nativity} (fol.5v), accompany the parable’s exegesis by charting

\textsuperscript{124} P.153-159.
\textsuperscript{125} Fols.17v and 18r, and perhaps fols.20r and 22v, offer images that might be described as inspiring the imagination rather than empathy.
\textsuperscript{127} P.90.
\textsuperscript{128} E.g., Ancrene Wisse and Arthurian legend, see chapter 3; see also e.g., Rosemary Woof, “The Theme of Christ the Lover-Knight in Medieval English Literature,” in \textit{Review of English Studies, New Series} 13, no. 49 (1962): 1-16.
\textsuperscript{129} For analysis of the complex iconography of these images, pp.97-109.
Man’s descent into sin and Christ’s arrival for his salvation. The text then provides the devotee with a catalogue of the “weapons” starting with the knife of the circumcision (fol.6r9) representing the first occasion on which Christ’s blood was spilt. Each Instrument of Christ’s Passion is highlighted by rubric in the text, provided with a short, elucidatory text, and illustrated with an appropriate scene in the marginal space. The lance (fol.7v) is supported by a highly-individual illumination which will be discussed below. These illustrative images run to fol.9r where, midway down the page, the tone of the text changes. Here, Colda launches into an invocation which closes the parable with a triumphal and redemptive cry: “Rise up,” is repeated six times in four lines, and in the last line the resurrection is acknowledged by the words, “He arose.” On fol.9r, to heighten the reader’s experience of the text, the artist progresses from Passion images, which end with the entombment at the foot of fol.8v, to three soteriological images: Resurrection, Harrowing of Hell and Heavenly Coronation/Last Judgement. The text closes with an entreaty that evil should be renounced and salvation sought through the Passion Instruments and an appreciation of Christ’s suffering.

Originally, the reader would have found the closing paragraph of the first treatise and several prayers on fol.3’s now-missing bifolium-counterpart, which would have lain between today’s fol.9 and 10. A note, added in an eighteenth-century hand at the foot of fol.9v, reads, “One folio or more is absent.” Fortunately, the text of this missing folio has been preserved in a small volume from the convent library which contains an eighteenth-century German translation. From this, we learn that Colda ended his treatise by quoting St. Augustine’s (354-430) report of “the words of the Lord addressed to redeemed mankind,” in which Christ itemised his sufferings. Colda follows this with a

130 Mount of Olives (fol.6r20, representing the “rain of blood” from Luke 22:44); ropes [binding Christ], scourges and birch rods (fol.6v5); [tying] to the column (fols.6v4 and 7r7); splattering with spit (fol.6v12); lance (fol.7v16); nails and hammer (fol.7v27); wounds (fol.8r4); seamless robe (fol.8r8); lots (fol.8r16); pliers (fol.8v10); ladder (fol.8v15).
131 Chapter 3.
132 “exsurge nunc…Exsurge gloria mea; exurge […] psalterium et cithara…respondet in psalm tuæ. Exsurge igitur domine; exsurge in adiutórium sponsae tuæ. Surrexit…” fol.9r15-18.
133 Preserved in German translation, MS XVI.E.12, fol.20v12-21v10.
134 Urbánková, 15, and Toussaint, 194, suggest the prayers commenced at the top of verso.
135 Appendix III.
136 “Dees folium aut pluram” fol.9v; see Urbánková, 15.
138 “die Worte des Herrn, mit welchen / Er den Erlösten Menschen also anredet:” NKČR MS XVI.E.12, fol.20v20-21, transcr. Toussaint, 193.
rendition of Christ’s words by St. Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-August 20, 1153), paraphrased in Christ’s fol.10r speech banner. Finally, Colda concludes with a short prayer, “that we may at all times reverently remember his bitter suffering, so that that we may never be separated from his sweetest embrace,” and a final blessing. It is not impossible that this page was also illuminated: it seems we shall never know. The emotive prayers that followed on the verso were, almost certainly, designed for recitation whilst gazing on the opposing Andachtsbild of the Man of Sorrows with the Instruments of the Passion as part of the spiritual and mimetic process of empathetic meditation. The impressive fol.10r Andachtsbild shares its bifolium with the introductory oration on fol.2 which provides us with a possible dating for the image. Its verso is an un-ruled lacuna, and so, with this image, the first treatise is complete.

The second treatise, a Lament of the Virgin Mary, opens on fol.11r with a decorated initial: a blue “E” with red filigree. This complements the opening initial of the third treatise which reverses the colour scheme: a red “P” with blue filigree. This similarity, significantly, suggests that they were written up on the same occasion. Identifying the Virgin Mary and Mary Magdalene as principal mourners at the Crucifixion was characteristically Franciscan: the Passional laments may therefore reflect Cunegund’s Clarisse upbringing. The artist illustrates the opening page of the first lament with an example of a minor, but extremely emotive, Andachtsbild of the Grieving Virgin (fol.11r). The rubric makes the introduction: “You see Mary bitterly weeping and bitterly sorrowful.” I suggest that the artist intended the haunting presence of this image to persist in the imagination of the viewer over the following, five, unillustrated pages, and that it was this purposeful decision not to illuminate again until fol.14r that led to the omission of a section of the text thus requiring fols.12 and 13 to be slotted in as an addendum. The lament starts with a short narrative introduction (fol.11r1-7); following

139 “Oh Man, see what I have to suffer for you.” - “O Mensch siehe / was ich wegen diener leiden mus,” NKČR MS XVI.E.12, fols.21r22-21v2, transcr. Toussaint, 194.
140 “Thus, as a man, I stand here for you [ie. your sake] when you sin...” - “Sic homo sto pro te cum pecess...” speech banner, fol.10r.
141 “das wir Seines bitteren Leidens unß andäctig / allzeit erinen mögen, damit wir auf Ewig von / seiner süßesten umbfahung nimmer abgesondert / werden” NKČR MS XVI.E.12, fol.21v5-8, transcr. Toussaint, 194.
142 P.158.
143 See chapter 3.
144 P.33.
145 Treatises two and three share bifolia therefore were written up at the same time, see appendix III.
147 “Intuemini mariam amare flentem et amare dolentem,” rubric title, fol.11r.
148 Appendix III; pp.43-44.
this, the Virgin delivers a monologue bewailing the tragic loss of her son (fol.11r8-11v10). St. John the Evangelist is then briefly introduced, on fol.11v, and he is given seven lines of dialogue in which he asks the Virgin why she continues to mourn so deeply (fol.11v12-18). In a spirited, poetic response, the Virgin berates John the Evangelist in a resoundingly, nagging female tone as she impatiently chastises him for his inability to comprehend the depth of her emotional reaction whilst goading him towards an appreciation of a mother’s loss. She takes his words and uses them against him as a repetitive, interrogatory refrain throughout the text, for example, “I see him die in so much horrific pain; and you say, ‘Why do you weep?’” The Virgin Mary’s soliloquy ends on fol.13r on a note of despair, “Thus, woe is me, he has abandoned me and gone away.”

Here, a sentence has been added in the margin in a different hand which reads, “The reading finishes for Good Friday.” This effectively divides the work into two readings. Two lines below, another additional margin note has been added which reads, “The reading starts for the Easter vigil.”

The narrator of the second “reading” takes up the story with a rhetorical question: “Yes, but whither has your beloved gone, O most beautiful of women? Whither has your beloved gone, whom you mourn with so much pain? We shall seek him with you.” Illuminations recommence on fol.14r as the reader is guided breathlessly through a brisk narration of events surrounding the Resurrection (fol.13v-16v). The attendant images illustrate revelation following upon revelation: to the three Maries (fol.14r); to the Virgin Mary (fol.14v); at Emmaus (fol.15r); to the apostles (including doubting Thomas), and then to Peter and John on the Sea of Tiberias (fol.15v). Fol.16r required no illustration, nor is it provided with one, for here the text becomes rhetorical in preparation for a conversation between Christ and Mary at their apocryphal first meeting after Christ’s death. The readers are directly called upon to listen in (fol.16r21); the narrator then proceeds to present the exchange between Christ and his mother verbatim (fol.16r24-16v27). The conversation between Christ and the Virgin Mary fills almost the entire fol.16v text space (bar the last line) and is illustrated by the attendant, large, touching image of Christ embracing his Mother: a small illustration of the apocryphal account was previously illustrated on fol.14v. Fol.16v’s extraordinary image represents another of the lesser Andachtsbilder and

149 “in tot horrendis dolo/ribus conspicio mori; et tu dicis, cur ploras?” fol.12v8-10.
150 “Sic heu / me solam reliquit et abit” fol.13r20-21.
151 “Explicit collatio inparascve” fol.13r21.
152 “Incipit collatio in vigilia pasche” fol.13r23. 18 lines lower another spidery cursive margin note marks an alternative starting point. “Incipias hic” – “You start here” fol.13v16; see p.146-147.
compares with that of the *Grieving Virgin* on fol.11r. The iconography of Christ and Mary embracing, as will be shown below,\(^{154}\) also strongly references the Old Testament Song of Songs: it is a tender image which the nuns, quite appropriately in the context of *Brautmystik* (the interpretation of the Christian virgin as Christ’s betrothed),\(^{155}\) might interpret as a lovers’ embrace.\(^{156}\)

The Lament of the Virgin Mary ends on fol.17r with a brief account of Ascension and Pentecost – significantly, also revelatory experiences - both of which are illustrated. The author then closes the treatise by invoking the Virgin’s intercession (fol.17r24-28-fol.17v1-9). It is this that appears to have inspired the illustration of the *Dormition* (fol.17r) since no reference to the occasion is given in the text. The author’s petition continues overleaf, on fol.17v, where it is accompanied by two large illustrations. To the left is an architectural structure bordered on all sides by lines of rubric in praise of the Virgin,\(^{157}\) and displaying at one time both the Coronation of the Virgin and King David playing his harp. To the right, on a ground sprinkled with stylised rose blooms, the reader is presented with a final, post-resurrection, apocryphal revelation from the Gospel of Nicodemus: the risen Christ embracing Joseph of Arimathea as he releases him from incarceration.\(^{158}\)

Accompanying this scene is the most poetic of all the Passional’s rubric titles. This verse, and the accompanying, dramatic images which burst from the final page of the Lament of the Virgin, are full of significance and implication: this will be considered below.\(^{159}\) They mark the close of the second treatise.

On the facing page (fol.18r), the artist has created an imaginative and structurally-impossible scene illustrating the path to Heaven. He appears to have worked in close cooperation with the scribe to produce an arresting opening page for the third Passional treatise: Colda’s second work, on this occasion on the subject of the Heavenly Mansions.\(^{160}\) The rubric title for this fanciful image of *Christ guiding Souls Heavenwards*, on fol.18r,\(^{161}\) reads, “Jesus reveals the mansions to the sponsa and others”.\(^{162}\) Colda

\(^{154}\) P.152-159.
\(^{155}\) See, for example, Jeffrey F. Hamburger and Susan Marti, eds. *Crown and Veil: Female Monasticism from the Fifth to the Fifteenth Centuries* (New York, 2008).
\(^{156}\) Pp.153-156.
\(^{157}\) Either side the image, and the first line beneath, are inleonine hexameter; the second line below the illustration is in leonine pentameter.
\(^{159}\) Pp.160-163.
\(^{160}\) John 14:1-3.
\(^{161}\) Chapter 3.
\(^{162}\) “Ihesus Mansioenes ostendit sponsae et cetis” rubric title, fol.18r.
declares himself unfit to expound on the nature of angels (fol.19v11-19) and defers to the knowledge of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite.\textsuperscript{163} He then proceeds to list the divisions of the celestial hierarchy: the choirs of the Divine and the ranks of Blessed Mortals, commenting upon each in turn. (Jan Vilikovský notes that a large part of the treatise is lifted directly from the thirty-fourth homily of St. Gregory the Great, on the angels.)\textsuperscript{164} The *Heavenly Mansions of the Divine* are illustrated on fol.20r; the *Heavenly Mansions of the Mortal Blessed*, on fol.22v. Apart from the introductory image of *Christ guiding Souls Heavenwards*, these magnificent, full-page illuminations are the only images in this treatise, and the last in the manuscript. Their rubric headings may provide insight into the leanings of Cunegund’s piety: on fol.20r, “Nine choirs resound with the sweetness of song – Judging Mary as worthy of being preferred above all,”\textsuperscript{165} and on fol.22v, “You who are called the Virgin, alone in your virtue – You are worthily crowned, placed above all the saints.”\textsuperscript{166} Both express intensely Marian messages which complement the images of the Coronation of the Virgin that surmount the mansions in each illustration.\textsuperscript{167}

Colda closes his treatise on the heavenly mansions with an elaborate panegyric on Cunegund, dwelling on the conceit that he and Cunegund compare with Sts. Jerome and Paula (fols.30r-31v). This eulogy provides the reader with valuable information about Cunegund. We learn how her intellectual curiosity put idle men to shame (fol.30r20-23); how she exhausted herself with debates and constant study (fol.31r27-28), demanding new works to be written, and fervently applying herself to scrutiny of the scriptures (fols.30r23-25 and 31r16-17); how she rejected her elevated earthly status and possessions for the rewards of heaven (fol.30v2-4); of the humility reflected in her speech and the deference she showed to the poor (fol.30v25-28), which is particularly admired by Colda who bemoans, “rarely does one come across devotion and humility in leaders; rarely is it seen in our times”;\textsuperscript{168} of her fair and godly exertion of authority over her flock (fol.31r2-5), and her impartial and proper examination and judgement of legal disputes (fol.31r11-16). The final page of the third treatise includes vital information on the dating of the Passional (fol.31v4-15), as will be demonstrated below.\textsuperscript{169} This eulogy mirrors the opening


\textsuperscript{164} Vilikovský, 36; see also Toussaint, 19 n. 16.

\textsuperscript{165} “Chori novena resonant meli- Censentes dignam cunctis præferre Mariam” rubric title, fol.20r.

\textsuperscript{166} “Quae singularis virgo virtute vocaris – Sanctis praeposita cunctis dignae coronaris” rubric title, fol.22v.

\textsuperscript{167} Iconography of the Coronation of the Virgin appears crucial to the function of the Passional, p.73-76.

\textsuperscript{168} “Raro hoc nostris temporibus / cernitur raro devocio et humilitas in prin/cipibus invenitur” fols.30v28 – 31r1.

\textsuperscript{169} P.29-31.
dedication speech on fol.2, both in content - flattering Cunegund (and to some extent Colda himself) - and position. Colda assures Cunegund that her ultimate place in Heaven will be, not among the mortals, for he states, “know that you will attain a share with angels and archangels.”\textsuperscript{170} He describes how, extraordinarily, she will be accepted by each angelic hierarchy in turn (fols.30v18-31r22), and he then concludes that her fervent study of the holy scriptures will win her a place among the cherubim,\textsuperscript{171} and that she will receive delights, due only to saints, among the seraphim.\textsuperscript{172}

The final two treatises were unillustrated: the “Sermon of Pope Leo for Palm Sunday”\textsuperscript{173} (originally attributed to Pope Leo the Great as his seventh sermon, the author is now referred to as Pseudo-Pope Leo),\textsuperscript{174} and the Lament of Mary Magdalene.\textsuperscript{175} It may be assumed that the reader could refer to the earlier illustrations to enable visualisation of the narrative since these would be applicable to the content of these final two works which are both themed on Christ’s Passion. The Sermon of Pope Leo appears to have been included in the Passional’s original scheme for it shares three bifolia with Colda’s treatise on the heavenly mansions.\textsuperscript{176} It appears, however, that the number of pages required for both this and the text of the lament was miscalculated. The Sermon of Pope Leo is short, covering only four and three-quarter pages (fols.32r-34r). Beneš spaced the words broadly across the text-area, employing very few contractions. As noted above, possibly due to a mistake, gathering V lacks the extra bifolium that would have matched it with its predecessor and allowed enough space for the final treatise.\textsuperscript{177} The Lament of Mary Magdalene, therefore, starts on the verso of the last folio in the gathering (fol.34v) and continues onto a single separate bifolium (fols.35 and 36). Parchment was expensive and Beneš, in order to ensure that the lament could be accommodated on the added bifolium, VI, widened the text-space (although, as noted, the last four lines on fol.35r spill out across the entire width of the page).\textsuperscript{178} He also compressed the script not only by squeezing the letters close together but by employing many suspensions and contractions. After a mere four-line narrative introduction, the Passional Lament of Mary Magdalene opens in the voice of the Virgin

\textsuperscript{170} “Cum angelis / quippe et archangelis scito Te porcionem acci/pere,” fol.30v18-20.
\textsuperscript{171} “Sed quia sacris litteris Te novi tam / vigilanter intendere non Tibi inter / cherubim locum dare.” fol.31r16-18.
\textsuperscript{172} “inter / seraphin recipies premia sanctis feliciter pre/parata,” fol.31r20-22; see p.73.
\textsuperscript{173} “Sermo sancti leonis pape de passionis domini” rubric heading, fol.32r1.
\textsuperscript{174} Toussaint, 21 n. 24.
\textsuperscript{175} Ibid., 18, Toussaint suggests this to be an extension of the Homily by Origen of Alexandria (184/5-253/54), the “Complaints of Mary Magdalene”, which was included in a manuscript gifted to the convent in 1303 by Cunegund, and therefore one of the first writings she specifically chose to share with her Benedictine sisters; NKČR MS XIII.E.14c.
\textsuperscript{176} Appendix III.
\textsuperscript{177} P.16.
\textsuperscript{178} P.19.
Mary who, bemoaning her own loss, commiserates with the Magdalene as a fellow mourner. This may, therefore, be seen as an appropriate continuation of the earlier lament: the second treatise. Mary Magdalene responds by enumerating her encounters with Christ. It will be demonstrated below that Cunegund had a proven, special affiliation with Mary Magdalene. The Passional comes to its end at the foot of fol.36v.

Before considering aspects of the Passional’s art, it is vital to establish as precise a date as possible for the work’s execution in order to provide the correct context for its proper appreciation. In this, we are extremely fortunate for the manuscript itself provides clear evidence for accurate dating through several specific references: a luxury that is seldom available to codicologists. It therefore seems to me somewhat perverse that the literature concerning the Passional, sometimes on weak or even absent grounds, offers an extraordinarily varied range of dates. To cite just a few examples: Karel Chytil - 1312-1316, Anton Friedl - 1314-1321, Urbánková - 1312-1321, Hamburger dates the fol.10r image - 1321, and the Passional manuscript itself - c.1320; Benešovska - 1312-before 1320; even the website of Národní knihovna České republiky, the National Library of the Czech Republic, Prague offers - 1313-1321 and 1321-1400. I shall argue that specific time-references found in the manuscript itself and examined below provide all the evidence required for a secure dating of the manuscript to 1312-1314.

In this, I concur with Vilikovský who, in my view, correctly concluded in 1948 that the date of delivery of Colda’s treatises is unequivocal: “for both, the time of submission is given absolutely precisely as 1312 for the first and 1314 for the second”. As will be shown below, the first treatise is dated 1312, and the third is dated 1314, in the Passional; stylistic characteristics in text and illustrations and shared quires show that the second, third and fourth treatises were written up together and therefore are all datable to 1314.

Appendix III demonstrates by the disposition and sharing of gatherings that the text and

179 Chapter 3.
181 Antonín Friedl, Počátky Mistra Theodorika (Prague, 1963), 38.
182 Urbánková, 15.
184 Ibid., 408.
185 Benešovska, “Abbess Cunegonde,” 487.
187 “u obou je také zcela přesně udaná doba složení, rok 1312 u prvého a 1314 u druhého,” Vilikovský, 31.
188 Appendix III.
illustrations run over several quires. Even if quires III, IV and V had been quaternions, as was probably originally planned, the second, third and fourth treatises would not have been confined to separate gatherings.\textsuperscript{189} the first treatise is the only one to have a complete quire to itself. Text and illustrations, therefore, would still have run over from one gathering to another. It is, however, possible that the fifth treatise was an afterthought (tacked onto the final verso of quire V and requiring an extra bifolium, VI), added to swell the volume.\textsuperscript{190}

Even if this was the case, Cunegund’s obvious anxiety to proceed with the codex, which is reiterated several times in the Passional (as shall be demonstrated below),\textsuperscript{191} suggests that all the treatises in the second production period of the Passional were written up in quick succession. Evidence for Cunegund’s eager anticipation, the use of the same scribe, and the unusual fifth gathering (a ternion plus a bifolium) all point towards the Passional having been completed under pressure and within a very tight time-schedule.\textsuperscript{192}

The rationale behind a dating of 1312-1314 lies mainly in the references within the Passional itself. These may be summarised as follows (underlining has been added):

There are three references which date the first treatise to 1312: two specifically to the day, month and year, and one to the year alone:

Fol.2v - dates the presentation ceremony: “Date, in Prague, in the year of our Lord 1312, on the sixth day before the kalends of September.”\textsuperscript{193} (The “sixth day before the kalends of September” is August 27.)

Fol.31v - in the eulogy following Colda’s treatise on the heavenly mansions, dated 1314: “two years have gone by since...I composed a small work of three days about the strong soldier [the first treatise].”\textsuperscript{194} ie. 1312.

Fol.31v - and again, “[the first treatise] I presented on the sixth day before the kalends of September, 1312.”\textsuperscript{195}

The text, therefore, provides evidence for the production and presentation of the first treatise in 1312.

\textsuperscript{189} P.16.
\textsuperscript{190} This might support the argumentt for Cunegund’s authorship.
\textsuperscript{191} Pp.30-31.
\textsuperscript{192} Pp.31-32.
\textsuperscript{193} “Datum Prage Anno domini / millesimo Trecentesimo Duo/decimo...Sexto kalendas Septembris,” fol.2vb10-16.
\textsuperscript{194} “transacto biennuo / opusceulum laboris triduenio mili/te...pensionibus composui,” fol.31v4-6.
\textsuperscript{195} “anno do/mini millesimo trecentesimo duodecimo / sexo kalendas septmbris edidi,” fol.31v9-11.
Colda also supplies evidence within the text for the treatise on the heavenly mansions having been composed August 8 and 9, 1314:

Fol.31v - “This one I accomplished on the third and fourth days prior to the octave of St. Dominic [ie. eight days after the festival] in the year 1314, the thirteenth year of your benediction.”

Fol.31v - six lines previously, he recorded, “two years have gone by since...I composed a small work of three days about the strong soldier [ie. the first treatise]”

Ergo the first treatise is dated 1312; the third, 1314.

From the point of view of dating the entire work, it is important to note that on no less than seven occasions in the third treatise the reader is informed that Cunegund not only provided the impetus, but impatiently drove Colda to complete his work:

Fol.19v - “Behold, you Cunegund, daughter of the most serene King Otakar, venerable abbess of the monastery of St. George in the citadel of Prague, never cease to demand of me that which Dionysius deems impossible.”

Fol.30r - “Thus your demanding convenience urged me on that I should produce the script of the present small work since I could not fail to obey your orders.”

Fol.30r - “She entreats that those new things should be written; she who condemns the reading of idle texts.”

Fol.31r - “You (Cunegund) go through long speeches and, (although you are) tired by frequent reading, you require me to depict some small work.”

Fol.31v - “Brother Colda, the least of the Predicants is hard pressed to create by your orders.”

Fol.31v - “driven by you requests, I composed that small work of three days toil, about the

---

197 “transacto biennuo / opusculum laboris triduani destrenio mili/te...pensionibus composui,” fol.31v4-6.
198 “Ecce / tu chunegundis serenissimi regis ottacari / filia monasterij sancti georgij in castro pragen/si venerabilis abbatissa quod diony/sius repute / impossibile a me non desinis exposc/ere imponis/que” fol.19v4-9; see p.163 on Cunegund seeking reassurance on the heavenly hierarchy.
199 “Sic vestra michi inportuna / institit oportunitas ut präesentis opusculi / scriptum ederem vestris que parere postulacio/nibus non negarem,” fol.30r6-9.
200 “Illa ut nova scribantur pe/tit isterum dampnabilis desidia etiam scripta / leger fastidit,” fol.30r23-25.
201 “Tu longis orati/onibus decursis lectionibus fatigata assiduis / quedam conpingere opuscula me compettis,” fol.31r27-29.
strong soldier."  

Fol.31v - “Now, urged by your request, I have put together in less than two days a concise work about the heavenly mansions.”

This is clear evidence that Cunegund drove Colda on to hasten the production of his second work and that planning of the following treatises commenced immediately upon submission of the first Passional treatise, if not before. Indeed, the other works may have been ready to write up but were delayed by Colda’s self-confessed tardiness. Fol.11r onwards appears to have been hastily written up and some of the smaller illustrations executed with a degree of confidence but perhaps less care, suggesting that they were completed with considerable rapidity, presumably immediately following Colda’s submission of the text of the third treatise in August, 1314; the sure and meticulous execution of the larger images does not by any means indicate a slow worker. The rather uneven, sometimes-careless scribal work of the later treatises contrasts the obvious care taken over the opening section and indicates haste. Beneš’s work is particularly flawed on fol.13r. For example, fol.13r8 and 13 contain crossings-out; fol.13r22, erasure where Beneš initially marked the extra *di* of *dilectus* by subpunction but then decided to scrape both letters and dots away; fol.13r22-25 has two examples of scribal eye-skip leading to dittography. The errors in the last three lines of text have not only been scored through but there is subpunction beneath the repeated words. On occasion, Beneš copied words in the incorrect order, inverting neighbouring words. This he has corrected by placing a small letter *b* and *a* to indicate that the order should be reversed. (All these are standard scribal errors and methods of correction.)

Together with such transcription mistakes, the rubrication of majuscules is entirely absent from fol.11v10-13v inclusive, and again from fols.35v-36v, suggesting hasty workmanship. Pressure to complete the work would account for this: punctuality at the price of punctiliousness?

It is estimated that a monastic scribe devoted six hours a day at most to writing and wrote at a rate of perhaps 150-200 lines of text per day. The resultant writing-speed of between twenty-five and thirty-three lines an hour implies that it would have taken a mere seven to

---

203 “opusulum laboris triduani destrenio mili/te vestris pulsatus pensionibus composui,” fol.31v5-6.
204 “Nunc vestri postulacionibus stimulatus opus / de mansionibus caelestibus quodam brevi/loquio infra biduum complavi.” fol.31v7-9.
205 E.g., fol.25v19.
206 Clemens and Graham, 35-36.
nine days to complete the entire 1314 section of the Passional manuscript. Since each page has approximately twenty-eight lines, at this speed Beneš could complete a page an hour. Had he written at the considerably slower pace of an hour a day, he would still have completed the work within a month: well within the remaining four months of 1314. These expert craftsmen are likely to have laboured diligently over the Passional, particularly if their illustrious patron was importuning them to complete the project. It is reasonable to assume, as the quality of the work suggests, that they executed their skills with speed and assurance.

The leaf signatures “a-h” found centrally at the foot of fols.11v and 14v-20v in gathering III were, in all probability, to allow the manuscript to be divided to allow the scribe and artist to work separately on the project.208 (These are distinct from the quire numerals “j” and “ij” which are found at the foot of fols.20v and 28v and which mark the end of gatherings III and IV respectively for binding purposes.) A faint, cursive catchword - *tinuit* - survives at the foot of fol.5v in gathering II which may have served the same purpose as the leaf signatures since it lies within the gathering. This differs from the sliced-through and worn-away catchwords “*angelorum fuiunt*” and “*am*” at the foot of fols.20v and 28v respectively which, like the quire numerals on the same pages signalled to the binder the correct placement of gatherings.209 Leaf signatures offer further, important evidence that the second part of the Passional was worked on in haste.210 The illustrations of the second and third treatises, painted in the second phase of the Passional’s production, run from fols.11r to 22v across gatherings II, III and IV; the text of the third treatise spills onto gathering V, and the fourth treatise is completed at the end of this gathering. This demonstrates continuity of work over these three gatherings;211 The volume of pictures towards the beginning of the codex may raise unrealistic expectations for the modern reader used to ordered or even dispersal of illustrations throughout a book. There is no indication, however, that more illustrations were planned and the fact that several pages within the illuminated sections were purposefully unadorned - (fols.2r and v), 9v, 11v-13v, 16r, 18v-19r, 20r-22r, 23r-36v - when illustrations were not required to elucidate the text, leads me to the conclude that the programme was considered complete. The Passional was an ambitious undertaking the completion of which was keenly awaited. I consider the role of the artwork to have been fulfilled.

208 Pp.42-43.
209 Appendix III; other catchwords may have been trimmed away.
210 Scribal errors suggest haste, as discussed above p.31.
211 Appendix III.
How might the National Library of Prague have arrived at the questionable starting date for the Passional as 1313? The Passional first treatise was presented to Cunegund August 27, 1312, presumably as a quaternion fols.3-10 (now-missing): starting with the *Arma Christi Andachtbild* through to the end of the devotional prayers with further works eagerly anticipated. Toussaint reiterates Rynešová’s observation that the painting style of fol.1v is akin to that of the 1314 section of the work. It is likely that the artist painted his patron image and the important presentation ceremony after it had taken place. It also seems clear that Beneš also retrospectively wrote up Colda’s dedication speech (fol.2v) which presumably had been delivered at that ceremony. This folio shares its bifolium with the seminal illumination of the *Man of Sorrows with the Instruments of the Passion* which introduces the darker flesh tones and more sombre palette of the later section of the Passional. Rynešová correctly observed, in a footnote, that Beneš initially miswrote the date of the presentation in single spacing on fol.2v: “Presented in Prague in the year of our Lord 1313...” She did not extend her argument but neither does she suggest this as a date of production. I consider the writing up of the speech to have been delayed into the early months of 1313 thus accounting for some development in the artist’s style and the insertion by the scribe of the incorrect date: a simple mistake when moving into a new year that we all fall prey to on occasion. Such scribal errors are commonplace. Later commentators have taken up the date of 1313 seemingly overlooking the fact that the scribe himself recognised his error, scratched out and corrected the date of the presentation to 1312, replacing it on double spacing. 1312 therefore stands as the ceremonial date when the completed first treatise was handed over. The introductory speech and fol.10r image, however, may be dated 1313.

Why then the often cited 1321 end-date? Matějček set a *terminus ante quem* of 1321, the year of Cunegund’s death, suggesting the lack of illuminations in the latter part of the codex as an indication of incompleteness. As mentioned above, this seems unlikely.

---

212 P.29.
214 Chapter 2.
215 “Datum prague /.../... /... /...” fol.2vb9-10. See Rynešová, 23 n. 1.
216 Clemens and Graham, 35-43.
217 The date also given on fol.31v of the Passional.
Rynešová considered the codex complete but, without evidence beyond a lack of illustrations, she suggests that fols.12 and 13 were inserted after Cunegund’s sudden death in 1321, along with the last two, unadorned treatises; this completely overlooks the sharing of gatherings.\textsuperscript{219} Květ also considered Cunegund’s death to have interrupted production,\textsuperscript{220} and Urbánková cites the simplicity of binding as further evidence for a post mortem conclusion of the project.\textsuperscript{221} Thus, without what might be considered adequate justification or evidence, 1321 has persisted over the years as a possible end date for the manuscript’s completion.

I propose the following summary. Colda’s first treatise was finished and ceremoniously presented in August, 1312, as a quaternion. It undoubtedly went into immediate use. The presentation speech, the illustration of the ceremony, and the \textit{Andachtsbild} on fol.10, were written up and painted sometime in 1313/1314, and the resulting sexternion was then in use as a functional devotional treatise, probably wrapped for protection in the limp, parchment binding that was later incorporated into the back pastedown. Through 1313 and the first half of 1314, indications given in the manuscript are that completion of the Passional was impatiently awaited but delayed by Colda’s failure to produce the commissioned third treatise (his second work). The manuscript was almost certainly produced with due haste following Colda’s composition and submission of his second work, August 8 and 9, 1314, and completed and bound within the year. So many medieval manuscripts remain without provenance or date, it seems counterintuitive not to accept the evidence for dating offered within the Passional. With an established date, 1312-1314, this manuscript may be confidently placed in its historical context: for the arguing of my hypothesis this is of paramount importance. It also allows the Passional to be held up against other art of the period and given its rightful place in a broader art-historical setting. The reasoned date for this manuscript is 1312-1314: this, I believe, may be applied with confidence to all the illuminations.

The first Passional treatise was presented to Cunegund in a highly significant year.\textsuperscript{222} 1312 was the tenth anniversary of the confirmation of the Feast of Corpus Christi by Pope Clement V which took place at the Council of Vienna, October 1, 1301-May 6, 1302.\textsuperscript{223}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[219] Rynešová, 34; appendix III.
\item[221] Urbánková, 15.
\item[222] I have found no previous allusion to this.
\item[223] Celebrated on the Thursday following Trinity Sunday, the Feast of Corpus Christi was originally established by Pope Urban IV in 1264 by the bull “\textit{Transiturus}” and, according to Thomas Aquinas’
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
just 200 miles from Prague, and which was attended by the influential John IV of Dražice (c.1250-January 5, 1343). Bishop of Prague (1301-1343). (This festival, and Cunegund’s pious regard for it, which is indicated not least in the fol.10r Man of Sorrows, is discussed below.) 1312 was also the tenth anniversary of Cunegund’s consecration as Abbess of St. George’s Convent, September 19, 1302, led by the said Bishop John IV.

Further to this, 1312 was the centenary year of the granting of dynastic succession to the Premyslides by the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II (December 26, 1194–December 13, 1250) when he signed the Sicilian Golden Bull, September 26, 1212 [fig. 1.4]. This last date introduces another interesting point. As noted, the fol.2v dedication records, “...1312, on the sixth day before the kalends of September”, that is August 27, corrected after initially miswriting the year, as discussed above. It is not impossible, however, that the month was also misreported, for the sixth day before the kalends of October is September 26. This would have coincided exactly with the date of that all-important bull, and would have been closer to Cunegund’s September, 19, anniversary. In addition, Cunegund’s brother, Wenceslas II, was born September 27, 1271; the day after the kalends of October. Commemoration of all these events would honour the Premyslide dynasty; not specifying the occasions would conform to Cunegund’s rejection of earthly royal status so boldly announced on fol.1v of the Passional. In contrast to the presentation of the first treatise, there is no indication of any celebration following the final completion of the codex; it is possible the entirety should have been submitted on the 1312 ceremonial occasion but that Colda’s delay, which he was at extraordinary pains to own, meant that the first treatise, observed to have been the most important document as the only one
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biographer, Bartholomew of Lucca, it was reconfirmed at the Council of Vienna, Miri Rubin, Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture (Cambridge, 1992), 176-181, hereafter cited as Rubin.


P.135-136.

Žemlička, Stotei, 40-41. 1212 was the year Frederick II became Rex Romanorum, ie. King over the German Lands of the Holy Roman Empire, presumably relying on Otakar I’s support, just as Richard of Cornwall was to rely upon Otakar II’s in 1257; see p.10.

“anno do/mini millesimo trecentesimo duodecimo / sexto kalendas septembris edidi,” fol.31v9-11.

P.33.

The date, however, appears on both the title and fol.31v9-11 - both penned by Beneš, p.29.

Kalends is the 1st of the month.

P.71.

P.30-31.
marked up in red plummet, was the only item completed in time. Nevertheless, the convergence of these anniversaries would provide an auspicious reason for the execution of an exceptional manuscript.

The artistic component of the manuscript attracts several interesting observations which will be explored over the course of the thesis. It will be demonstrated how the artist appears to reflect Cunegund’s personal soteriological, pious, and even literary concerns, shaped by her Franciscan upbringing. As well as displaying iconographic idiosyncrasies, the style of painting exhibited in the manuscript raises the more complex issue of the Passional’s place in the development of Bohemian art. It has long been recognised that the exquisite, mature, gothic style employed by the Passional’s artist has no precedent in the surviving art of late-thirteenth-century, early-fourteenth-century Bohemia; nor is there evidence for a local, gradual development of such a style. Indeed, surviving, late-thirteenth-century examples of Czech painting reflect strong influences from Saxony and Thuringia, as well as elements absorbed from the Byzantine East. Standing alone in Czech art of the period, the figures that populate the pages of the Passional are elegant and expressive, swathed in voluminous robes which fall in soft folds around body and limbs, lightly modelled in tonally-gradated washes; the expertly-draughted architectural frames that adorn some of the illustrations are purely gothic in form: slender-pillared, with ogival arches, pinnacles and gables.

No study has previously attempted to systematically examine the Passional’s art for clues as to the origins of its style and iconography. Before undertaking such an examination, however, it is necessary to address the most frequently rehearsed question in relation to the identity of the Passional artist; one that has been the subject of heated debate since the end of the nineteenth century. Was the scribe, Beneš, also responsible for the illuminations of the Passional or did the scribe and the artist have separate identities? The hypothesis that I am proposing is that the art of the Passional has an English connection and that the master that illustrated the manuscript may have travelled from Westminster to work in the new royal court in Prague. Establishing whether or not two individuals were at work on the manuscript must, therefore, be the starting point. From there, differences between the art of Passional and that in other Bohemian manuscripts will be addressed, also considering examples from neighbouring countries, and the problem of how the style of the Passional
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235 P. 18.
236 Chapter 2.
illustrations is positioned in relation to contemporary artistic tendencies will be explored.
Before taking a closer look at the style and iconography of the Passional paintings, a subject of considerable dissension must be addressed. It rests on the question: Was the scribe Beneš also, the artist of the Passional? This point of view was most fervently advocated by Karel Stejskal in his 1975 monograph and is still prevalent. In establishing a basis for my hypothesis, it is imperative to separate the identities of scribe and artist. In the following discussion I offer evidence for two individual masters having worked on the manuscript: one scribe and one artist.

In 1865, Ignác Jan Hanuš suggested that the Passional’s art was the product of several artists. (This idea was recently revived by Jeffrey Hamburger and Gia Toussaint who suggest that two scribes and two artists were involved.) Antonín Matějček and Blažena Rynešová, writing in the 1920s, both agreed that only one artist was responsible for the Passional’s illustrations and this continues to be the widely-accepted view. The pressure exerted by Cunegund for the rapid completion of her project may explain the less precise nature of some of the smaller images in the 1314 section of the Passional: certainly, and understandably, greater attention was given to the larger, more important images.

The question of Beneš’s authorship of the Passional paintings has been the main focus of academic discussion concerning the Passional for more than a century. This has never been satisfactorily resolved and ambivalence remains even today. Two “fathers” of Czech art history, Jan Vocel and Karel Chytil (April 18, 1857-June 2, 1934), both considered Beneš to be the artist. In the nationally-aware atmosphere of nineteenth century Bohemia, crediting Beneš with the production of the paintings as well as the written word had the attraction of his presumably being Czech. Their contemporary, Hanuš, passionately

237 For Passional examples, reference should be made to the manuscript illustrations provided in [fig. 1.1].
238 Stejskal, Pasionál, 21-146; including the detail listing in Manuscriptorium, on-line manuscript catalogue and digital library, Národní knihovna České republiky, Prague, www.manuscriptorium.cz – viewed from 30.10 2007: “Písařem i iluminátorem rukopisu byl svatojiřský kanovník Beneš.” – “Scribe and illuminator of the manuscript was the St. George’s canon Beneš.”
239 Hanuš and Vocel, 235.
240 Hamburger, The Rothschild Canticles, 159 and Toussaint, 32. Generally, it is agreed that differing qualities in quills and parchment preparation account for scribal variability.
241 Matějček, Pasionál, 10, and Rynešová, 21.
242 Beneš’s title, p.9.
244 P.11.
refuted this assumption, in his lively, published dispute with Vocel.\textsuperscript{245} Matějček was more equivocal in his 1922, illustrated monograph on the Passional. He considered the evidence insufficient to sustain the argument for a single master having executed both painting and writing, and expressed his belief that separate craftsmen had worked closely together on the project.\textsuperscript{246} This aspect of his argument led Rynešová in 1926, somewhat irrationally, to favour Beneš as both scribe and artist arguing that two masters would be unable to sustain such intimate cooperation.\textsuperscript{247} Rynešová’s view, however, contradicts what is known of artists’ working practice of the period where separate scribe and painter was the norm,\textsuperscript{248} and where craftsmen regularly collaborated.\textsuperscript{249} She limited the argument: “Either an unknown artist is presumed or the illuminator is acknowledged as being Beneš.”\textsuperscript{250} She formulated the dilemma to reflect her preference for the latter option which apparently only required “acknowledgement”. Her conclusion affirmed her opinion: Beneš was “scribe and illuminator of the ‘Passional’.”\textsuperscript{251} Some forty years later, in 1969, Stejskal was to adopt this idea enthusiastically.\textsuperscript{252} Such was his conviction that Beneš was unequivocally scribe, artist (and poet) that he referred to him throughout his 1975 monograph as \textit{de facto} the Passional’s illuminator.\textsuperscript{253} Ema Urbánková in her historical introduction to Stejskal’s work,\textsuperscript{254} was notably more cautious: “text and painting are so often closely associated that it has led some researchers to the opinion that Beneš was also the illuminator of the codex.”\textsuperscript{255} Stejskal’s monograph was well-illustrated, popular and, for a time at least, afforded a definitive judgement on the artist’s identity. Not all were persuaded by Stejskal’s arguments however, and three years later Jakub Pavel, in an overview of Czech Art, dedicated two sentences to the Passional describing it as the work of “an unknown artist”.\textsuperscript{256} In 1997, however, Pavel Spunar described “the achievement of canon Beneš, scrivener and illuminator”.\textsuperscript{257} Jana Nechutová, for example, writing in 2000, continued the trend describing Beneš as illustrator,\textsuperscript{258} and in 2009, Anna Kvíčalová also

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{245} Hanuš and Vocel, 232.
\bibitem{246} Matějček, \textit{Pasionál}, 8.
\bibitem{247} Rynešová, 27-28.
\bibitem{248} Clemens and Graham, 20-22.
\bibitem{250} “Buď se předpokládá neznámý umělec nebo se iluminátorem označuje písař Beneš,” Rynešová, 26.
\bibitem{251} “původce, písař a iluminátor ‘Pasionálu’,” ibid., 35.
\bibitem{253} Stejskal, \textit{Pasionál}.
\bibitem{254} Urbánková.
\bibitem{255} “že se v Pasionálu tak často úzce prolíní text i malba, vedlo některé badatele k mínění, že Beneš byl i iluminátorem.” Urbánková, 14.
\bibitem{256} Jakub Pavel, \textit{Dějiny umění v Československu} (Prague, 1978), 78.
\bibitem{257} Spunar, “Introduction,” xxvii.
\bibitem{258} Jana Nechutová, \textit{Latinská literatura českého středověku do roku 1400} (Prague, 2000), 193.
\end{thebibliography}
pronounced scribe and artist of the Passional to be one and the same.\textsuperscript{259} Today, there appears a certain reticence within the Czech Art establishment which is reflected in Hana Hlaváčková’s article in the recent authoritative volume on the Luxembourgs: “St. George’s canon Beneš (scriptor), perhaps also the illuminator.”\textsuperscript{260} I shall re-examine the little that is known of Beneš and, by close scrutiny of the Passional, offer evidence in favour of establishing the artist as having been a separate master.\textsuperscript{261}

On fol. 1v of the Passional, Beneš is introduced as a canon serving the basilica and as the manuscript’s scribe.\textsuperscript{262} Canons were responsible for leading Divine Office (\textit{Officium Divinum}) also known as the Canonical Hours (\textit{Liturgia Horarum})\textsuperscript{263} - performed within the basilica by the nuns on eight occasions over each twenty-four-hour period - and to preside at Mass, administering communion.\textsuperscript{264} Their further obligation to the convent included the provision of spiritual guidance to the nuns, reading aloud at mealtimes and singing in the choir: duties performed on a strict rota, known as \textit{hebdomada}, recorded in the Fragmentum Codicis Praebendarum.\textsuperscript{265} Other commitments included handling of accounts,\textsuperscript{266} and in this respect the text of the Passional exhibits the interesting feature (not previously commented upon) of calligraphic extensions reaching over the headlines, characteristic not of \textit{textualis formata} but of clerical documentary script.\textsuperscript{267} Not only do the ascenders of many of the Passional majuscules steal over the top line,\textsuperscript{268} but there are seven clear examples of decorated calligraphic ascenders.\textsuperscript{269} These provide good evidence that the scribe, Beneš, was accustomed to preparing documents and undertaking clerical work.

\textsuperscript{259} Anna Kvíčalová, “Diskrepance mezi obrazem a textem ve středověkém křesťanském umění: Flexibilita náboženské literatury,” \textit{Rozhledy a polemika} 2/VII (Brno, 2009), 30-48, at 36.
\textsuperscript{261} Much of this evidence was presented in Vlček Schurr, “The Dedication Illustration,” 201-204.
\textsuperscript{262} P. 9.
\textsuperscript{263} Divine Office marks out the Benedictine day; service times alter with season and local practice e.g.: night \textit{VIGILS}, 2-3.30 am; \textit{meditatio} until dawn; LAUDS, 4.30-5am; \textit{reading}; sunrise PRIME, 6am, =1st hour; TERCE, 9am, =3rd hour; \textit{labora}; SEXT, midday, =6th hour; \textit{labora}; NONE, 3pm, =9th hour; evening \textit{VESPERTS}; a meal; sunset COMPLINE; 6.30-9pm; bed, see Dom. Cuthbert Butler, \textit{Benedictine Monachism} (London, 1924), 286-288, at 287.
\textsuperscript{264} Nuns were forbidden to administer Eucharist, Clifford H. Lawrence, \textit{Medieval Monasticism} (London, 1989), 219.
\textsuperscript{265} Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, Fragmentum Praebendarum, Distributionum et Officiorum in Ecclesia S. Georgii Castri Pragensis, MS XIII.A.2, transcr. Dobner, 6:334-368; see also Tomek, \textit{Dějepis}, 1:445.
\textsuperscript{266} Ibid., 446.
\textsuperscript{267} Derolez, 80.
\textsuperscript{268} I-fol.6v; h-fol.23v; I-fol.24v; I-fol.31r; h-fol.31v; I-fol.33r; I-fol.36v.
\textsuperscript{269} h-fol.5v; I-fol.12v; h-fol.18v; I-fol.19v; I-fol.32r; I-fol.34r; L-fol.35r.
Each canon was supported by revenue from a *praebenda*: an estate or parish that was in the Abbess’ gift. The extent of a canon’s responsibilities within his parish is unclear. As we know from the *Fragmentum Codicis Praebendarum*, Beneš was responsible for a living on the Přílepy estate. Přílepy lies approximately sixty-three kilometres west of Prague and the Convent of St. George; a time-consuming journey if Beneš was required to attend in person. The document goes on to identify Beneš as a scribe: “this Beneš himself wrote new writings in an old Gradual with his own hand” – “*scrip*ta *scripsit*.” The *Fragmentum Praebendarum* therefore confirms Beneš as canon and scribe: as in the fol.1v title which he himself penned: “Beneš canon of St. George, the scribe of this book” – “*scriptor*.” Neither reference describes him as *pictor*, artist. This provides the starting point for further exploration of the question: Was Beneš also the artist of the *Passional*?

Seven points present themselves for consideration and each will now be examined in turn. Firstly, as noted above, Beneš is shown to have been a secular priest within the St. George’s chapter and to have held a supplementary living a considerable distance from Prague. Alongside his other duties, he worked as a scribe, undertaking clerical duties for the convent such as drawing up documents. Rynešová was the first to assign two other works in the medieval library to Beneš: a Processional monialium, and part of an *Antiphonary*. Neither of these liturgical codices are illustrated, nor do they possess any elaborate or inhabited initials; the Processional monialium, however, contains one major initial “M” [fig. 2.1], and two smaller initials “H” and “V” later in the codex. If this work was penned by Beneš, logic has it that were he also an artist he would have provided these initials. The Processional initials are neatly executed but artistically unremarkable: painted in a vivid, opaque blue and red puzzlework separated by a narrow white space, they take the form of *litterae duplex*, but with none of the usual, additional flourished ornamentation. The Processional letter “M” might be compared with an initial “D” on fol.78v of a Bohemian Psalter with Chants, dated 1240-1270 [fig. 2.2].
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271 NKČR MS XIII.A.2, fol.6v23 and fol.6v28-29; see p.9.
272 Approximately thirteen hours walk.
273 “ipse Benessius manu propriâ ea que sunt in antiquo Gradwali nova *scrip*ta *scripsit*.” NKČR MS XIII.A.2, fol.6v30-31; also Dobner, 6:348-349.
274 “Benessius Canonicus Sancti / georgij *scriptor eiusdem / libri*” rubric title, fol.1v.
275 Rynešová, 25 and 31.
276 Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, Processional monialium, MS VII.G.16, and Antiphonary, MS XIV.G.46.
277 Contrast this with, for example, the finely illustrated Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, Sedlecův Antiphonary, MS XIII.A.6 [fig. 2.34].
278 Fol.10v, with smaller initials on fols.22v and 32v respectively.
279 Derolez, 41.
280 Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, Psalter with Chants, MS I.H.7.
importantly, they bear no resemblance to anything in the Passional’s artistic vocabulary, certainly not to the confident, flourished, second-rank initials that open the second and third treatises on fols. 11r and 18r. These are standard for the period, and probably worked by the artist of the Passional since painting of the hierarchy of initials was within the remit of a manuscript’s illuminator.281

This introduces the second point of evidence supporting the argument for two, cooperating but separate masters. It was normal practice for a scribe to direct a manuscript’s illuminator in the provision of painted initials.282 The Passional offers explicit evidence for this which appears to have passed unnoticed by previous commentators.283 Between fols. 24r and 28r, six of the eleven alternate red and blue initials that mark the paragraph headings in the third treatise are accompanied by tiny, discreet guide-letters: the scribe’s instruction to the artist (fol. 24r, p+a; fol. 26v-o; fol. 27r-n; fol. 27v-o; fol. 28r-v). Such guide-letters occur in many medieval manuscripts, as for example in the near-contemporary Willehalm Codex in Kassel,284 demonstrating a co-operative working practice. Originally, each of the eleven letters in this section of the Passional would almost certainly have had its small, attendant cue-letter either in the margin,285 or in situ [fig. 2.3].286 On close observation, the guide letter “o” on fol. 26v is seen to be peeping out from beneath the paragraph mark; fol. 27r’s guide-letter “n” is totally visible; on fol. 28r only the tail-end of the guide-letter is discernible beneath the initial “V” [fig. 2.4]. This serves to demonstrate how other guide-letters may have been painted over by the final initial.

A well-recognised, similarly co-operative practice was for the scribe to provide marginal instructions to the artist as to the required illustration; these offer another evidential pointer towards two masters working side-by-side on the Passional.287 An example of such directions survives on fol. 15r as a faint, cursive word lindeanima (linen cloths) surviving at the foot of the page. This prompt refers to the uppermost illumination of the Apostles at the Empty Tomb, where the same word has been added as a rubric title. When the gatherings
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284 Wolfram von Eschenbach’s Willehalm, MS 2° MS poet. et roman. 1, Cologne, 1334, Hessiche Landesbibliothek, Kassel, see Holladay, “Willehalm Master,” 72.
285 As fol. 24r, p+a (outer margin), fol. 27v-o (inner margin).
286 As fol. 26v-o; fol. 27r-d; fol. 28r-v.
were tidied up, the binder failed to trim this instruction away. The guide-words are a third indicator of two masters at work.

The fourth indicator has already been alluded to: the fact that the bifolia of gathering III were given leaf signatures “a-h” at the foot of fol.11v and 14v-20v. Designed to allow for the splitting up of the gathering during production, they were meant to be of mutual benefit to both scribe and artist. In this case, however, it appears to have been spectacularly unhelpful. When creating a manuscript, it was usual for the scribe to write the text on a complete quire, leaving spaces for the artist to then complete the work by the addition of initials and illuminations. In the first treatise, it seems likely that this was the case with the exception of the rubrics as these were clearly added after the completion of the illuminations: several contour the images, for example, around the figure of Beneš on fol.1v, or intervene between figures as on fol.5r’s image of the Incarceration of Mankind, and the bloody, rubric details were certainly a final touch. Evidence has shown that in crafting the 1314 section of the codex, speed was of the essence. Presumably for this reason, when preparing gathering III there was an apparent departure from usual practice and the gathering was passed to the artist to be painted prior to being written up, rather than being written up first. This is the likely cause of the error that necessitated the later addition of fol.12 and 13. The text for these two folios was, no doubt, always intended to be without illuminations and should have been written on leaf signature pages recto of “b”, “b”, recto of “c” and “c”. Since Beneš, as scribe, would have been aware of the need for two leaves of unillustrated text, it would appear that the artist may have made this mistake; perhaps through miscommunication. The fol.15r instructional note linteanima, however, suggests that Beneš was directing the artist to paint that subject on the recto of “c”, which is an incorrect instruction. Had the text been fully written up before illustration the mistake would not have arisen. The error could only have been remedied if it had been recognised immediately on completion of the images on fol.14v. Already by the fourth page of illustrations the error was irrevocable for, in the planned construction of the quire as a quaternion, the images on fol.14v and 15r should have been the central images, sharing a bifolium and facing one another, on the pages with the leaf signature “d” and the recto of
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288 Other possible, now illegible, examples may be found in the outer margin, fol.4r, God creating Eve (this is erroneously given as fol.4v in Vlček Schurr, “The Dedication Illustration,” 214 n. 45); beside the foot of fol.4v’s Temptation of Adam and Eve (possibly originally “lignum” as in the rubric title); fol.8v, in the outer margin, beside the Crucifixion, to the left of the Entombment.
289 Pp.16 and 32.
290 Appendix III.
292 Appendix III and [fig. 1.1].
“e”. Instead, these images appear erroneously on leaf signature pages “b” and the recto of “c”; fol.15r’s illustration was, therefore, painted on the outer recto of a separate bifolium. The theory that painting preceded writing in this section is supported by the observation that, in places, the scribe appears to have strayed over the paintings (fol.14r,15v,17r,18r): most clearly seen on fol.17r where the “t” at the end of line is written above the line to avoid the apostle’s halo.\footnote{Rynešová, 28 n. 1, but she also believes the last letter fol.17r12 to be written over the paint.} The pagination error was an understandable oversight as it is far more difficult to calculate ahead for the independent completion of images, than to write and then illustrate in the established chronological order. The time-pressure exerted on the protagonists of the Passional by their patron was the likely reason for departing from usual practice in the 1314 section of the codex. Perhaps the artist was available only for a certain time, or Beneš unavailable when required to write up the text. These measures, aimed at progressing the work, appear to have been to the detriment of the text’s ultimate integrity. Had scribe and artist been one master it is unlikely the mistake would have arisen. These errors and confusions themselves speak of a scribe unused to preparing illuminated manuscripts and sharing his work with an artist. It does, however, strongly indicate that a shared working method led to the creation of the Passional.

The fifth sign that artist and scribe were two individuals may be seen in the relationship upon the page between art and written word. The few instances in the 1314 section of the codex where the text appears to crash into the illustration have been mentioned above. Lines two and three on fol.18r actually run over the carefully drawn pinnacle. I suggest that if the scribe and artist were the same person the interaction between text and image might have been handled with greater success. This is a subjective statement, nevertheless, I believe, worth consideration. It is human nature to take care of something that one has created with effort; added to which, had the same hand been at work, it might be expected that the degree of spatial awareness demonstrated by the fol.18r image would also have been reflected in the distribution of the text. This is true again in the disposition of writing on fol.22v where scribe and artist were required to co-operate: the text is split by the central image of the Coronation of the Virgin which tops the Heavenly Mansions of the Blessed. It appears that, having decided how the eight lines of text were to be divided across the page, Beneš repeatedly incorporated words from the end of lines in column \( a \) and placed them at the beginning of column \( b \): the best example is “hɪ’” at the end of fol.22va8 which remains faintly visible beneath the red filler-line at the beginning of fol.22vb8. This rather messy set of resultant corrections was achieved by scraping away of
text and adding wavy, red filler-lines to cover the erasures. The three descenders on the lower line also cross onto the painting. It should also be noted that on the fol.1v patron image, the text sits uncomfortably within Colda’s fluidly executed speech banner.294 Having allowed the words, “dictata de regnum,” to drop below the centre of the banner the words “me dictare fecisti,” are, by necessity, allocated a fraction of the space and crouch miserably along the banner’s lower edge. The final words, “sub militis apta figura,” are relegated in the same manner causing them to spill over the artist’s guiding line.

A sixth, more concrete, indication of two masters at work on the Passional is the persuasive evidence to be found in the application of the rubric; particularly within the first treatise. It is acknowledged that Beneš was the Passional’s rubricator and therefore responsible for applying both the red titles and the highlights to the text’s majuscules.295 (Rynešová and Stejskal concluded that Beneš also composed the words of the rubric captions.296 Toussaint notes that this is unsubstantiated,297 nevertheless, the attribution generally stands.)298 Stejskal pointed to the fact that the halo outlines and the copious daubing that represents Christ’s blood throughout the first treatise are all added in the same ink and with the same hand as the rubric titles and, therefore, that they were worked by Beneš.299 In this he appears to be correct. He presents this as evidence for the claim that Beneš was the artist. I argue, however, that this rather proves that he was not. I suggest that, once the artist had completed the paintings of the first treatise, Beneš additionally supplied the rubric titles and gory highlights. The evidence for this is four-fold.300 Firstly, scribes handled ink and rubric as a separate commodity from paint which was the preserve of the artist. Secondly, as has been noted, the scribe’s work, in contrast to the artist’s, contains many flaws including the omission of the rubric embellishments to several majuscules;301 on fol.4r, akin to such scribal errors, the figure of God lacks the intended rubric outline to the halo which only remains visible as plummet under-drawing. Thirdly, Stejskal makes the valid point that the representation of blood in the first treatise is by Beneš’s hand but fails to observe the contrast between this and the fine-handling of line

294 P.9-10 for full title and translation.
295 P.20.
297 Toussaint, 30.
299 Stejskal, Pasionál, 25.
300 This evidence appears to have escaped the attention of previous commentators.
301 P.31.
and paint in the illuminations. Crude, uneven slashes and ribbons of rubric-red are splattered on the paintings, for example, Christ on the Mount of Olives on fol.6r where bold commas of “blood” jostle their way to the ground, or the spots and dribbles of rubric applied to the painting of the Crucifixion on fol.8r. These daubs cannot be equated with the Passional’s meticulous artwork. The fourth point of evidence relating to the rubrics is the most fascinating, although over-looked by other commentators.\textsuperscript{302} The seamless robes, depicted on fols.3r and 8r are carefully flecked with tiny spots of white paint. I suggest that these carefully-applied dots of white were provided by the artist in order to point out to the scribe exactly where he should place his rubric to avoid the possibility of the red ink combining with the blue wash to create a muddy purple/brown. If so, the rubric was never applied: yet another over-sight on the part of the scribe?

Finally, it is a fact that it was normal professional practice for representatives of the two distinct professions of artist and scribe to co-operate in the production of manuscripts.\textsuperscript{303} As such, it would have been the appropriate approach to creating a work of such obvious significance as the Passional. Cunegund’s close association with the royal court, dictated by her own royal status as well as her intimate relationship with Queen Eliška, would allow her ready access to the most proficient artist available. By the early fourteenth century, the skills of artist and scribe were complementary and collaborative but distinctly separate. Indeed, even within the field of painting, illumination was emerging as a specialist profession. (A painters’ guild was established in Prague in 1348,\textsuperscript{304} and, according to lists compiled from records dating from 1348-1411, by that period at least ninety-eight householders declared their occupation as painter and ten as illuminator.\textsuperscript{305} Seventeen preparers of parchment, eleven booksellers and four ink makers are mentioned, however, of the 225 occupations listed there appears to be no record of professional scribe.)\textsuperscript{306} There is evidence to suggest, however, that the artist of the Passional was a very skilled draughtsman, capable of transferring his skill from one medium to another to meet the needs of patronage in the more provincial, early-fourteenth-century court of Prague.\textsuperscript{307} 

\begin{footnotes}
\item[302] First observed in Vlček Schurr, “The Dedication Illustration,” 203.
\item[303] Clemens and Graham, 20-22.
\item[305] Idem, Dějepis města Prahy, 12 vols. (Prague, 1892), 2:383-385, at 385.
\item[306] Ibid., 2:385, Tomek offers the unsure but plausible translation of the occupation quinternista as “pisář knih?” – “a writer of books?” taking his lead from the quinternion, another expression for a quinion or five bifolia gathering. This may, however, rather refer to a book binder than to a writer. That there are no scribes listed in the record may suggest that their practice continued within the monastic, court, and by then, university setting.
\item[307] A practice common in the medieval period: p.179.
\end{footnotes}
Matějček made the strong observation in 1922: “Comparison between the illuminations of the Passional and Czech work of this type clearly demonstrates that the illuminator of the Passional has nothing in common with that tradition and that his oeuvre does not conform to those developmental trends.” Hlaváčková recently concluded that, “No predecessors or direct successors of the Passion of Abbess Cunegonde in Bohemian book painting exist.” At least on this point, all commentators appear to agree: that this manuscript has no surviving local antecedents and no local, detectable crescendo towards its style, specifically not in Czech manuscript art of the preceding generation. To appreciate the stylistic leap witnessed in the Passional, it is necessary to develop an appreciation of the character of the illuminations and to consider them in the context not only of the art of Bohemia but also that of its near neighbours. John Higgitt, when making general, stylistic comparisons between the English and French thirteenth-century illuminated manuscripts, warned of the inevitable danger of over-simplification despite its being unavoidable. He goes on to suggest that, “Styles and ‘taste’ could no doubt, as they do today, carry connotations of national or group identity, of class, or of ideology.” Perhaps the possible employment of a foreign artist for the Passional illustrations may signify the wish of the Prague elite, newly under Luxembourg rule and with ties to the Holy Roman Emperor, to identify with courts farther West than their immediate neighbours.

Historically, strong cultural ties existed between the Czech Lands and Byzantium extending back to c.863 when the Christian missionaries, Sts. Cyril and Methodius, Greek priests from Constantinople, were invited to Moravia. Their teachings and translations of Christian texts into a Slav vernacular enabled the spread of Christianity throughout Moravia, Western Slovakia and Bohemia. Following the collapse of the Great Moravian Empire at the end of the ninth century, Bohemia became part of the German Empire and Prague began to establish itself as the Czech nation’s new cultural and political focus. Crucially, the Latin Rite superseded Slavonic liturgy as Bohemia came under the sway of
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308 “Srovnání iluminací pasionálu s českými práčemi toho druhu ukazuje zřetelně, že iluminátor pasionálu nemá s tradicí touto nic společného a, že jeho dílo do této vývojové / řady vždy nelze.” Matějček, Pasionál, 16-17.
310 Note: fifteenth-century iconoclasts destroyed much Bohemian art. Tomek, Dějepis, 1:231, records thirteen altars in St. Vitus Basilica during the thirteenth century; Antonín Matějček, Česká malba gotická: Deskové malířství, 1350-1450. (Prague: 1940), 13, records sixty by the late fourteenth century. The observation still stands on the surviving evidence.
311 Matějček, Pasionál, 16-17.
313 Ibid.
its Ottonian neighbours and the Holy Roman Empire; this also strengthened defences against the Árpád Hungarians who were creating a powerful empire to the East. \(^{315}\) Bohemia owed fealty to the Germans, eventually holding a privileged position as a kingdom within the Holy Roman Empire. \(^{316}\) Importantly, the dioceses of Prague and Olomouc came under the jurisdiction of the Archbishopric of Mainz. \(^{317}\) The association with their powerful western neighbours was strengthened when Cunegund’s great-grandfather, Otakar I (c.1155-December 15, 1230), \(^{318}\) married his first wife Adelheid of Meissen (c.1160-February 2, 1211). The judicious Premyslide kings, despite ever-increasing ties with the West, nevertheless continued to look eastwards over their shoulder: Otakar I’s second wife, Constance (1181-December 6, 1240), was the daughter of Béla III (1148-April 23, 1196), Árpád King of Hungary and Croatia. \(^{319}\) Cunegund’s grandfather, Wenceslas I (1205-1253) also effected a politically advantageous marriage to Cunegund Hohenstaufen (c.1200-September 13, 1248) of the Swabian ruling dynasty thus securing and reinforcing the already firm, political relationship with the German Lands. Neighbouring nations required such alliances: at the age of two, Cunegund, who was later to commission the Passional, was betrothed to the child Frederick of Thuringia in one such arrangement. \(^{320}\)

Political associations with Germany were also reflected in architecture: in the eleventh century, the westworks of the Basilica of St. George, to which Cunegund’s convent was attached, had Ottonian-style towers. \(^{321}\) In 1143, stonemasons from the Rhineland were called to Prague to build the Premonstratensian monastery in Strahov, Prague: \(^{322}\) this represents an earlier willingness of the Czechs to call in foreign craftsmen to execute high profile projects. In the second half of the thirteenth century, further artistic influences spread from Saxony to Prague in the fields of architecture and sculpture. The Church of St. Salvator within the Convent of the Poor Clares in Prague, founded by Cunegund’s father, Lisa Wolverton, *Hastening towards Prague - Power and Society in the Medieval Czech Lands* (Philadelphia, 2001), for period 1050-1200.


\(^{316}\) P.4 and 35; Krofta, 9-15.


\(^{318}\) Appendix IIb. Otakar I ruled Bohemia, his brother Vladislav ruled Moravia; when Vladislav died childless in 1222, Moravia came under Otakar’s rule, Fiala, *Předhusitské čechy*, 113.

\(^{319}\) Appendix Ic; Soukupová, 27.

\(^{320}\) Žemlička, *Století*, 129.

\(^{321}\) Merhautová, *Bazilika*, 40; surviving Prague examples - Sv. Petr in Vincula (St. Peter) and Sv. Jilji (St. Giles).

\(^{322}\) Appendix I; Zdeněk Dragoun, “Romanesque Prague and New Archaeological Discoveries,” in *Prague and Bohemia – Medieval Art, Architecture and Cultural Exchange in Central Europe*, eds. Sarah Brown and Zoë Opačić (Leeds, 2009) 48-64, at 39, suggests this influenced contemporary Prague architecture. I note St. George’s Basilica and Convent were rebuilt at this time, under Abbess Berta.
Otakar II, in 1261 [fig. 2.5], although unassuming, may be compared with Naumburg Cathedral’s west choir and Meissen Cathedral’s east choir [fig. 2.6]. It exhibits Gothic features promulgated by the Naumburg Master and his workshop, probably via Meissen. Thirteenth and early-fourteenth-century artistic influences, as ever, followed trends of politics, religion and society.

Religion has always been a main point of artistic impact, and many Premonstratensian and Cistercian monasteries, founded in Czech Lands c.1140 onwards, were largely populated by German monks. These, and other orders, commissioned and produced liturgical and theological codices. Consequently, Bohemian art displays a particular correspondence with that of its nearest neighbours, Saxony and Thuringia, and what little survives of thirteenth-century and early-fourteenth century manuscript illustration in Bohemia, reflects overwhelmingly German stylistic influences. The following overview aims to demonstrate how the art of the Passional is at odds with this artistic development.

The style of the Passional is characterised by the gentle elegance of the freshly-coloured figures that populate its pages, and the precisely drawn, decorative architectural elements that these figures occasionally inhabit. Uncluttered by fronds of foliage, drolleries and grotesques, or by the painted or diapered backdrops so common in illuminated manuscripts of the period across Europe, the characters illustrated in the Passional stand out against their plain parchment grounds, demanding the viewers complete and undistracted attention. Many of the illustrations are laid out as a narrative designed to be “read” by the devotee. Particularly striking are the larger images, including the full-page Andachtsbilder on fols.3r, 10r, and the Heavenly Mansions on fols.20r and 22v, to which the artist has given greater care and attention. The static quality of these large images contrasts the energy expressed in many of the smaller, narrative subjects that often illustrate movement: sometimes violent, sometimes urgent, sometimes decisive. The accomplishment and confidence of the artist is immediately discernible, and the overall effect created by his simple compositions is that of an airy and colourful picture-book.

323 Hanns Swarzenski, Die Deutsche Buch Malerei des XIII Jahrhunderts, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1936), 1:36-37, links Bohemian and Austrian, and Mittel Rheinisches manuscript art.
324 Fiala, Predhustské čechy, 398 and 402.
325 Krofta, 14-15.
327 Soukupová, 163.
328 Other large images referred to, fols.1v,4r,4v,7r,11r,16v,17v and 18r.
The narrative presentation of the Passional’s large, story-telling images has been compared with the Holkham Bible which, however, post-dates the Bohemian manuscript by some fifteen to twenty years [fig. 2.7]. Also comparable are the mid-fourteenth-century, Czech Biblia pauperum, the Liber Depictus [fig. 2.8], and the Velislavova Bible [fig. 2.9], which closely recall the layout of earlier, German, pictorial biblical scenes of the type pre facing an early-thirteenth-century German Book of Hours, possibly from Bamberg, Lower Saxony [fig. 2.10]. The Passional’s formal page lay-out - a broad, marginal section where the narrative illustrations are disposed, flanking a single, wide column of text - has, I suggest, more in common with that of the Sachsenspiegel manuscripts of which the Heidelberg manuscript is the earliest surviving copy [fig. 2.11]. Similar to many of the Passional images, the stacked scenes of the Sachsenspiegel are separated by a line beneath each scene. It is certain that this work, which was the definitive, customary law book for the Holy Roman Empire, would have been held in one or more copies in Prague (although no Prague manuscript survives, there are more than 400 manuscripts of this work extant: testimony to its wide-spread importance). So-called “German Law” was instituted and satisfactorily enacted across Bohemia and Moravia by the early years of the thirteenth century. Politically, the Czech king played a pivotal role within the Holy Roman Empire as the only monarch among the seven electors responsible for choosing Rex Romanorum, the German King, and, as Josef Žemlička notes, they are referred to in the Sachsenspiegel itself. Added to this, John of Luxembourg, monarch at the time of the Passional’s creation, was son of the Holy Roman Emperor, Henry VII of Luxembourg. The Sachsenspiegel set down imperial law that its subjects might live honestly and prosper; similarly, the Passional was dictating a mode of behaviour which Cunegund, and subsequently the nuns of St. George’s Convent, were to adhere to in order to live a godly life and attain salvation. The Sachsenspiegel of the Prague court, which would have
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330 Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Liber Depictus, Cod. 370, fol.4r.
331 Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, Velislavova Bible, MS XXIII.C.124, fol.18v; Stejskal, Pasionál, 120-123.
332 New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, Book of Hours, MS M.739, fol.9r.
333 Heidelberg, Universitätbibliothek, Sachsenspiegel, Cod.Pal. germ.164, fol.11r.
335 Krofta, 21-22.
336 From 1257 these were limited to only seven electors: Margrave of Brandenburg, Duke of Saxony, ruler of the Rhineland, Archbishops of Mainz, Cologne and Trier, and King of Bohemia, Žemlička, Století, 127.
337 Žemlička, Století, 127.
counted among the most valued of the nation’s documents, might have offered itself to the protagonists of the Passional as a most illustrious format-exemplar on which to model the manuscript’s page-layout. This would not have been driven by the artist but perhaps by Cunegund herself - as former heir to the throne it is likely that her political education was based on the *Sachsenspiegel* - with her court contacts and her powers of intellect, employing Beneš to establish the layout, implementing his scribal training and knowledge of manuscript format.

The bold, narrative depictions in the Passional also bear a notable similarity with wall-painting cycles of the period. Matějček was the first to recognise this, suggesting that the Passional Master “drew on experiences already gained in the field of monumental painting rather than a style nurtured by book painting.” The smaller scenes in the Passional are generally separated by two ruled lines, usually filled by a light, yellowish wash, recalling scene-divisions found in contemporary wall paintings across Europe. The bare, parchment backdrop of the Passional illustrations is also reminiscent of the lime-washed backgrounds of many church wall paintings, and is populated by relatively large figures not tightly confined within their pictorial space. These figures are executed in a generally soft, broad, painterly style and, although fine, ink outlines reflect the deft and unhesitating hand of an experienced draughtsman; the resultant whole is, however, quite at odds with the minute, exact art often found in top-quality illumination and demonstrated, for example, in the exquisite initials that adorn the Lectionary of Arnold of Meissen [fig. 2.12]. The lectionary artist handles his paint with extreme delicacy employing bright, opaque colours that are meticulously highlighted by hairlines of white. The decorative nature of this work is typical of the art of the illuminator and distinct from the Passional’s narrative, unembellished and light-handed style.

In the period leading up to the production of the Passional, Bohemian manuscript illumination modelled itself almost exclusively around German influences. The Germanising effect of the *Ostsiedlung* - the eastward flow of Germans encouraged in order to create new villages and wealth - must also have had an effect. There is, however, a
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341 Excluding fols.3v,5r and 8v.
342 P.63.
343 Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, Lectionary of Arnold Míšský, MS Osek 76, fols.65v.
complete absence of German, stylistic traits in the art of the Passional. For example, images of the story of Adam and Eve from fol.9r of the Book of Hours mentioned above [fig. 2.10] have nothing stylistically in common with those of the same subject in the Passional (fols.4r-5r). I propose to focus upon individual features of style thus demonstrating the common ground between Czech and German art towards the end of the thirteenth century and beginning of the fourteenth century, thus establishing a contrast between the art of the Passional and its Bohemian forebears.

One of the most arresting aspects of the Passional artist’s style is the colour and application of paint creating subtle, tinted illustrations. In contrast, surviving Bohemian illuminated manuscripts demonstrate the same use of strong, opaque colours, densely applied in dark blue, orange and red-pink, noted by Nigel Morgan as common in French painting, but incorporating the bright vermillion, olive-green and brown found in German manuscripts. In the 1312 section, the Passional’s artist employs a translucent, bright pale-blue, green, pink (occasionally an ox-blood red), and yellow; there is a preponderance of black on fol.1v, to conform with the religious habits, and brown on fol.3r where the cross dominates, and wooden implements are depicted together with the bare hillside of the Mount of Olives; flesh tones and hair are modelled in a discreet, sepia wash. The 1312 part employs a paler palette, subtler flesh tones and a generally lighter touch than the 1314 section which was executed after a two-year pause under apparent time-pressure and appears considerably bolder. (It has been observed that speed may account for the hurried appearance of some the smaller illustrations, although the larger images are consummately executed.) The colours in the 1314 section are darker and more intense but applied with the same deft assurance. Almost no yellow is used in this later portion of the codex except in the lines separating images. The pinks and blues, familiar from the first treatise, are accompanied by an intense and vibrant green. This is similar to that found in the 1312 section, however it is applied more opaquely. The sombre tone of these later illuminations is largely dictated by the sepia skin tones that model the flesh more intensely, accentuating the expressions of anxiety and distress worn by many of the figures illustrated.

The broad areas of wash that distinguish the Passional illustrations are contained within a relatively fine but firm, inked outlines defining forms: this is demonstrated well in folds of
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345 P.50, PML MS M.739, fol.9r.
347 Some German illuminations also include a vibrant aquamarine.
348 P.38.
cloth. It is particularly appreciable against areas of pink; in the 1314 section, some of the green garments rely almost solely on the gradation of colour to exhibit the physique of the figure around which they are draped. The artist applied layers of colour-wash, building the intensity of tones, indicating shading and contrasting highlighted areas where only thin tints were applied or where there was even an absence of paint. This is well demonstrated by the fol.11r image of the Grieving Virgin. Compare this with an Annunciation in a Czech Processional from the end of the thirteenth century [fig. 2.13],\(^{349}\) where dense blocks of colour are applied in thick, opaque paint then “shaded” with thin, black paint. Heavy, black lines mark out the shape of a sleeve, the line of a chin, the fold of a robe, etc. and white highlights the forehead and the edge of garments. These measures augment the two-dimensionality of the image rather than enhancing form. Similar uniform blocks of colour contained within thick black outlines may be seen within the initials of the Czech Psalter with Chants in an image of a donor with two martyrs [fig. 2.14].\(^{350}\) This artist has used fine white lines to mark out folds in the robe in a manner reminiscent of Byzantine art;\(^{351}\) black and brown appear to have been applied to create shading in an attempt to lend some plasticity to the otherwise flat images.

There is relatively little gilding in the Passional despite the obvious importance of the work. Apart from embellishing crowns,\(^{352}\) and haloes, it is reserved to distinguish Cunegund’s abbatial crosier (fol.1v); the betrothal ring and tip of the Christ-knight’s lance (fol.3v); and the star of the nativity (fol.5v). The artist applied gold leaf thinly to a glue base, apparently without the gesso layer which would have allowed him to burnish the gold to a fine lustre. Its absence may once again indicate that the master was not primarily an illuminator,\(^{353}\) opting for a simpler solution being less familiar with the finer techniques of the craft. The lack of gilding may also reflect a degree of thrift in the face economic adversity for 1312 was a year of dire famine: crops failed and people across all Bohemia and Moravia were dying of starvation.\(^{354}\) Rynesová noted that the application of gold leaf is thicker in the 1314 section.\(^{355}\) Perhaps this reflects a greater confidence in its application by the artist and some greater freedom in expenditure. The general limitation on the use of gold might also represent a Franciscan frugality, learned in Cunegund’s youth,\(^{356}\) and a

\(^{349}\) Prague, Národní knihovná České republiky, Processional, MS VI.G.15, fol.1v.
\(^{350}\) NKČR MS I.H.7, fol.113v.
\(^{351}\) P.57-58.
\(^{352}\) With the exception of the crown worn by the serpent, fol.4v, p.112.
\(^{353}\) See P.51.
\(^{354}\) Tomek, Dějepis, 1:494.
\(^{355}\) Rynesová, 22.
\(^{356}\) P.10.
response to the rubric message of the angel on fol.1v that Cunegund had turned her back on temporal royal power, and therefore by extension any showy display of wealth.\(^{357}\) (An undeniably lavish, silver-gilt reliquary for the skull of St. Ludmila has been identified as having been commissioned for the Convent and Basilica of St. George during Cunegund’s term of office [fig. 2.15]. This would be for the community, however, and not Cunegund’s personal devotions.)\(^{358}\) I consider the restraint demonstrated in the Passional to reflect the penitential nature of the work.\(^{359}\)

German and Bohemian art at the end of the thirteenth century employs several, Byzantine, artistic conventions. This can be demonstrated by a comparison between the handling of drapery in a mid-twelfth century manuscript illustration from Constantinople [fig. 2.16],\(^{360}\) an *Annunciation* in a mid-thirteenth century Franconian psalter [fig. 2.17],\(^{361}\) and the figure of an apostle in a Bohemian psalter [fig. 2.18].\(^{362}\) German painting was slow to absorb the Gothicising influences emanating from France, particularly Paris c.1240 onwards, and shows none of the extraordinary developments that were taking place in the second half of the century. It appears the transformation of art in France and England was not yet manifest in the art of the eastern territories Holy Roman Empire, including Bohemia.

The realistic depiction of cloth is one of the most obvious developments in the new, Gothic style of painting. This may be demonstrated by fol.4r’s *Creation of Eve*: God’s *pallium* is exuberantly depicted hanging in multiple swags and with soft folds cascading over God’s arm to end in triangular points. (The main, male figures in the Passional illuminations are barefoot, wearing a rectangular cloak, *pallium*, wrapped around the body and diagonally over the left shoulder, with a plain tunic beneath. This is referred to as “biblical dress” and was the established convention for the depiction of biblical characters.)\(^{363}\) The artist has perfected his ability to depict garments falling in yielding, realistic swathes around a human form. Contrasting this are the solid, flat, sharp-edged garments that typify German painting: the so-called *zachenstil* is exemplified by the hem-lines of the two-dimensional, formal figure of St. James in the Bohemian Franciscan Bible [fig. 2.19],\(^{364}\) painted c.1270-

\(^{357}\) P.71.  
\(^{358}\) Stehlíková, “Reliquary bust,” 468.  
\(^{359}\) P.130.  
\(^{360}\) Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct.T.inf.1.10 (Misc.136; S.C.28118), fol.178v.  
\(^{361}\) New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, Psalter, MS G.73, fol.7r.  
\(^{362}\) NKČR MS I.H.7, fol.176v; the bare parchment behind the figure is misleading as it was originally gilded.  
\(^{364}\) Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, Franciscan Bible, MS XII.B.13, fol.385r.
1280; the figure of St. Simon in the calendar of a psalter from 1250-1275 from Cologne [fig. 2.20], and St. Peter from the previously-mentioned Franconian Psalter [fig. 2.21]. This style - already recognisable in early works such as the ninth-century, Utrecht Psalter where garment-ends flutter out in energetic zig-zags [fig. 2.22] - was adopted and developed from Byzantine models. The illustration of Haggai in the Franciscan Bible [fig. 2.23] provides an excellent example of a Czech interpretation of this style, described by Helena Soukupová as “the dramatic style of sharply folded drapery, emanating from the so-called Saxon-Thuringia school”. Its presence is standard in late-thirteenth-century Bohemian manuscripts. As the name zachenstil suggests, cloth hangs in sharp zig-zags rather than flowing in the gentle folds to be seen in the Passional illustrations. An interesting contrast may also be drawn between the looping and gently-flowing V-shaped folds of Gabriel’s cloak on fol.5v of the Passional, his tunic dropping into four or five tubular pleats, and the frenetic zig-zagging of Gabriel’s vermilion cloak from an Annunciation within the initial “D” from the Book of Hours from Lower Saxony [fig. 2.24], the tail-end of which flickers out behind the figure in a flurry of white hemline and jagged edges.

The depiction of drapery in thirteenth-century Czech and German art is best examined by looking at one of the most important images in Christian Art: the Crucifixion. German iconographical influences are instantly recognisable in contemporary Czech examples, as when a mid-thirteenth ink drawing from Teplá Monastery in West Bohemia [fig. 2.25] is viewed beside, for example, the Crucifixion from the Franconian psalter [fig. 2.26]. Comparison reveals stylistic similarities in the handling of Christ’s loincloth: looped around the hips and tied, almost in a bow, below the umbilicus to form a skirt with a hem of broken lines and a single box-pleat around his left thigh. An example from Thessaloniki demonstrates the strong byzantinising influences at play [fig. 2.27]. The disposition of Christ’s legs and the arrangement of his loincloth in the Passional Crucifixion illustrations (fols.8r and 8v) is, however, very different and clearly points towards western origins: this
strongly supports my hypothesis and will be discussed in the final chapter.\textsuperscript{374} Having established the debt earlier Bohemian manuscripts owed to German models it may be recognised that the garments of the Passional figures draw on influences from the entirely different stylistic sphere of France and England. This is true also of the figures themselves and it is to these that attention will now be turned.

The gently swaying, contrapposto “S” stance of the Virgin Mary in fol.5v’s \textit{Annunciation}, so characteristic of what is understood as Gothic and so prevalent a posture throughout the Passional, clearly contrasts the austere, verticality of, for example, the Madonna in the Franconian psalter [fig. 2.17].\textsuperscript{375} The annunciate Virgin illustrated within an initial in the Czech Lectionary of Arnold of Meissen demonstrates this Germanic postural style: her cloak, with jagged hem-line, hangs straight down [fig. 2.28];\textsuperscript{376} also, there is no contrapposto in the figure of the Virgin taking doves to the \textit{Presentation in the Temple} in the Bohemian Franciscan Breviary dated c.1270-1280 [fig. 2.29].\textsuperscript{377} The figure-style here matches that of St. John the Baptist in the Bohemian psalter [fig. 2.30],\textsuperscript{378} and identifies with several German examples given above. Recognisable are the short, stocky, two-dimensional figures with hand-gestures that are neither mannered nor expressive but stiff; they have broad oval faces with wide-eyed, stylised facial expressions familiar from the Ottonian art of the previous two centuries (for example, the Bamberg Apocalypse, c.1001 [fig. 2.31].)\textsuperscript{379} Some of these robust figure-types found in Czech art also exhibit the rosy cheeks often found in late-thirteenth/early-fourteenth-century German art. The \textit{Annunciation} within the opening initial of the Bohemian Processional [fig. 2.13],\textsuperscript{380} may be compared with that in the Franconian psalter referred to above [fig. 2.17],\textsuperscript{381} and a mid-century image of the same subject in a manuscript from Augsburg [fig. 2.32].\textsuperscript{382} The characteristics outlined above are in stark contrast to the elegant, less schematic and more realistic representations of the figures in the Passional. Through posture, gesture and facial expression the Passional’s artist succeeds in expressing emotion. The faces are narrower, features delicate with smaller eyes, and eyebrows executed with care to convey the inner feelings of the subject. The image of \textit{Christ reunited with Mary his Mother} (fol.14v)

\textsuperscript{374} P.204-205.  
\textsuperscript{375} PML MS G.73, fol.7r.  
\textsuperscript{376} NKČR MS Osek 76, fol.188r.  
\textsuperscript{377} Prague, Uměleckoprůmyslové muzeum, Franciscan Breviary, MS 7681, fol.216v; note the zachenstil of her garments.  
\textsuperscript{378} NKČR MS I.H.7, fol.39v.  
\textsuperscript{379} Bamberg, Staatliche Bibliothek, Bamberg Apocalypse, Msc.Bibl.140, fol.59v.  
\textsuperscript{380} NKČR MS VLG.15, fol.1v.  
\textsuperscript{381} PML MS G.73, fol.7r.  
\textsuperscript{382} New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, Psalter, MS M.275, fol.1r.
exemplifies this, as does the half-page *Christ embracing his Mother* on fol.16v where emotion is etched into the facial features by subtle, sepia shading. Christ’s brow puckers in an intense expression of concern whilst Mary’s countenance has relaxed from the former expression of grief-stricken and anxiety, seen on fol.11r and the upper image on fol.14v, to one of deep contentment as their eyes lock in the most penetrating of gazes. The artist creates a highly-charged bond between the two figures, heightened by tender gestures as Christ’s hand cups Mary’s face and she in turn places her hand behind her son’s head with a light touch that appears to convey a sense of incredulity and wonder. Artists of earlier German and Bohemian manuscripts appear content to provide colourful, decorative illustrations to complement the texts they adorn. That is not to say that these illustrations are not effective and often lively but the results remain caricatured and two-dimensional, as in the image of *St. Paul’s Conversion* in the Lectionary of Arnold of Meissen [fig. 2.33].

Influences of Byzantine art detectable in thirteenth-century Bohemian manuscript painting may have been absorbed through German art or received directly from East. The vibrant and lively illuminations of the Sedlecký Antiphony, c.1240, perhaps more than others, combine elements absorbed from Byzantine art with emphatically German zachenstil [fig. 2.34]. It may be significant that this Antiphony was produced around the death in 1240 of Otakar I’s Árpád bride, Constance of Hungary, who had been Queen of Bohemia for twenty-two years, perhaps bringing with her certain eastern, cultural influences. The Sedlecký *Virgin and Child* employs *Hodegetria* Marian iconography, exemplified by the twelfth-century *Madonna and Child* on the Kastoria diptych [fig. 2.35]. If the Sedlecký Antiphony image of the Virgin [fig. 2.34] is compared with that in the Franconian Psalter [fig. 2.36], the head-coverings in these Czech and German examples may be seen to assume the same straight-browed, helmet-like forms found in any number of icons from Eastern Christendom. The separation of tones into bands of colour, which is clearly demonstrated in these examples, derived ultimately from an interpretation of the mosaic art of the East [fig. 2.37]. By contrast, the Passional artist moved away from
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these conventions employing, as has been observed, refined tonal gradation. His female figures, with the exception of the nuns, are largely depicted with heads either bare or covered with white veils, loosely draped over the head to flow gently downwards, usually with one end cast limply over one or the other shoulder. There are only a few instances when the female head is cloaked (fols.8r, 8v, 14r) or half-cloaked (fols.14r, 14v), primarily at moments of greatest grief as at the Crucifixion and Entombment (fols.8r and 8v), and even then, the cloth rounds the brow and flows fluidly down.

Austrian manuscript painting, like its Bohemian counterpart, also exhibits influences of German art. This is unsurprising - since Austria, Styria, Carinthia and Carniola, like the Czech Lands, also belonged within the German Empire - and may be demonstrated by stylistic features present in a Gospel, Sequentiary and Sacramentary, from 1260-1264: features that will be familiar from the above discussion [fig. 2.38]. It is interesting to note that the kneeling devotee, depicted on fol.110v - obviously a person of some importance in the production of the manuscript - appears as a tiny, inconspicuous figure. The relative self-effacement of donors and devotees also appears to be a feature of thirteenth-century Bohemian manuscripts where they are illustrated, often mid-codex, modestly tucked into small compositions or initials, such as Brother Godefridus in the Franciscan Bible [figs. 2.23, 2.39], or the devotee in the Psalter with Chants, mentioned above [fig. 2.14]. This is in marked contrast with Cunegund’s impressive, self-confident portrait on fol.1v of the Passional. The artist boldly places his patron centre stage in the Dedication Illustration, beside details of both her role and identity. This image aligns itself with the large, female patron images found in French and English manuscripts of the period, such as the prefacing image of the Taymouth Hours, c.1325-1335 [fig. 2.40].

The architectural, compositional elements found in the Passional will be examined in depth in the following chapter; in the context of the Passional’s stylistic place in Bohemian art and in relation to German art, it is necessary and sufficient at this juncture to undertake a brief comparison. The fine arch, over-reaching Cunegund in her fol.1v patron image, sets the tone for the architectural details in the Passional. Carefully drawn with a draughtsman’s precision, it is purely Gothic in nature having nothing in common with

392 P.63-64.
393 New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, Gospel, Sequentiary and Sacramentary, MS M.855, fol.110v.
394 NKČR MS XII.B.13, fol.171v. See p.XX.
395 NKČR MS I.H.7, fol.113v.
396 P.87.
397 London, British Library, Taymouth Hours, MS Yates Thompson 13, fol.7r.
architectural elements depicted in earlier, Bohemian manuscript illumination, as represented by the Franciscan Bible [fig. 2.23]; nor can its inspiration be found in the art of Germany, exemplified by the near contemporary Sachsenspiegel [fig. 2.41], or the arches over the saints referred to above [figs. 2.19, 2.20 and 2.21].

It can be confidently restated that the style of art practised in the Passional stands alone among surviving examples of preceding, Bohemian manuscripts. It owes nothing to the art of Germany, direct neighbours with the Czech Lands, and within whose Empire Bohemia was situated and which was the main source of influence for thirteenth-century Bohemian art. The Passional responds to an alternative source of artistic stimuli. The interesting and artistically crucial question then arises: “From whence did the Passional’s mature artistic style emerge?” If not from Bohemia nor the German Lands, the possibility must be considered that the Passional artist transported his already-honed painting skill from farther afield, introducing to the Prague court a style which was already established in France and England. I shall now open the discussion on the relationship between the style of art demonstrated in the Passional illuminations and that in the West in the decades around 1300, which will be the focus of the final chapter, with a brief survey tracking the changes in academic opinion. It will be demonstrated how this has fluctuated over the years. It is my hope that, with the contribution offered in my thesis, it will be brought full circle.

As early as 1881, Chytil recognised the Passional’s unique status in early-fourteenth-century Bohemian art and drew a tenuous connection between the art of the Passional and English painting, declaring the illuminations to be, “completely other; related somewhat to an English work from the early fourteenth century, the so-called Psalter of Queen Mary.” Matějček, in 1922, having made the observation that the Passional failed to follow the artistic traditions of the previous generation, concluded that the artistic style was indirectly linked with Anglo-French manuscript painting. In 1926, he also confirmed Chytil’s opinion that stylistic similarities were to be found between the Queen Mary Psalter and the Passional. In 1931, Jan Květ noted that architectural details in the Passional recalled those found in manuscripts from England and from areas responding to
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399 Heidelberg Universitätbibliothek, Cod.Pal.germ.164, fol.9v.
400 PML, MSS M.94, fol.5v and G.73, fol.3v.
401 “jevi zcela jiný styl, přibuzný ponikud anglickým pracím z poč. XIV st., tak zvanému žaltáři královny Marie.” Chytil, “Vývoj miniaturního malířství,” 102. Referring to London, British Library, Queen Mary Psalter, MS Royal.2.B.VII.
402 P.47.
403 Matějček, Pasiñál, 120.
404 Matějček, “Illuminované rukopisy,” 121.
English influences, indicating that the artist was, as he put it, “schooled in England.” He briefly compared the art of the Passional with that of the Psalter of Robert De Lisle, and also drew comparison with the architectural detail and figure-postures in the Brussels Peterborough Psalter. Květ’s carefully considered but largely undeveloped observations, many of which concur with my own, gave me the confidence to pursue my own hypothesis which will be expanded upon in the fourth chapter. There is a divergence of opinion in his surmise that some Byzantine elements in the Passional indicate knowledge of Italian art, suggesting the Passional artist may have worked in Canterbury. Drobná, writing in English in 1950, echoed but did not expand upon Květ’s general judgements. Since then, any connection between English art and the Passional has been forgotten, ignored or purposefully dismissed by following generations of academics under the post-war communist regime to the present-day. Westminster, and the art of Westminster Abbey in particular, has never been specifically linked with the art of the Passional.

Stejskal, writing in 1975 during the Czechoslovak communist era, assessed the illuminations’ mathematical qualities offering an astrological/cosmological role for the manuscript. Hlaváčková described this particular perspective as “interesting; however, it appears that the content of the paintings can be understood even without it.” Political constraints at that time prevented a thorough consideration of the manuscript’s crucial religious aspects, although the intense secularisation of society over an entire generation appears to have generated little appetite among today’s academics to pursue this course of study. The cold war years also fostered a reluctance to look beyond the country’s boundaries, particularly towards the West, for a context for the Passional’s art. Stejskal’s desire for Czech ownership of the Passional’s art may have led him to claim Czech authorship without entertaining an alternative possibility, or searching for clues within the paintings. A chapter of his monograph entitled, “Beneš’s Journey to Western Europe”, declared the painting style exhibited by Beneš (aka the artist) to have resulted from a Czech training, complemented by a period of study in Paris c.1302-1312.
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credited any detectable English influences in the Passional art to the "fact" that they could have been absorbed, "without quitting the continent."415 Despite including the De Lisle Psalter’s illustration of Christ in Majesty [fig. 2.42] in his monograph,416 Stejskal commented upon what he perceived as a shared expression of "cosmic harmony" rather than undertaking a comparative, stylistic analysis.417 Of the Queen Mary Psalter, he wrote that it "has nothing in common with the luminous, modelled approach of Beneš’s illustrations."418 Concerned as he was with geometry and cosmology over iconographic or stylistic detail, Stejskal dismissed any association with England simultaneously rejecting, and failing to address, the opinions of earlier Czech art historians. Toussaint, author of the most recent monograph, incisively described Stejskal’s approach as, "the fatal mixture of a national consciousness and an attitude of Marxist atheism."419 Nationalism is a tempting, but severely distorting element: one that must be strenuously avoided. Paul Binski offers a general, salutary word of warning to be "wary of the deeper chauvinisms of art history."420

Hlaváčková’s recent assessment of the Passional’s illustrations identifies French illumination exclusively as their stylistic progenitor: “the style of painting follows the North-French book painting and French court art, but it exhibits a great deal of originality (similar to the texts)...Not only the drawing linear style where colours played only supplementing roles, but also the strongly stylized, rhythmical and yet strongly expressive figures and their prolonged canon are reminiscent of Paris painting” [sic].421 Toussaint’s 2003 monograph, however, represents the Passional as stylistically independent: her summary of the painting style is left on a somewhat unsatisfactory note and, seeming reluctant to commit herself, she pessimistically concludes: “Although the classification of the Passional is not ultimately satisfactory, it can be considered complete: the stylistic debate has for the time-being come to an end; there is nothing to add.”422 I disagree, and my thesis aims, through close examination of style and iconography, to reach a definitive

415 “některé význačné rukopisy, iluminované v Anglii...dostaly do francouzského majetku. Byla zde tedy možnost, aby se Beneš seznámil s anglickou knižní malbou, aniž by opustil continent.” Stejskal, Pasionál, 103.
416 Ibid., 99; BL Arundel 83.II, fol.130r.
417 “V nich dosahuje dobové úsilí o vyjádření “kosmické harmonie” – “Encapsulated within them...[the De Lisle illustrations]...is a contemporary attempt at the expression of ‘cosmic harmony’”, ibid., 103.
418 “Se světelné plastickým pojetím Benešových ilustrací nemá však východoanglický žaltář nic společného.” Stejskal, Pasionál, 104.
422 “Die wenn auch letzlich nicht befriedigende Einordnung des Passionals kann zunächst als abgeschlossen betrachtet werden: die stilistische Debatte ist vorerst an ihr Ende gelangt; ihr ist nichts hinzuzufügen.” Toussaint, 36.
evaluation of the origins of the Passional’s art. In summary, any international, stylistic
influences detected in the Passional illuminations have, over the years, been considered in
turn: English or Anglo-French, English, then Franco-Czech, and finally French – I now
offer England once again, and more specifically Westminster. What evidence therefore can
be found in the painting that sheds light on its artist’s origins? Considering all aspects, I
shall reappraise the art of the Passional in the context of the elegant Gothic art forms that
were the currency in western art of this period, searching for them on the pages of the
Passional.

Although I question Hlaváčková’s assertion that the Passional’s art derived from the
French, there was, without doubt, a powerful artistic conversation between France and
England, Paris and London, from the mid-thirteenth through to the early-fourteenth
century. As Binski aptly expressed it: “we should perhaps think less in terms of Anglo-
French dependence or of acquiescence to Paris, than of mutual and roughly concurrent
participation in a reservoir of styles dating to the last third of the .. century especially
given that the Edwardian court had close cultural and diplomatic links with
Picardy, Flanders and Lotharingia, as well as Paris.” Some characteristics present in the
Passional also feature in wider European art, but it is their prevalence in English art and in
the Passional manuscript that is crucial to this study. At this point in the discussion, it is
necessary to seek out general, stylistic features that might signal to the observer that the art
of the Passional may indeed have originated in England as, under the Plantagenets, the
country was establishing its own national, and even regional, artistic identity at the close of
the thirteenth/beginning of the fourteenth century.

A link has been made between the Passional illustrations and wall paintings. The early
fourteenth-century programme of paintings in the Church of St. Mary, Chalgrove in
Oxfordshire [fig. 2.43], offers itself as an excellent comparator. Here, roses, a common
decorative filler, are scattered over the wall as they are behind the figures of Christ and
Joseph of Arimathea on fol.17v. The narrative of the Church of St. Mary’s wall-painting
programme plays-out against a plain backdrop of lime-washed plaster, the tiered scenes
separated by painted strips as in the Passional. Roger Rosewell highlights the “use of
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cartoon-strip-like narratives which portrayed the lives of Christ and popular saints in successions of small, rapid frames” on the walls of English churches.\(^{429}\) The Passional illustration of the Parable on fol.3v is unquestionably laid out in a series of “cartoon-strip-like” scenes. The Passion of Christ is depicted along Chalgrove’s north wall and that of the Virgin along the south wall: this parallels the Passional’s dual programme - Christ’s Passion (in treatise 1), and the predominantly Marian-themed scenes following the Resurrection (in treatise 2). Complementary Passion and Marian cycles are acknowledged as a specific feature of English church wall painting towards the end of the thirteenth century.\(^{430}\)

The Passional artist’s painting style has also been observed to be restrained, executed with a sure hand, the paint applied in tinted washes.\(^{431}\) This characteristically English technique has a strong bearing on my hypothesis.\(^{432}\) It is recognisable, for example, in an early-thirteenth-century psalter held by Trinity College, Cambridge [fig. 2.44],\(^ {433}\) and was later employed by, among others, Matthew Paris, as the Chronica Majora Madonna and Child demonstrates [fig. 2.45].\(^ {434}\) The fashionable, apocalypse codices that emanated from the London workshops, and which reached a peak of production between 1250-1280,\(^ {435}\) exemplified by an apocalypse from c.1255-1260 [fig. 2.46],\(^ {436}\) make an informative comparison with the Passional images, their narrative being presented through tinted images on a bare parchment ground, as in the Passional. The palette used in this and other apocalypse manuscripts is also comparable, and unlike the opaque blue and orange palette favoured in French manuscripts.\(^ {437}\) Hair and facial features are gently modulated in brown, and the scenes are coloured in a lively green and blue, complemented by a pale red (as that used for Christ’s garments on fol.10v). The pink-red found in French manuscripts and in the Passional will be shown to have been an important colour in the art of Westminster Abbey.\(^ {438}\) La Estoire de Seint Aedward le Rei [fig. 2.47],\(^ {439}\) a prestigious, Westminster
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work painted around the same time as the apocalypse referred to above, also employs a similar range of colours to those found in the Passional, particularly the frequent use of green, although the latter’s palette is more vibrant and the colours less translucent. The artists all modulate their colour-washes to create shape by using a lack of paint to create highlights, suggesting the human form beneath folds of cloth. This is also a feature of the images in the Queen Mary Psalter, a very important comparator in this study. These illuminations are particularly delicate and restrained; in many examples, the colour is restricted to predominantly green, brown and purple.\footnote{See Lucy Freeman Sandler, \textit{A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in the British Isles - Gothic Manuscripts, 1285-1385}, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1986), 2:64-66.} Whereas, in contemporary French manuscripts heads are delicately pen drawn with little or no added colour or shading, as in the late-thirteenth-century Cycle de Guillaume d’Orange [fig. 2.48],\footnote{Boulogne-sur-mer, Bibliothèque municipal, Cycle de Guillaume d’Orange, MS 192, fol.285v.} in the Queen Mary Psalter and the Passional, the flesh and hair are carefully modelled in brown, as demonstrated in the illustrations of the \textit{Creation of Eve} in both manuscripts [fig. 2.49].\footnote{Passional fol.4r and BL MS Royal 2.B.VII, fol.3r.} The elegant and serene fol.4r depiction of God seems heralded by figures in earlier English art, such as the on-looking St. John the Divine in the Douce Apocalypse [fig. 2.50]\footnote{P.197-198; Oxford, Bodleian Library, The Douce Apocalypse, MS Douce 180, p.14.} Their gestures are comparably relaxed, unlike those often found in French illustrations of the period: exaggerated, flat and often awkwardly-angled at the wrist [fig. 2.48]. Both figures have comparable physiognomy and strike poses that are imposing yet not over-mannered.\footnote{P.197-198.}

The impetus from France introduced a new breadth in the depiction of drapery folds into English art c.1255-1260, leading to a softening and curving of figures,\footnote{P.56.} and in the handling of cloth to create loose folds c.1270-1290.\footnote{See Morgan and Sandler, “Manuscript Illumination,” 20-22.} This lent an overall more lyrical and realistic appearance to the subjects depicted: one that both suited and reflected the romantic and chivalric tendencies of the age. In English illustrations, tunics now hung in a shapely manner around the human form, trailing in soft folds onto the ground, and cloaks began to hang in loose, rounded swags, the quantities of cloth allowing the artists to display their skill. In the 1314 section of the Passional, the artist demonstrates his mastery in representing falling cloth, almost in an embarass de richesses, exemplified in the image of the \textit{Grieving Virgin} (fol.11r). This feature of the Passional artist’s work will be considered below, particularly in a comparison with the Majesty Master’s work in the De
Lisle Psalter. The ability to subtly shade and highlight provides plasticity and form to the human figure: this was fully mastered by the artist of the Passional.

It is clear on examination that the Passional images of the Crucifixion find their equivalent not among those of Central Europe but among those of France and England. In this argument, the handling of Christ’s loincloth serves as a useful stylistic identifier. In this assessment of stylistic tendencies, it is sufficient to observe the general disposition and handling of the folds of cloth wrapped about Christ’s hips compared with Czech examples. In the Passional, the loincloth is not knotted to the front of Christ, as in the example from Teplá monastery [fig. 2.25], nor to the side as in the engraved image on the so-called Otakar II’s Coronation Cross from 1261-1278 [fig. 2.51]. On fols.8r and 8v, Christ’s loincloth is presented as a large swathe of cloth completely encircling Christ’s pelvis and tucked into place so that the two tail-ends dangle on either side. The cloth hangs particularly abundantly over Christ’s right thigh, a point of fabric reaching down to mid-calf: on fol.10r this portion of the garment has a curtain-like appearance. The loincloths’ apron area appears folded over at the top with two, lateral pleats and a distinctive central “belt” under which the cloth then falls away from Christ’s abdomen in soft cascades. The same handling is found in the De Lisle Psalter, and is similar to other English examples, such as the Queen Mary Psalter, and the Thornham Parva Retable [fig. 2.52]. Further similarities will be examined in the final chapter.

The proficiently-draughted, architectural details in the Passional will also be examined in depth in the final chapter where the manuscript’s illustrations will be shown to betray certain specifically English features. Here, it is sufficient to observe the structures’ general form which is undeniably Gothic in character. There are several features that distinguish the style depicted from French Rayonnant, pointing convincingly to English Decorated style: the wafting crockets, like little hands curving upwards towards the
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crowning acanthus, rather than the tight, nodding buds favoured in France; the un-tiled roofs of the flanking pinnacles, contrasting the steep, tiled Rayonnant examples; but most distinctive are the Passional’s perfect examples of ogival arches.\textsuperscript{456} In the fol.1v \textit{Dedication Illustration}, the artist provides the figure of Abbess Cunegund with a perfectly articulated, curvilinear, ogival arch supported by elegant, pierced cusps, tipped with small trefoils, beneath which to sit. The arch springs from slender columns, each topped by pinnacles with steep, crocketed roofs that end in elegant finials. It is adorned by a series of gently-undulating crockets, rising to culminate in a flounce of acanthus, supporting the central shield which illustrates St. George on his mount. The whole presents an architype of western Gothic architecture but distinctly English in character.

The introduction of architecture as a decorative and compositional feature, framing the subject and providing it with a space to inhabit, albeit two-dimensional, is common in both French and English art of the period. If the scene of the \textit{Entombment of Jacob}, from the Psalter of St. Louis\textsuperscript{457} - its frame with twin arches set with rising gables flanked by pinnacles, backed by a wall pierced by lancet windows under a tiled roof - is compared with the architectural elements on the wall paintings of the tiny, Suffolk Church of All Saints, Little Wenham, it can be appreciated just how close the artistic dialogue was between France and England at the close of the thirteenth/beginning of the fourteenth century [fig. 2.53].\textsuperscript{458} The Passional’s architectural style, as observed by Květ in 1931,\textsuperscript{459} resonates with that of the Brussels Peterborough Psalter.\textsuperscript{460} Compare the arches framing the Passional fol.17v \textit{Coronation of the Virgin} with the double-bay structures on fol.13r of the Brussels Peterborough Psalter [fig. 2.54]. There is, however, a major difference between the ornamental, architectural frames found in the Peterborough Psalter, and the decorative “constructions” wrought by the Passional artist. The former provides a repetitive, compositional device, creating “windows” through which the illustrated scene is observed; by contrast, the elaborate edifices in the Passional function as inhabited furnishings for the scenes. They also appear in the minority of images. The arched, niche-structures on fols.1v and 17v represent thrones; fol.18r presents a soaring tower inhabited by music-making angels where solid, earthly architecture gives way to ethereal, unsupported gothic arches, buttress, and pinnacles in a fantastical conjuring of the journey to Heaven; fols.20r and 22v portray the cubicles of imagined heavenly mansions. The
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accurate and precise architectural drawings of the Passional demonstrate the quality of the artist’s draughtsmanship. His use of line-weight and composition reflects a facility in producing architectural plans whilst displaying a thorough knowledge of contemporary architectural elements and forms. The result is not dissimilar to the rare survival of the near-contemporary design for the façade of Orvieto Cathedral [fig. 2.55], which references French Rayonnant architecture. The structures in the Passional will be shown in chapter four to be reminiscent of certain items of English cathedral furniture executed in early Decorated Style which itself was an English interpretation of Rayonnant.

The above comparative study of style has reviewed the relationship between the art of the Passional and preceding Bohemian art, in the context of the nation’s membership of the German Empire in Central Europe, and to the Gothicising trends in the art of the West. This leads to a resultant recognition that the Passional artist’s style fits more comfortably within the artistic developments to the west of Europe. Already, it is beginning to emerge that the Passional art exhibits a closer stylistic affiliation to English than to French art of the end of the thirteenth and beginning of the fourteenth century. Now, attention is turned to the field of iconography which travels hand-in-hand with style. In the following chapter, the Passional will emerge as a functional object and attention will drawn to the vital role played by the artist, through choice iconography and expressive illustration, in achieving the aims of those who conceived the complex, personal and important project, and in shaping the Passional into a unique devotional manuscript.
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3. A STUDY OF ICONOGRAPHY

Study of the rich iconography of the Passional yields much information about the artist, his patron, and their interrelationship. Some of the illuminations are highly individual while others adhere to conventions established and practised over centuries. In the case of the former, I shall attempt to identify why the artist might have been called upon to provide these original images; and in the latter, I shall be guided by Anne Rudloff Stanton’s approach and, rather than dwelling on the evolutionary development of the iconography employed, concentrate on its significance in the context of the manuscript, paying particular attention to the most singular and distinctive features. Iconography, like style, carries with it some inherent indications for ascertaining the origins of the artist and his art, and certain aspects in the Passional will again be shown to point towards an association with England: this, however, will be the concern of the final chapter. It has been observed that Colda repeatedly expressed deference to Cunegund, not only as abbess and princess but as an intellectual and the driving force behind the project. I suggest that there is evidence, often revealing itself in the Passional’s highly distinctive illustrations, of Cunegund’s specific eschatological fears that may have been growing as she faced her mortality and which she called upon Colda to address. By studying the manuscript’s iconography, we are not only able to discern her pious attitudes but also to gauge her personal involvement in the project (which, I suggest, may have included the composition of the rubric titles and possibly also the texts of the laments), and the degree of influence she may have exerted over the artist and the image content. Medieval royal women were major patrons of devotional books, often exercising great control over the works they commissioned. Cunegund and her Passional would seem to be a case in point.

Jonathan Alexander raised the importance of attempting to read medieval, manuscript images using the codes that belong the culture in which they were created; in the same way that we are able effortlessly to make nuanced judgements, assessments and reactions when we observe contemporary images from within our own cultural sphere, such as those in
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465 Cunegund’s authorship can only be touched on in this study as it is outside the remit of my thesis, nevertheless, it is important as a consideration as it casts a new light on Cunegund’s potential control over the content of the illustrations and suggests a much closer working partnership between the abbess and her artist. It is a subject of present research.
magazines or advertisements. In relation to the Passional, it is necessary to possess not only a level of understanding of the religious female piety of the age, but also of Cunegund’s personal circumstances. Known details of her religious and social background shed considerable light on the iconographic choices made in the Passional illustrations and might explain why the artist sometimes strayed from the exact use of iconography employed in other European manuscripts, including those from Westminster and environs. Being sensitive to iconographic cues, one can appreciate why a particular scene might have been selected and handled in a certain manner, what the desired response might have been, and how the iconography relates to the accompanying text. This will necessarily lead to some subjective and hypothetical interpretations being offered in order to explore and to approach any true understanding of the manuscript and its function. Art is not a science and medieval religious art in particular carries with it much that is deeply emotional, spiritual, traditional and superstitious and it aimed to elicit concomitant responses. The important point is that any interpretation should be founded on rigorously identified, if fragmentary, evidence. The text offers the primary guide to establishing the Passional’s raison d’être but it is the illustrations that formulate and direct the pattern of devotion dictated by the manuscript. The blue-print for contemplative prayer is most particularly centred around the mnemonic and expressive Andachtsbilder (the major example on fols.3r,10r and possibly including 20r and 22v, and minor examples on fols.11r and 16v); and around the several, highly individualised images which appear to closely reflect aspects of Cunegund’s spiritual concerns, her background and her religious training. The illuminations appear to express the specific, pious intentions of this manuscript and its patron.

It has already been suggested that the artist produced the fol.1v patron image following the ceremonial handing over of the manuscript of the first treatise: perhaps early 1313. Caroline Walker Bynum observed: “‘Made by’ in the case of medieval devotional objects often better describes the activity of the patron who commissioned the work than that of

---

469 See for example, Hamburger and Marti eds., Crown and Veil; Caroline Walker Bynum, Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages (Berkley, 1982); idem, Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women (Berkley, 1988); idem, Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond (Philadelphia, 2007); Rosalynn Voaden, God’s Words, Women’s Voices - The Discernment of Spirits in the Writings of Late Medieval Women Visionaries (York, 1999); Jessica Barr, Willing to know God - Dreamers and Visionaries in the Later Middle Ages. (Columbus, 2010).
470 P.33-34.
the sculptor or illuminator who formed it.” There can be little doubt that Cunegund directed the artist to present her as she wished to be remembered, “in secula seculorum” fol.31v28. as abbess and princess. The artist employs an age-old conceit, creating a hierarchy of size to denote importance: the large figure of Cunegund dominates the image, seated upon a roll-cushion upon a throne, beneath an arch. This authoritative, formal, knees-apart, seated, frontal pose is usually, in earlier manuscript depictions, the preserve of distinguished or high-ranking rulers and religious figures, chiefly male. A similar pose is adopted on Cunegund’s abbatial seal [fig. 3.1], here, however, the the knees are gently deflected to the side. Both images, and particularly that on fol.1v, echo those found on the royal seals of Czech kings [fig. 3.2]. Perhaps Cunegund wished to remind the viewer that she was once heir to the throne and that she has set this aside, as the fol.1v rubric titles explain. It may also be interpreted as an expression, not of pride, but of the jurisdictional power of her office. In the Passional, Cunegund is framed by the elegant, ogival arch that is a precedent for the heavenly mansions, represented on fol.s.20r and 22v, possibly anticipating that on her death she will be thus rewarded. Cunegund was already forty-seven when she commissioned the Passional: a considerable age for the period. The manuscript expresses not only her clear desire to win salvation and a heavenly crown but also reflects her faith in and fear of the Four Last Things – Death, Judgement, Heaven and Hell – an anxiety shared by many in this period. There is a crucial message in the words of the administering angels on fol.1v: “You spurned the world and renounced earthly royal power,” “I bestow on you a blessed crown as a reward.” Following Wenceslas III’s death, in 1306, Cunegund was the senior Premyslide, in the very position provided for by the 1257 privilegium. It was too late, however, for the forty-one-year-old Cunegund who was not only husbandless but in religious enclosure and thus excluded from consideration. Significantly, the sentiment of the angels’ rubric message was expressed in a letter, written in the 1230s, from St. Clare (1194-1253) to St. Agnes of Prague, Cunegund’s guardian in the Clarisse Convent of St. Francis. St. Clare wrote: “the king himself [Christ] will take you to his bosom in the heavenly bridal chamber…because you have despised the glories of earthly power…you are already caught in his embrace, and he has adorned…you with a

---

472 Much of the assessment of fol.1v iconography was presented in Vlček Schurr, “The Dedication Illustration,” 192-218.
473 P.75.
474 On kissing the fol.1v image pp.84-85.
475 “mundum sprevisti regnum terrestre liquisti” “felici dono iam te praemiando / corono” rubric titles fol.1v.
476 P.10.
golden crown marked with the emblem of sanctity.” Following the tenets of Brautmystik, St. Clare equates the reward of renunciation with the joy of sharing a spiritual, conjugal bed with Christ: the one dependent upon the other. It also offers Cunegund the promise that her rejection of earthly power will be thus rewarded, and she will be crowned in Heaven.

Sts. Clare and Agnes conducted a personal correspondence over a twenty-year period, pre-1234-1253: four of St. Clare’s letters survive. In this study, this valuable correspondence will provide much evidence for Cunegund’s pious outlook and for her aims in creating the Passional. This link has never previously been drawn and has a bearing on the artistic content of the Passional. It is unimaginable that St. Agnes would not have placed the wisdom of such an illustrious Christian role-model at the centre of her great-niece’s tutelage during the five impressionable teenage years that Cunegund was under her care: St. Agnes died in 1282, when Cunegund was seventeen. There is clear, but previously unacknowledged, correlation between the letters and many of the Passional illustrations, including fol.1v, and in particular the emotive Andachtsbilder. That the letters survived the intervening 700 years indicates the respect they commanded. This is unsurprising since St. Clare was companion of St. Francis (1181/1182-October 3, 1228), as well as founder of the Clarisses and St. Agnes’ mentor. St. Clare died August 11, 1253, and was canonised by Pope Alexander IV, August 15, 1255. Her surviving letters are drenched in motifs drawn from the Song of Songs, the biblical epithalamium which was used by St. Jerome (March 27, 347-September 30, 420) and subsequent authors as a framework on which to build the tenets of Brautmystik. The correspondence, just as many of the Passional illuminations, focuses on Christ’s humanity which, as Rosalynn Voaden highlights, elicited strong and passionate responses from women. “Marriage” to Christ was central to a nuns’ vocation and central to the message that St. Clare was transmitting to her protégé, and, through St. Agnes, to Cunegund. In this chapter, it will become clear how the illustrations, particularly

480 St. Clare of Assisi, 109-123.
481 P. 10.
482 St. Francis was canonised by Pope Gregory IX, July 16, 1228, well within St. Agnes’ lifetime and only six years before she became a Clarisse, 1234.
483 On St. Clare, see Christopher Stace, St. Clare of Assisi - Her Legend and Selected Writings (London, 2001).
484 Matter, 58.
485 Voaden, God’s Words, 15.
those in the second treatise, reflect the Franciscan text of the Meditations on the Life of Christ,\textsuperscript{486} which would, almost certainly have formed another strand of Cunegund’s Franciscan education: a copy was to be found in the medieval library of the Convent of St. George.\textsuperscript{487} This, and references to the Gospel of Nicodemus - also in her library - strongly indicates Cunegund’s editorial control over the Passional’s production, and particularly over the content of the images.\textsuperscript{488}

Colda records how Cunegund incessantly questioned him on the subject of the heavenly mansions (fol.19v4-9). This is evidentially crucial and clearly signals anxiety on her part as to her own place within that heavenly hierarchy. Colda’s 1314 treatise on the heavenly mansions provides an answer to her eschatological fears: “Know therefore that you will receive a place among the angels and archangels.”\textsuperscript{489} On fol.1v, the angels’ rubric-utterings declare Cunegund’s rejection of “earthly royal power” and confirm the reward for her humility. The artist is also required to convey this humility. The authoritative, front-facing pose on her abbatial seal is, in fact, softened on fol.1v as the artist depicts Cunegund with head inclined and gaze dropped (a humble pose) as she acknowledges the manuscript-gift from Colda and Beneš. Cunegund’s humility was presented by Colda, in the closing words of his eulogy at the end of the third treatise (fol.31v19 and 26),\textsuperscript{490} as a key to her ultimate salvation. An essential element of Cunegund’s piety was a desire to win her heavenly crown (referred to above in the quote from St. Clare’s letter,\textsuperscript{491} and supremely visible on her portrait image on fol.1v) and with it, absolution and redemption of sins.\textsuperscript{492} It is important to note that there are no less than eight illustrations of heavenly coronation in the Passional (fols.1v, 3v, 9r x4, 17v, 20r). I suggest that their inclusion was at Cunegund’s behest and demonstrate a personal preoccupation.

Extraordinarily, Colda does not suggest that her place will be among the ranks of the mortal blessed but rather among all the ranks of the immortals (fols.30v17-31r22). He


\textsuperscript{487} Vilikovský, 27, refers to an unidentified volume of Pseudo-Bonaventura, \textit{Meditationes Vitae Christi} in Cunegund’s library. Writings of Pseudo-Bonaventura are included in the 1303 florilegium gifted by Cunegund to the convent, Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, MS XIII.E.14c.

\textsuperscript{488} NKČR MS XIII.E.14c, fols.2v-34v and MS XIV.E.10, fols.31r-53r; see pp.147 et seq. and 162-163.

\textsuperscript{489} “Cum angelis / quippe et archangelis scito te porcionem accipere” fol.30v18-20.

\textsuperscript{490} See pp.26 and 75.

\textsuperscript{491} P.70-71.

\textsuperscript{492} Quote on p.75.
concludes: “Because I know you to be so attentive to the sacred texts without doubt you will be given a place among the cherubim. Because truly having been kindled by the love of God, having put on the religious habit you reject the deceit of the world, you will accept the delights among the seraphim, the holy reward happily having been prepared.” This expedient neatly avoids any discomfiture for she does not fit any of the female categories: married, widow or virgin (which should have been her appointed place in order to receive her crown as Christ’s bride). Note that the five virgins depicted in the fol.22v Heavenly Mansions of the Blessed all wear gilded crowns: no other category of mortal is depicted as crowned. The crown is the particular token of virginal recognition that Cunegund seems anxious to receive, as rehearsed in the fol.1v dedication illustration. According to Colda’s rhetoric, by joining the cherubim and seraphim she might occupy a preeminent position closest to Christ’s throne, in the highest rank of the celestial hierarchy, as illustrated on fol.20r: the performative coronation image might assist her towards her own heavenly coronation. I believe that Cunegund’s desire for the heavenly crown is as central to the making of the Passional as it is to the composition executed by the artist on fol.1v. The “blessed crown” that we witness Cunegund receiving, illustrated so visibly by the artist, is the crown referred to in St. Jerome’s letter 22 to St. Paula’s daughter, Eustochium: “though God can do all things He cannot raise up a virgin when once she has fallen…He will not give her a crown.”494 The loss of her virginity would underpin any soteriological concerns held by Cunegund. Unlike countless other holy women who turned to an enclosed life after marriage - as widows, because their husbands had rejected them, or having remained chaste during their marriage prior to joining an order495 - Cunegund took her vow of chastity when still a virgin, as a Poor Clare, pledging herself to a chaste “marriage” with Christ, only to then leave enclosure, in 1290/1291 to take a mortal husband.496 Even the act of leaving a convent was forbidden, especially among the new orders. Carola Jäggi and Uwe Lobbedey describe how, Dominican and Franciscan nuns “were not allowed to leave its confines except when a natural catastrophe threatened their lives or a daughter

495 As St. Kinga (Cunegund), Cunegund’s maternal great aunt, Appendix IIC.
496 P.10.
foundation required new personnel. Even their last residing place had to lie within the walls."

Cunegund broke all her vows but, most significantly, that of chastity. Where would Cunegund stand, as a mother of three, and having reneged on her solemn pledge of fidelity to Christ? St. Jerome makes the answer abundantly clear: “He will not give her a crown.” St. Jerome’s famous Letter 22 provided the foundation for Brautmystik; it established a paradigm for the virginal Christian female, whilst transmitting the erotic element of the Old Testament Song of Songs to female Christian piety, and was a fundamental text in female religious education. In 1319, Cunegund gave her convent a manuscript compilation which includes this letter on fols.201v-283v, although, as Gia Toussaint points out, Cunegund would have been aware of it prior to this date, particularly having been raised as a Clarisse. Clearly no longer a virgin, Cunegund’s loss of her virginity might be viewed as a spiritual catastrophe.

In the opening illumination of the Passional, the artist does not simply record the physical, ceremonial presentation of the manuscript: he links this moment with that strongly-desired and anticipated reception of a heavenly crown, signalling Cunegund’s salvation and future acceptance into the heavenly abodes. (This, and all the crowns depicted in the Passional are fleuron crowns favoured not only by French royalty, but also by the Czech Premyslides [fig. 3.3].) The simultaneous reception of the manuscript and the potential reward of a heavenly crown is represented as an interdependent act. Crucially, the Passional itself is thus demonstrated as playing a part in Cunegund’s ultimate salvation. As so often in medieval paintings, time boundaries dissolve. Upon the page, the artist invites the viewer to experience and witness the coexistence of events both in the present moment and in an imagined future. Painted images were commonly believed to preserve immense spiritual and mystical power: the fol.1v image is one of prolepsis - Cunegund

498 P.11-12.
499 Matter, 15; see p.73.
500 See, for example, Kate Cooper, “The Bride of Christ, the “Male Woman,” and the Female Reader in Late Antiquity,” in The Oxford Handbook of Women and Gender in Medieval Europe, eds. Judith M. Bennett, and Ruth Mazo Karras (Oxford, 2013), 529-544, at 533-538.
501 Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, MS XII.D.10.
502 Toussaint, 57.
503 Binski, Westminster Abbey, 110.
receiving her heavenly crown – and would be deemed capable of executing an active, performative role not only in anticipating the act envisaged but also in ensuring its accomplishment. Cunegund might expedite the realisation of her hopes, desires and prayers, by having the artist depict her salvation in painting.506

In obeying her royal duty as a Premyslide princess, Cunegund broke her religious vow of chastity and risked her eternal soul by marrying Boleslav II of Mazovia. Cunegund’s life-long dilemma was in the conflict of duty owed on the one hand to her dynasty and nation and on the other to her Lord and God. This is introduced in her fol.1v title: “Cunegund, the most serene abbess of the monastery of St. George in the citadel of Prague, daughter of his majesty Otakar II the King of Bohemia”;507 the artist conveys the dignity of both offices. Abbess and Princess were amongst the highest-ranking female positions in their respective hierarchical systems - religious and feudal. There are many clues that indicate that in this opening image Cunegund was attempting to rationalise and reconcile the duality of these demands. (Contradictory juxtapositions were peculiarly appealing to the medieval way of thinking, in a time when boys could be bishops,508 and princesses, abbesses.) Colda references the paradoxical yet complementary aspects of her life in the closing words of his 1314 eulogy, hoping to: (Underlining added) “…demonstrate your humility and… show the dignity of your generosity. The first considers the intercourse of religion, the second the loftiness of your royal birth. And in the same way that the chaste virgin is associated with sacred virginity, so in your personage religious humility is adorned by royal birth. May the nobility of your graciousness last throughout the ages. Amen.”509 Colda even hints that her regal humility might equate with sacred virginity and therefore perhaps be a saving grace.

Cunegund might receive praise for, and exhibit, humility but she clearly lacked neither strength of personality nor authority as her fol.1v image demonstrates, and as Colda confirms in his eulogy.510 As senior Princess,511 Cunegund would be afforded total

506 Eight images of coronation, p.72.
507 “CHUNEGUNDIS / abbatisa monasterii / sancti georgii in castro / pragensi serenissimi / boemiæ regis domini / Ottacari secundi / filia” title, fol.1v.
508 Echoes of the medieval fascination with the ‘upside-down world’ survive today in several churches and cathedrals e.g. Salisbury, where boys (often choristers) become “bishop” for a period, see Neil Mackenzie, The Medieval Boy Bishops (Leicester, 2012).
510 P.26-27.
511 Pp.10 and 70.
obedience with few to answer perhaps the king himself. Her status as Princess Royal was impressive: she and those surrounding her would have been acutely aware of this. In turn, total obedience was also due to an Abbot, or in this case Abbess, within the community in Benedictine practice.\footnote{Christopher Brooke, \textit{The Rise and Fall of the Medieval Monastery} (London, 2006), 22.} Furthermore, as Klaus Schreiner explains: “the abbesses of medieval female monasteries held secular powers of jurisdiction. As feudal rulers over properties and people, they were in charge of territories and their populations. As female rectors of high and lower churches, they assigned benefices, sinecures, and canonical seats.”\footnote{Klaus Schreiner, “Pastoral Care in Female Monasteries – Sacramental Services, Spiritual Edification, Ethical Discipline,” in \textit{Crown and Veil: Female Monasticism from the Fifth to the Fifteenth Centuries}, ed. Jeffrey F. Hamburger, and Susan Marti (New York, 2008), 225-244, at 225.} Ultimate responsibility for the managerial and financial burdens imposed by running a large estate rested with the abbess.\footnote{Katrinette Bodarwé, “Abbesses,” in \textit{Women and Gender in Medieval Europe: An Encyclopedia}, ed. Margaret Schaus (New York, 2006), 1-4, at 2-4; skills Cunegund could teach Eliška.} This is demonstrated by Cunegund’s challenging the brethren of St. Thomas in Prague’s Lesser Town over ownership of a garden adjacent to their church, 1306.\footnote{Appendix I; Zdenka Všetečková, “Prague 1 – Lesser Town, St. Thomas’ Church,” in \textit{A Royal Marriage – Elisabeth Premyslid and John of Luxembourg, 1310}, exhibition catalogue, English edition, ed. Klára Benešovská (Prague, 2011), 168-173, at 168.} She reveals herself as a woman in charge, acting with the confident independence born of both her offices: more than capable of demanding and controlling the creation of her own manuscript, the Passional and, as I aim to demonstrate, its illuminations.

Cunegund is instantly identifiable on fol.1v as abbess by the conspicuous insignia of her office: her crosier [fig. 3.4]. The artist depicts this in detail: its curve is echoed in the arch above and answered by a trail of rubric. This image, and that on the Abbess' official seal [fig. 3.1], provides invaluable evidence for the crosier’s original appearance. Today, the only original metalwork surviving is on the staff [fig. 3.5]. Dana Stehlíková describes the crosier’s volute on fol.1v as containing “a figure of dragon without St. George (ivory?),”\footnote{Stehlíková, “Crosier,” 486. The volute was altered in 1553 to incorporate the figural group of St. George and the dragon, and revised again in 1836, ibid.} and then when referring to the seal: “the depicted crosier with a dragon in the volute was inspired by the real crosier.”\footnote{Idem, “Majestic seal of Abbess Cunegonde Premyslid,” in \textit{A Royal Marriage – Elisabeth Premyslid and John of Luxembourg, 1310}, exhibition catalogue, English edition, ed. Klára Benešovská (Prague, 2011), 499, at 499.} Rather than being worked in ivory, as Stehlíková suggests, I consider the gilded illumination on the fol.1v as an indication that the entire volute was worked in gold, probably the product of expert Prague goldsmiths.\footnote{The crosier is one of the few gilded objects in the Passional, p.53; see Dana Stehlíková, “Goldsmithery in Bohemia in 1270-1324,” in \textit{A Royal Marriage – Elisabeth Premyslid and John of Luxembourg, 1310}, exhibition catalogue, English edition, ed. Klára Benešovská (Prague, 2011), 452-457.} It differs greatly from...
the simple, generic volute ends illustrated for example on fol.22v [fig. 3.6]. On observation, however, I consider Cunegund’s crosier volute to have ended not in a dragon, as Stehlíková suggests, but in a finely depicted, five-lobed leaf [fig. 3.7] - a vine leaf. This would express obvious eucharistic symbolism.\(^{519}\) (An image of Sts. Waltrude and Gertrude in Madame Marie’s Picture-book, Paris, c.1285, depicts two crosiers of very similar design [fig. 3.8].)\(^{520}\) Cunegund’s crosier was a gift from her brother, King Wenceslas II and an accurate and detailed portrayal of this valuable and prestigious sacred object in the Dedication Illustration would be appropriate as a record for future generations.

Family members commonly provided convents with gifts,\(^{521}\) for example, according to the Chronicon Thietmari,\(^{522}\) the Saxon King Otto III (Holy Roman Emperor 996-January 23, 1002) gave a gold crosier to his sister when she became Abbess of Quedlinburg in 999.\(^{523}\) Cunegund’s crosier has two, original bands encircling the stem [fig. 3.5], each bearing two bars of writing:

\[\begin{align*}
\times & \text{ ANNO DOMINI MCCIII HUNC BACULUM FIERI FECIT. WENCESLAUS} \\
\times & \text{ I.I. BOHEMIAE ET POLONIAE. REX. ET. DEDIT. GERMANI SUAE.} \\
\times & \text{ DOMINAE CUNIGUNDAE. ABATISSAE. MONASTERI.I SANCTI. GEORGI} \\
\times & \text{ IN. CASTRO PRAGENSI. ANNO. PRIMO BENE DICCTIONIS. SUAE.}^{524}\n\end{align*}\]

The crosier was commissioned in 1303, therefore at least three months after Cunegund’s consecration as Abbess of St. George’s Convent in September 1302.\(^{525}\) Stehlíková points out that this was also the year of Wenceslas II’s marriage to Elizabeth Rejčka, his second wife, which took place May 26.\(^{526}\) The crosier may have been a votive gift, not only to

---

\(^{519}\) Alison Stones, Le Livre d’images Madame Marie; reproduction intégrale du manuscrit Nouvelles acquisitions français 16251 de la Bibliothèque nationale de France (Paris, 1997), 104, describes the leaf at the centre of the volute as a sycamore.


\(^{522}\) German Chronicle by Thietmar von Merseburg (July 25, 975 - December 1, 1018).


\[\begin{align*}
\times & \text{ In the Year of our Lord 1303 this crosier was commissioned by Wenceslas} \\
\times & \text{ King of Bohemia and Poland, and given to his true sister} \\
\times & \text{ Mistress Cunegund Abbess of the Convent of St. George} \\
\times & \text{ In the citadel of Prague in the first year of her incumbency.} \\
\times & \text{ Stehlíková, “Crosier,” 486.} \\
\times & \text{ Tomek, Dějepis, 1:211; Stehlíková, “Crosier,” 486, suggests that the Cunegund may have assisted at the} \\
\times & \text{ wedding, also that the image of Cunegund with her crosier and with a crown suspended over her head may be} \\
\times & \text{ seen as indication that she was present at the queen’s coronation. I offer an alternative assessment of the} \\
\times & \text{ iconography, p.73-75.}\n\end{align*}\]
mark Cunegund’s instalment as Abbess of St. George’s Convent but also to ensure the blessing of Wenceslas’ marriage. The inscription declares Wenceslas as King of Bohemia and Poland, perhaps acknowledging his sister’s all-important role in his attainment of the Polish throne in August 1300.527 (Wenceslas may, I suggest, have performed a public act of contrition for this misdeed when, in 1292, the year after Cunegund was taken from the Poor Clare convent in Prague, he reaffirmed the foundation of St. Kinga’s Clarisse Convent (founded in 1280) in Stary Sącz, Lesser Poland, 100km south-east of Krakow.528 It is not impossible that Cunegund had even stipulated generosity towards the Order of Poor Clares from which she was so abruptly extracted.) Through the gift of a crosier, Wenceslas may also have sought Cunegund’s forgiveness, and spiritual atonement for having withdrawn her from enclosure.

If the volute of the crosier does indeed end in a vine leaf, a further, interesting possibility should be entertained. The vine leaf features prominently on the crest of the Bishop of Prague, John IV of Dražice [fig. 3.9],529 who consecrated Cunegund as Abbess on September 19, 1302.530 Bishop John IV was a major patron of art and architecture531 - including his palace beside the River Vltava in Prague Lesser Town (Malá Strana)532 - marking his patronage liberally and ostentatiously with his family crest [fig. 3.10].533 I suggest his patronage may have extended to the commissioning of the crosier: his personal device being wrought into the volute to reference his patronage and his part in Cunegund’s consecration as abbess. He was from a noble, Czech family with a history of service to the Premyslides,534 and was close to the King Wenceslas II.535 The Crown owned all Episcopal

527 Tomek, Dějepis, 1:211.
528 St. Kinga (or Cunegund), his great-aunt and his sister’s namesake, and a member of the convent, died July 24, that same year, see appendix Ilc.
529 P.35; see Hledíková, Biskup Jan IV. For his life and work, in English, Benešovská, “Jan IV,” 522-529.
530 Stehlíková, “Crosier,” 486.
531 Benešovská, “Jan IV,” 522.
532 Appendix I; nothing remains but the street name, Biskupský dvůr – Bishop’s court. His personal chapel was decorated with images of all the bishops of Prague and the walls painted with shields of the Czech nobility, Tomek, Dějepis, 1:227.
533 John IV was also patron of several architectural projects, including the completion of the Church of St. Jilji in Prague, 1311 and 1316, ibid., 523. Towards the end of his long life (d. January 5, 1343, aged 92) he commissioned an Augustinian monastery for canons in Roudnice and Labem (and a bridge to span the River Labe (Elbe) at this point), advertising his patronage over the entrance to the cloister.
534 Lord Gregorius of Dražice and his son Bishop John III are referred to as members of one of ten families given judicial rights and chosen to serve King Otakar II in the citadel of Prague, Tomek, Dějepis, 1:343.
535 At Bishop John IV’s own ordination Wenceslas II gave him an emerald ring, gave him the sceptre and orb to hold (confirming his ducal title and symbolically bestowing upon him temporal and ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction), and provided a feast with game from the royal forests, also in a remarkable gesture of respect from a king to a prelate suggesting deep familiarity, on returning to the Bishop’s Palace, the dismounted king led the bishop’s horse through the gates of the Bishop’s palace, all the while uttering words of blessing, ibid., 1:359.
property: if the bishop commissioned the crosier as a gift on the king’s behalf this would flatter both the monarch and recipient. This must remain hypothetical, nevertheless, the crosier, recorded by the artist in the Passional’s patron portrait, demonstrates continued Premysl’s support of the convent and a mark of approbation of Cunegund’s status as abbess from a brother and a king, even if accomplished through the Bishop of Prague’s initiative.

The argument for the artist having presented a near-accurate likeness of the crosier is strengthened by his detailed representation of the garments worn by the assembly, particularly the somewhat idiosyncratic habits of Cunegund and the sisters of the convent. These are markedly different from the standard Benedictine robes worn by the previous generation of nuns (as demonstrated by a stone tympanum that may have originally been placed over the entrance to the Chapel of the Virgin Mary, in the cloister of St. George’s Convent [fig. 3.11]. The nuns’ unusual garb, depicted on fol.1v, might represent Cunegund’s interpretation of pepla crispa, a form of habit modelled on the Magdalene’s dress. This was known as Ranse throughout Saxony, Meissen and Thuringia, areas all closely associated with Prague. This Czech version does not answer to the same description as that given by Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz in the early eighteenth century, but is distinguished by the prominent, starched (crispa), high collar of the cloak (pepla).

We know that Cunegund specifically identified herself with Mary Magdalene for it would be no accident that she was admitted to the Convent of St. George on the Feast of Mary Magdalene, July 22, 1302. The Virgin Mary and Mary Magdalene were held up, particularly by Franciscans, as exemplars of compassion and piety: idealistic role-models for nuns. Their involvement in Christ’s life and their presence at the Crucifixion made them obvious candidates. According to Jacobus de Voragine’s account in the Legenda

---

539 Leibniz gives an account of the pepla crispa worn by the Penitential Order of St. Mary Magdalene, “Ordo iste Beata Magdalena de poenitentia...sorores nostrae istae ante reformationem et in principio reformationis suae pepla crispa vulgariter dicta Ranse deferebant, quaemodum B. Mariam Magdalenam portasse existimabant...per to tum Saxonia, Misniam et Thuringiam,” Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, Scriptorum Brunsvicensia illustrantium vol. 2 (Hanover, 1710), 872.
540 Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, Fragmentum Praebendarum, Distribucionum et Officiorum in Ecclesia S. Georgii Castrli Pragensis, MS XIII.A.2, fol.8v17-18, “Cunegundae que receipt habitum monasterium Anno domini MCCCij die marie / magdalene.”
Aurea, Mary Magdalene, like Cunegund, was wealthy and of royal descent: as notorious for her abandonment to fleshy pleasures as she was celebrated for her beauty and riches. I consider it deeply significant that Cunegund so aligned herself with the Magdalene, presumably identifying her broken vow of chastity with the Magdalene’s “abandonment to fleshy pleasures”. Perhaps Cunegund, too, was anxious to serve and anoint as she “sat at the Lord’s feet” - as Voragine describes - and therefore to be absolved of her sins.

This association is also reflected in the contemporary, introductory rubrics of the convent’s ludus paschalis, which describe the Abbess as preceding the Magdalene to the sepulchre: “the Mistress Abbess leads, Mary Magdalene follows her, the three Maries follow her together with the older men.” (She does not appear to participate in the performance beyond kissing the linens at the end of the performance.) Her allegiance to Mary Magdalene is declared again, through the artist’s ministrations, in the lower image on fol.7v which is modelled on noli me tangere iconography but substituting a supplicant nun for the Magdalene. Although not explicit, the nun may originally have represented Cunegund; it, nevertheless, provides for posterity a generic nun/Magdalene figure with which any nun might identify. It speaks of Cunegund’s penitence and desire for absolution. On fol.1v the nuns are shown dressed in their black habits: black, representing repentance, was established in the ninth century by imperial decree as obligatory for Benedictines. The Passional artist, however, painstakingly adds the further detail of bold cross-hatching over the veils and tunics. I suggest that this replicates the visibly coarse, open-weave appearance of goat-hair cloth used widely across Europe mainly for shrouds and, significantly, for penitential “hair shirts” (Thomas à Becket was found to be

544 Ibid.165.
545 Stejskal, Pasionál, 34-35, rather suggests Cunegund adopted role of Mary/Eve and Christ’s Bride.
547 Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, MS XII.E.15a, fol.69v.
548 “Domina abbatisa precedet / Maria Magdalena sequetur eam / tres Marie sequentur eam cum / senioribus.” NKCR MS XII.E.15a, fol.69v1-6; see p. 111.
549 P.85.
550 Pp.120-123.
551 Stejskal, Pasionál, 27, identifies the kneeling figure as Cunegund.
553 Barbara Harvey, Monastic Dress in the Middle Ages - Precept and Practice (London, 1988), 9-10.
wearing one such).\textsuperscript{555} Making this highly visible in the fol.1v portrait illustration offers a statement of Cunegund’s piety and desire for atonement, and that of her nuns.

The artist distinguishes Colda as a Dominican in the fol.1v illustration, accurately depicting the distinctive black mantle, or cappa, that gave the order the sobriquet of the Blackfriars. Just as black represented repentance, so the white of his cote, or tunic, symbolised glory.\textsuperscript{556} The observant artist has depicted Colda’s doublet,\textsuperscript{557} the shirt worn beneath the cote, peeping from beneath his loose sleeves at the wrists of his up-stretched arms. These shirts were traditionally made of linsey-woolsey, a linen/woolen mix fabric of loose weave known in medieval time as stamineum.\textsuperscript{558} Nor did the artist shy away from depicting the nuns’ undergarments, similarly revealed at the wrist.\textsuperscript{559} Beneš, in contrast to the other figures, cuts a dash in his splendid, rose-pink cote, and his strikingly blue scapular: the apron-like working-garment of those committed to a religious life. This is tied about his comfortably-rounded waistline with a white rope. Writing between 1292-1296, William Durand of Mende (c.1230-1296) stipulated that “sacred vestments are not to be used for daily wear.”\textsuperscript{560} Priests usually wore white, red, black or green.\textsuperscript{561} Beneš’s pink and blue working apparel, perhaps distinguishing him as a scribe, is a relieving splash of colour contrasting the garb of the other attendees at this solemn ceremony. His wide cuffs, buttoned-in at the wrists,\textsuperscript{562} reflecting contemporary fashion,\textsuperscript{563} would be practical for scribal activities. In 1312, however, the year the Passional’s first treatise was written, Pope Clement V passed a ruling that forbade members of religious orders to wear buttons, considering them to be a vainglorious extravagance.\textsuperscript{564} As a secular canon, Beneš was presumably exempt from the edict: so, it would seem, were the angels hovering over Cunegund whose buttoned sleeves, offer them an air of fashionable elegance. Once again,

\textsuperscript{555} Harvey, 7-8.
\textsuperscript{556} White habits are worn by Praemonstratensians (established Strahov monastery, Prague, 1140), and Carthusians (established in today’s Smichov area of Prague c.1342). Carthusian novices, like Dominicans, wear a black mantle over their white robes, Harvey, 9.
\textsuperscript{557} Harvey, 20.
\textsuperscript{558} Ibid., 24.
\textsuperscript{559} Even Christ’s doublet is revealed at the wrist on fol.18r.
\textsuperscript{561} Ibid., 213; Margaret Scott, Fashion in the Middle Ages (Los Angeles, 2011), 9, remarks that secular priests were expected to wear distinctive garb.
\textsuperscript{562} Excavations by a dock wall in Queen Victoria Street, London E.C.4, revealed a bale of several hundred late thirteenth-/early fourteenth-century textiles including lines of same-fabric buttons, sewn along garment edges, Crowfoot, Pritchard and Staniland, Medieval Finds, 9; also, opposite 20, Plate 1.
\textsuperscript{563} Henry V of England advocated a limit of 1/2 yard of material to be used in the making of monks’ sleeves, Harvey, 13.
\textsuperscript{564} Ibid., 12.
in contrast, Colda’s severe “St. Peter’s tonsure” which represented the crown of thorns, in contrast, Colda’s severe “St. Peter’s tonsure” which represented the crown of thorns, 565 Beneš seems to have had an eye on courtly style: although tonsured, his wavy hair and curled fringe (known as a dorstott), were the height of contemporary fashion. 566 Indeed, bar the bald pate, his hairstyle compares with that of Christ as the lover-knight (fol.3v) and Adam (fol.4r), both of whom are presented, by contemporary standards, as archetypal, beautiful young men. The Passional artist certainly had an eye for detail.

Also, in the spirit of accuracy, I would argue, the artist presents eight (adult) serene, nuns prominently on the right of the fol.1v introductory image. (Incidentally, eight is an intimate enough number to gather comfortably before the Passional images, although individual devotion would seem more likely.) Their presence suggests their importance not only to the occasion but also in the reception and future use of the Passional manuscript. Their copious folds of cloth indicate large quantities of fabric, signalling wealth and nobility. 567 St George’s Convent attracted women from elite families. 568 Benedictine female houses were historically the refuge of the nobility to the point of social exclusivity. 569 The Convent of St. George, despite being a female foundation, was the first monastic establishment in the Czech Lands 570 and remained one of the most significant religious communities together with several other female communities — the Convent of St. Francis in Prague 571 and the Convents in Doksany 572 and Třebnice. 573 All had the advantage of strong royal connections conferring high status. The Premyslides followed the example of the famous Saxon female religious houses, such as Gandersheim and Quedlinburg, in numbering royal daughters in the roll-call of abbesses. 574 St. George’s Convent was a royal foundation, and its situation adjacent to the Prague palace, was a recommendation to Premyslide princesses. As has been mentioned, it enjoyed a five-century-long association with the ruling family of Přemysl. 575

567 Scott, Medieval Dress, 44.
568 From the surviving archival evidence, it would appear that the nuns of St. George’s were historical drawn from the aristocracy, Tomek, Dějepis, 1:443.
570 Founded c.970, Fiala, Předhusitské ěechy, 398.
571 Franciscan/Clarisse double monastery, founded 1234, ibid., 401; see Soukupová; p.10.
572 Premenstratensian, founded 1144-1145, ibid., 402.
573 In Silesia, Cistercian, founded 1202, see Soukupová, 27-31.
574 Appendix IIb.
575 P.4.
My conclusion, that the artist represented on fol.1v the full complement of sisters in St. George’s Convent, is supported by a diploma recorded a generation later, in the convent’s *Fragmentum Praebendarum*, listing eight nuns each with their area of responsibility:

“Bohunca the prioress, Agnes the sacristan, Ludmila the sub-prioress, Anka in charge of the infirmary, Jutka in charge of the consecrated wafers(?)”, Margaretha (*puzwic’ii*) Sudka the housekeeper and Katherina (*stukonis*). The entire holy convent of the aforementioned monastery of St. George...” (Václav Vladivoj Tomek provides a further, intriguing detail that “at Easter, [the feasts of] St. George and Candlemas, each and every canon received coloured eggs, eight in number.”

Painted, hard-boiled eggs were traditionally given by Czech girls to their preferred boy. Each canon received eight eggs, suggesting that every nun gave every canon an egg, confirming the head count of nuns as eight.) Among the functions performed by the sisters of the Convent of St. George, those of “*puzwic’ii*” and “*stukonis*” remain elusive. It is interesting that Tomek was also unable to supply a translation for these words.

The 1303 official list of the brethren at Westminster Abbey, also Benedictine, lists the names forty-nine monks; their roles appear comparable but with several monks fulfilling a single post. Five of the occupations are identical: prior, subprior, *sacriste* (sacristans), *camerarii* (chamberlains - which I have translated above as housekeeper), *infirmarii* (infirmarers). The remaining most important roles listed in Westminster are *elemosinarii*, *cellerarii*, *refectorarii* and *coquinarii* (almoners, cellarers, refectorers and kitchener’s). Perhaps Margaretha and Katherina performed alms-giving or culinary tasks.

The Passional itself, largely through the illustrations, emerges as a very female-orientated manuscript. Women outnumber men on fol.1v by 5:1. It appears unremarked upon that, despite the huge figure of Cunegund dominating the composition, prominence is also afforded to the standing group of Benedictine nuns clustering expectantly to the right of the composition. Proportionally smaller than Cunegund, they are nevertheless significantly

---

576 NKČR MS XIII.A.2, fol.11r35, “hostiaria” lit. a pyx, led me to suggest this occupation. Dobner, however, transcribed this as “ostaria” lit. pertaining to a door, and therefore possibly gatekeeper, Dobner, 6:361.

577 “Bohunca priorissa Agnes custrix Ludmila subpriorissa Anka infirmaria / Jutka hostiaria Margaretha puzwic’ii Sudka cameraria Katherina stukonis. Totiisque / ... ( conventus sanctimonialium). monasterium Sancti Georgii predicii...” NKČR MS XIII.A.2, fol.11r34-36. Note: I have relied on Dobner’s transcription of the bracketed section, see Dobner, 6:361.

578 “o welkonocích, sw. Jiří a o poswícení dostáwali kanowníci barwených wajíček, každý pokaždé osm;”

579 Ibid., 1:446.

580 Ernest Harold Pearce, *Monks of Westminster: being a register of the brethren of the convent from the time of the Confessor to the dissolution, with lists of the obedientaries and an introduction* (Cambridge, 1916), 11.
larger than their male counterparts on the left of the picture.\textsuperscript{581} As with Colda and Beneš, the nuns appear to float ethereally against the page, although the artist introduces some sense of spatial definition: the hands of the innermost two nuns and Colda’s kneeling figure are placed in front of the slim shafts that support Cunegund’s canopy, bringing them to the fore. As observed above, the title above their heads identifies, “The Prioress with her convent.”\textsuperscript{582} Two of the nuns courteously gesture with open right hands towards their abbess with apparent deference and respect. They interact directly with the proceedings and I suggest that, despite their being afforded no other particular distinguishing features, these two members of the convent, positioned nearest their Mother Superior, may represent the prioress and sub-prioress.

The artist provides the participants on fol.1v with benign expressions but no distinguishing facial characteristics. Damage has resulted in Cunegund’s face and upper chest having lost much of their definition. Karel Stejskal interpreted this as a purposefully punitive act, exacted by the nuns, for Cunegund’s prideful representation as crowned Mary,\textsuperscript{583} and equivalent to the attempted-oblation of the evil Belial’s head (fol.5r).\textsuperscript{584} It will be recalled, however, that just thirty/fourty years after her death, Cunegund was remembered in the \textit{Fragmentum Praebendarum},\textsuperscript{585} together with recorded \textit{obitus} for her soul,\textsuperscript{586} as: “foremost in the memories and prayers of people of the present day...as an example of pious, monastic demeanour and reverence.”\textsuperscript{587} The mid-fourteenth-century “Pulkavova chronicle” also records that, on joining St. George’s Convent, Cunegund, “became abbess and instigated many freedoms within the convent.”\textsuperscript{588} Far from being proud and overbearing, it seems she ruled with a light hand. Unlikely, therefore, that the sisters would besmirch her face. In the \textit{Dedication Illustration}, Cunegund’s mouth is obliterated; the circular smudge above her head, ends in the tell-tale line,\textsuperscript{589} representing the edge of a water-mark. This damage is certainly due to deferential kissing,\textsuperscript{590} or the kissing of fingers

\textsuperscript{581} The little nun illustrated to the far right is a special exception, pp.11-12.
\textsuperscript{582} P.8.
\textsuperscript{584} Pp.110-111; also, p.149, for smudging of Christ’s face, fol.14r.
\textsuperscript{585} Pp.12-13.
\textsuperscript{586} NKČR MS XIII.A.2, fols 4v and 8v.
\textsuperscript{587} “in memoria est praesentium hominum Domina Cunegundis filia regis Prziemisil praedicta...sancte / conversationis et religionis exemplo,” NKČR MS XIII.A.2, fol.9r31-32; see also Tomek, \textit{Déjepis}, 1:445.
\textsuperscript{588} “A když pak potom abbatysí byla, mnoho svobody klášteru učinila jest.” Příbik Pulkava z Radenina, \textit{Kronika Pulkavova}, 314.
\textsuperscript{590} See also Toussaint, 13.
then laid upon the image. The resultant effect of this ritual, known somewhat clinically as devotional osculation,\textsuperscript{591} is also seen beside her right cheek and right foot. Physical contact formed an integral part of a medieval nun’s religious expression.\textsuperscript{592} (It is interesting to note the rubric stage instructions at the close of the convent Easter drama, instituted during Cunegund’s incumbency, and referred to above,\textsuperscript{593} which direct the Abbess to publicly express her devotion through kissing. The stage directions read: “Meanwhile the Mistress Abbess affectionately kisses the linen bindings and prays”\textsuperscript{594} - actions also in tune with Franciscan piety.) Signifying reverence and affection,\textsuperscript{595} ritual kissing remains a regular feature of Christian worship to this day. There is little doubt that here, as on fol.10r which will be discussed below, later generations of nuns were expressing emotions of love and admiration for a generous and devout former abbess and benefactor.\textsuperscript{596}

Each nun pictured on fol.1v carries a book: certainly, a conscious iconographic inclusion. They may represent service books, advertising their observance of Canonical Hours and that they follow the Virgin Mary’s example as recorded in apocryphal texts;\textsuperscript{597} they may also indicate Cunegund’s provision of books to her convent,\textsuperscript{598} supporting the sisters in their pursuit of theological knowledge through reading and thus enabling their participation in the reception of the Passional. Unlike Dominicans, Benedictines valued intellectualism over academic excellence, and by the early fourteenth century their houses were recognised as spiritual and cultural centres.\textsuperscript{599} Benedictines formed part of what Newman describes as, “the Latin textual community.”\textsuperscript{600} On Cunegund’s abbatial seal, she is depicted holding a book raised to chest level, representing her authority [fig. 3.1].\textsuperscript{601} It appears open towards her, advertising that she was intellectual, well-read and devout.\textsuperscript{602}

Note, a total of twenty-nine books are illustrated within the Passional illuminations.


\textsuperscript{592} Bynum, “Foreward,” xv.

\textsuperscript{593} Pp.80, also111.

\textsuperscript{594} “Interim domina / abbatissa deos/culatur linthe/um et orès...” Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, Processionale monialium, MS VII.G.16, fol.101v. Note: this is the manuscript identified as having been written up by Beneš, p.41.

\textsuperscript{595} See Rudy, “Dirty Books,” 2; also, De Hamel, A History, 210.

\textsuperscript{596} P.138.

\textsuperscript{597} Hamburger, Marx and Marti, “Time of the Orders,” 72.

\textsuperscript{598} Pp.5 and 13.

\textsuperscript{599} Van Zeller, 	extit{Benedictine Nun}, 54.


\textsuperscript{601} Stehliková, “Majestic seal,” 499.

\textsuperscript{602} Pp.26.
Cunegund, who studied and commissioned books for the library, may well have directed the artist to specifically include them.\footnote{603}{Pp.71-72.}

In a study of sixty manuscripts containing female portraiture around 1300, noting this as twice the number of surviving manuscripts of the period portraying individual men, Alison Stones demonstrates that women played an important part in the commissioning and receiving of books.\footnote{604}{Alison Stones, “Some Portraits of Women in their Books, Late Thirteenth - Early Fourteenth Century,” in Livres et lectures de femmes de Europe entre moyen âge et renaissance, eds. Anne-Marie Legaré and Bertrand Schnerb (Turnhout, 2007), 3-27, at 3.}

Often these women are nameless and without context.\footnote{605}{Loveday Lewes, Women, Art and Patronage, 8.}

Stones lists the various forms of ownership mark that might be present,\footnote{606}{Ibid., “Some Portraits,” 3.} pointing out how rare it is to be able to provide the patronage portrait with an identity.\footnote{607}{Ibid., 8}

The Passional manuscript – image and text - provides all the required ownership information: a patron portrait; Cunegund’s written name, position and heritage; heraldic shields; a record of the commission, stating the remit; dates of both composition and presentation of the first treatise. Cunegund appears to have had a close eye on posterity. This manuscript, however, is unlike the majority of female-portraited works in being neither secular nor in the vernacular.\footnote{608}{Ibid.}

It is also unusual for female portraits to occupy a full page, as on fol.1v,\footnote{609}{Ibid., 9.} although the late thirteenth-century illumination depicting the Comtesse de la Table, wife of Raoul de Soissons,\footnote{610}{Ibid., 11.} kneeling before a statue of the Virgin and child\footnote{611}{Historically, the image was identified as Yolande of Soissons, stepdaughter of the Comtesse de la Table and subsequent owner of the manuscript, ibid.; New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, Psalter-Hours, MS M.729, fol.232v.} provides another example, as noted by Toussaint [fig. 3.12].\footnote{612}{Toussaint, 149-150.}

Female patrons were often portrayed kneeling, often before the Virgin; and often holding a book.\footnote{613}{Ibid., 8}

Cunegund’s authoritative, frontal pose, seated on her throne, again strays from this norm. She reaches to receive the volume from Colda’s hand.\footnote{614}{Ibid.}

Toussaint notes the similarity between this and the full-page composition, depicting Queen Jeanne de Bourgogne-Artois (d.1330), wife of Philippe V.\footnote{615}{See Stones, “Some Portraits”, 5-6; Toussaint, 41; Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Breviculum ex artibus Raimundi Lulli electrum, MS St. Peter perg. 92, fol.12r.} She receives the works from Thomas le Myésier (?-September 11, 1336) the compiler of the teachings of Ramon Llull (c.1232-c.1315-1316) who is pictured at his back with his
hand upon his shoulder [fig. 3.13]. The Queen stands, however, and is similar in stature to her assembled ladies-in-waiting. The patron-portraits, in the Passional, the Psalter-Hours of Comtesse de la Table and Queen Jeanne’s breviary, all employ architectural frames. The French examples are elaborate, formulaic and severe, creating a decorative box-frame around the entire scene.616 Cunegund, in contrast, is enclosed, alone within a private space created by the graceful, ogival arch which serves to emphasise her importance as well as, as I have suggested, presaging her future, ultimate reward of a heavenly abode.617 Queen Jeanne’s breviary post-dates the Passional by some seven years but here, as in the Passional, heraldry also plays an important role providing some of the most obvious cues for the medieval viewer to “read”.618 Her gown echoes the three heraldic shields above her head. The Comtesse de Table is also depicted wearing an heraldic mantle, and she is surrounded by six identifying shields (two complete and four semi-obscured by the elaborate frame). The Queen and Comtesse therefore declare their allegiance in both their heraldic dress and shields.619 Cunegund’s portrait does exactly the same, but this displays her divided allegiances: her dress is Benedictine and emulates the pepla crispa, declaring her religious, personal and penitential affiliations; the three, traditional “heater” shields, prominently displayed above her throne declare her dynastic and national allegiance.

On fol.1v, each shield is given a genitive rubric title: “the emblem” is understood, “of Bohemia”, “of St. George”, “of St. Wenceslas”.620 The central shield forms the pinnacle of the architectural structure, and is exceptional. Larger and placed higher than its companion shields, it is not a coat-of-arms but an illustration of St. George, patron of nation, convent and basilica, uniting Cunegund’s allegiances.621 His depiction as a Christian Knight on a field Gules, mounted and battle-ready, lance dipped and pennant fluttering,622 sets the tone for Colda’s discourse on taking up Christ’s weapons, Arma Christi623 (Instruments of his

616 Pp.65-66 [fig. 2.53].
617 P.70.
618 Pp.68-69.
619 Some fifteen years later, the Luttrell womenfolk also display their heritage and loyalties on their heraldic gowns in the patron portrait, London, British Library, Luttrell Psalter, Add. MS 42130, fol.202v; see Michelle Brown, The World of the Luttrell Psalter, (London, 2006).
620 “Boemiae”, “Sancti Georgii”, “Sancti Wenceslaii” rubric titles, fol.1v; for further discussion see chapter 3.
621 P.4.
Passion) to conquer evil. Flanking this shield, the artist impressively portrays the military coat-of-arms of the Kingdom of Bohemia and the Premyslide kings. On the left, and therefore first to be “read”, is the lion of Bohemia: on a field Gules, blazoned a lion rampant Argent queue fourché, crowned Or,\textsuperscript{624} langued, armed.\textsuperscript{625} St. Wenceslas’ armorial bearings are depicted on the right: usually on a field Or (here the parchment provides the field), blazoned an eagle displayed épandre Sable, klee-stengeln Or,\textsuperscript{626} flamed Gules, langued Gules, armed Or. Zdeněk Fiala declares the Passional illustrations to be the earliest surviving painted and coloured depictions of the charges of the Bohemian lion, and the St. Wenceslas eagle.\textsuperscript{627} These overtly nationalistic symbols may have been consciously chosen by Cunegund to echo formal, royal depictions: such as the shields flanking the image of her brother Wenceslas II, on his royal seal [fig. 3.2],\textsuperscript{628} and in the Codex Manesse [fig. 3.14].\textsuperscript{629} The Czech lion and eagle are both an expression of nationhood (Bohemia) and heredity (Premyslide), and sacred protection is offered through Sts. George and Wenceslas.

Colda’s fol.1v speech banner announces that Christ is represented in the first treatise, and probably at Cunegund’s bidding,\textsuperscript{630} as “the bridegroom in the fitting guise of a soldier”.\textsuperscript{631} In his eulogistic dedication speech, opening on fol.2r, Colda takes the opportunity to direct Cunegund and her nuns to take up arms against evil: the Arma Christi, displayed as objects to be meditated upon on a shield on fol.3r, and with the Man of Sorrows on fol.10r. Colda’s instructions are as follows: “Put on the armour of God, you who are uncertain, that you may be able to withstand the snares of the Devil…if you want to fight against Satan with victory you must arm yourself with spiritual armour. Therefore, you who fight every day as men in this battle, by implanting a manly spirit into your female breasts, using skilled mental ability, fly to the weapons of the Passion of Our Lord, as surely as you will

\textsuperscript{624} The Bohemian lion is usually depicted as crowned Or, langued Or, and armed Or. Tiny fragments of gold remain on the crown, the claws of the right foreleg and possibly between the lower teeth – this would require reverification, however repeated access to the manuscript was not possible. These areas are all very small and presumably more difficult to prepare with glue – the tongue appears to have been applied over paint and this would account for its loss.

\textsuperscript{625} I am grateful to Timothy H.S. Duke, Chester Herald of Arms of the College of Arms, for his guidance.

\textsuperscript{626} This trilobate design on the wings appears commonly in medieval German heraldic devices, representing the upper margin of the eagle wings; described as “clover stalks”.

\textsuperscript{627} Fiala, \textit{Predhusitské čechy}, 97.

\textsuperscript{628} Heildelberg, Universitätssbibliothek Heidelberg, Cod.Pal.germ 848, Codex Manesse, Zürich, fol.10r [fig. 3.14].

\textsuperscript{629} Pp.9-10.

\textsuperscript{630} “sponso plura sub militis apta figura,” rubric title fol.1v.
have need of strong weapons so that you may more safely win against the enemy.”

Colda’s words echo the Rule of Benedict chapter reading for January 1, Prologue, v.3, repeated to Cunegund and her nuns in the manner of a New Year’s resolution, which takes the form of a rallying cry calling Benedictines to arms: “to you, then, whoever you may be are my words addressed, who, by the renunciation of your own will, are taking up the strong and glorious weapons of obedience in order to do battle in the service of the Lord Christ, the true King.” The sources this invoked would also be familiar: St. Paul’s entreaty to the Ephesians to fight evil with, amongst other items, a shield - “take up God’s armour;...take up the great shield of faith with which you will be able to quench all the flaming arrows of the evil one”, and to the Romans - “Let Christ Jesus himself be the armour that you wear; give no more thought to satisfying the bodily appetites.” St. Jerome, engineer of the medieval nuns’ life-ethos, also paraphrased St. Paul: “take to yourself the shield of faith, the breastplate of righteousness, the helmet of salvation and sally forth to battle. The preservation of your chastity involves a martyrdom of its own.”

Note how St. Jerome links the fight directly to virginity.

The elaborate, rubric title, titulus, at the end of the introductory speech on fol.2v refers to the schematic illustration on the facing page. It reads: “Here is the shield, the weapons and the insignia of the invincible soldier who is named conqueror with five wounds, supported by a lance and honoured by a crown.” The artist provides Cunegund with an Andachtsbild of Christ’s insignia: a pseudo-heraldic coat of arms, Arma Christi, emblazoned with the Instruments of the Passion. This shield counterparts those displayed above Cunegund’s fol.1v portrait, similarly representing a militaristic “signature”. Here,

632 “In/duite inquiens vos armaturam / dei ut possitis stare adversus in/fidias dyabgli... Si vultis adversus satanam / victoriose confligere oportet ar/mis spiritalibus vos armare / Vos ergo que femineo pectori vi/riem inserendo animum in hac / pugna cottidie viriliter confili/tis ad arma passionis dominice prudenti use consilio convola/tis ut tanto adversarium vinca/tis securius quanto forci/orum / armaturarum asseruit vobis usus.” fol.2ra22–fol.2rb8.
633 Also, May 2 and Sept. 1; noted by Toussaint, 110.
634 St. Benedict of Nursia, The Rule, 1.
639 P.21.
640 “Hic est Cipeus arma et in/signia Inuictissium militis qui / cognominatus est victor cum Quinque wlnenibus Fultus Lan/cea Decoratus que Corona” title, fol.2v.
Cunegund might align herself as a soldier with Christ, rallying to his “coat-of-arms”. Appropriately, Cunegund’s name translates as “brave in war”.641

Medieval knights recognised one-another in battle or tournament through heraldic devices on their accoutrements:642 visual cues, identifying familial ties and continuity,643 developed during the second quarter of the twelfth century.644 Display was paramount and, as a mark of respect, arms-bearing shields were hung in halls and above tombs and commemoration, for example the accoutrements above the Black Prince’s tomb in Canterbury Cathedral [fig. 3.15].645 Stejskal noted a link with the medieval poetic account in the Gesta Romanorum;646 the significance in this work of the hanging-up of shields as a chivalrous act is examined in depth by Toussaint.647 She points out the following words among the lost prayers:648

Lo, He who rose long ago
Now coming forth in humility
Has hung up his shield here
To venerate You.”649

The shields displayed on fols.1v and 3r honour family, nation and Christ’s suffering, not only with pride and admiration and as *memoria passionis* - images recalling Christ’s Passion - but as an act of chivalry and as a petition to God for future aid and protection in battle.

It has already been noted that the cross dividing the fol.3r shield recalls the arms of St. George.650 It is painted half-light, half-dark in a not-wholly-successful attempt to create form. The emblazoned items float eerily in the spaces beneath the arms of the cross, each recalling an element of the Passion story and the spilling of Christ’s blood. The circumcision knife is included, representing the first occasion on which Christ bled,
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645 Ibid.; Toussaint, 123.
647 See Toussaint, 76-85;122-124, on the hanging-up of shields in Gesta Romanorum and Ancrene Wisse. 648 P.22.
649 “Der Vor zeiten auf gegangen / Kommst in Demuth nun herfür / Hat sein Schild hier aufgehangen / zur Verehrung, siehe, Dir.” Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, MS XVLE.12, fols.20v-24r, at fol.22r16-19 (transcr. Toussaint, 195).
650 P.21.
described by Robert Swanson as the “proto-Passion”.\textsuperscript{651} The fol.3r image of \textit{Arma Christi} prepares the reader for discussion of these items in following text. On fol.6r, Colda acknowledges the widespread veneration of the Instruments of Passion writing: “No doubt the devotion of the people established the veneration of the Weapons, which was also approved by the wise pronouncement of the exalted pope at the Council of Lyon.”\textsuperscript{652} There was a strong tradition but, as Toussaint states, no firm evidence of the Council’s directives.\textsuperscript{653} She cites the text accompanying the comprehensively illustrated \textit{Arma Christi} in the manuscript \textit{Omne bonum},\textsuperscript{654} dated c.1365-1375 [fig. 3.16], which claims three years’ indulgence offered by Pope Innocent and a further, two hundred days by the Council of Lyon for devotions to the Instruments of the Passion.\textsuperscript{655} The text and illustrations in the Passional correspond with contemporary religious dogma and patterns of devotional piety.

The five wounds, the lance and the crown are all specifically mentioned in the fol.2v title,\textsuperscript{656} and all play an important role in Colda’s first treatise. Christ’s victor’s crown of thorns and the lance are first to be “read” on the left of the shield. The crown dangles from a nail which is surrounded by a splashed circle of rubric which is matched on the opposite arm of the cross. These ghostly representations of Christ’s hand wounds are depicted as vivid, red “Catherine-wheels” in their original locations despite the absence of Christ’s body. Two foot-wounds similarly hover beneath the nail that inflicted them which is shown driven into the Cross’ upright. Above, Christ’s side-wound appears in the same manner as a diagonal, black gash surrounded by a riot of rubric, completing the “five wounds” of the fol.2v title. It was not unusual for the side wound to be included as an item in \textit{Arma Christi},\textsuperscript{657} and I suggest that it is illustrated twice on fol.3r of the Passional.\textsuperscript{658} The second representation is an ambiguous image set between the hammer and the knife, offering itself for individual scrutiny.\textsuperscript{659} The perimeter of the oval, outlined in minium, creates the illusion of a circumscribed cut of flesh in which a further, red gash appears

\textsuperscript{651} Robert N. Swanson, “Passion and Practice: The Social and Ecclesiastical Implications of Passion Devotion in the Late Middle Ages,” in \textit{The Broken Body – Passion Devotion in Late Medieval Culture}, eds. A. A. MacDonald, H. N. B. Ridderbos and R. M. Schulsemann (Groningen, 1998), 1-30, at 17.
\textsuperscript{652} “Que profecto arma devotio / fidelium venerari instituit quod etiam in Concilio Ludunensi [=Lugdanum, Latin name for Lyon]” fol.6r3-4.
\textsuperscript{653} Toussaint, 138-139.
\textsuperscript{655} Toussaint, 138.
\textsuperscript{656} P.89.
\textsuperscript{658} Stejskal, \textit{Pasionál}, 73, describes this as an egg, bearing magical/superstitious properties.
\textsuperscript{659} Alternatively, it might represent Malchus’ ear, cut off by St, Peter, Matt. 26.51, Mark 14.47, Luke 22.50-51, John 18.10-11, although the rubric outline makes this unlikely.
embedded, perhaps heralding the focal, enlarged side-wound in the companion Andachtsbild on fol.10r. Devotion to Christ’s five wounds was widespread and, over the following two centuries, escalated to cult status.

An interesting comparison may be made with an image in a contemporary French Book of Hours [fig. 3.17], where the crown of thorns and lance are similarly placed, but the disembodied wounds, also placed on the armature of the cross, take the form of five-petalled roses. In this French image, the accompanying text reads: “this white shield signifies the gentle body of Jesus Christ.” In the Passional fol.3r image, the stretched skin of the parchment forms the shield’s back-ground: it might thus be interpreted as Christ’s own body. Robert Swanson describes later English “Charters of Christ” where, “the Passion process is likened to the preparation of a document, Christ’s skin being the parchment, his blood the ink, and the scourging and other tortments the pens.” It is possible the Passional artist had similar imagery in mind for most of the precisely painted items displayed on the fol.3r shield are daubed with stylised beads or strokes of minium representing Christ’s blood. (The seamless robe, as on fol.8r, is flecked with white paint, as discussed above.) The only items not “blood”-spattered are the ladder, dice and vinegar cup, none of which were in direct contact with the bleeding Christ.

Christ’s blood may be counted among the “weapons” laid out before the devotee on fol.3r so prominent is its place in the image. It is not the gushing gore of so many later depictions of the Passion and imago pietatis, but stylised beads aligned along the edge of the objects or the fancy ribbons and squiggles of rubric pouring from the wounds. Memoria passionis were required to shock in order to be affective (and effective). What better way to elicit an emotional response than to illustrate liberal outpourings of Christ’s blood? In this respect alone, the fol.3r and 10r Andachtsbilder would deeply move the contemporary viewer. Christ’s blood, the “source” of eucharistic wine, was among the most rare and

662 Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, MS 288, fol.15r; see Stejskal, Pasionál, 71-72; Toussaint, 120; Lewis “The Wound,” 204-229.
663 On the five-petalled rose, pp.96-97 and 159-160.
664 “Cis es/cus blans signifie le cors le dous ihejsus crist” Arsenal, MS 288, fol.15r3-4.
665 Swanson, “Passion and Practice,” 20.
666 P.45.
667 P.46.
668 Here the sponge appears as tiny whorls within the cup’s lip. Not specified in Luke, the other gospels, Matt. 27.48; Mark 15.36; John 19.29, describe the sponge being set upon a cane, as on fols.8r and 10r.
669 Vlcek Schurr, “The Dedication Illustration,” 203, erroneously omits the vinegar cup.
valued relics in Christendom, from which all seven sacraments were believed to draw their power. From the twelfth century, the chalice gradually became the preserve of officiating priests, withdrawn from the laity, ostensibly lest even the smallest drop of wine be spilt whilst in its eucharistic form. The denial of this element to communicants fuelled not only their desire to experience it, but also its consequent cult status, dramatically culminating in Bohemia’s fifteenth-century Hussite uprising. Already in the early fourteenth century, the illustration of Christ’s blood in the Passional would have been heavy with meaning.

St. Wenceslas, Cunegund’s ancestor, the national patron saint whose shield surmounts her throne on fol.1v, was himself the subject of a blood-miracle: the failure of his blood to congeal after his brother murdered him in 929. On fol.3r, ribbons of red illustrate blood continuing to pour from the wound-sites despite Christ himself being absent. This was proof of the incorruptibility of his body for blood flowing after death demonstrated the presence of the Holy Spirit. The artist expresses this again on fol.10r. Cunegund had known links with the East: she was daughter of Cunegund of Hungary and grand-daughter of the Russian Lord, Ratislav Michailovich Chernigovski and Anna of the Árpád dynasty; she had spent twelve years at the Mazovian court in Poland; her brother, Wenceslas II is recorded as having frequently attended Eastern Orthodox masses performed in Greek and Old Slavonic by clerics whom he invited from all over the Eastern Empire. As a result of these contacts, Cunegund would have known of the Eastern doctrine of the Rite of Zion, which dictated that the wine of Eucharist should be heated and drunk warm from the chalice. This created a powerful association with Christ’s words, reported by St. John: “My flesh is real food; my blood is real drink. Whoever eats my flesh
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673 Rubin, 70.
674 Thomas Aquinas defended this, since the priest partook of both eucharistic elements, Bynum, *Holy Feast*, 56.
676 Ibid.
677 Ibid., 1-21.
679 Bohuslav Havránek and Josef Hrabák, eds. *Výbor z české literatury od počátků po dobu Husovu* (Prague, 1957), 56-57.
682 Tomek, *Dějepis*, 1:209.
683 *Kronika Zbraslavská*, 177.
684 Ogilvie, *Iconography*, Chapter II.
and my blood dwells continually in me and I dwell in him.”685 The mysteries of transubstantiation - the translation of bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ at the moment of consecration - was promulgated at the fourth Lateran Council, 1215, and was a focus of discussion within the Medieval Christian Church.686 Cunegund would have been drawn into the widespread fascination with Christ’s bleeding,687 appreciating the obvious eucharistic implications conveyed in the fol.3r illustration. As will be demonstrated below, she also practised devotion to Corpus Christi, represented in the other eucharistic element: the host.688

Christ’s blood also commanded a special place in the devotions of nuns of St. George’s Convent. I suggest that the theme of blood, which predominates the illustrations of the first Passional treatise, is also linked with a venerated Crucifix, housed in the basilica, that was reported to bleed intermittently and portentously. It was the subject of a papal indulgence issued April 4, 1251, by Pope Innocent IV for: “the precious shed blood from the precious body of the Redeemer.”689 In 1252, the year Otakar II married Margaret of Babenberg,690 the chronicler recorded: “On the June 13, blood flowed from the foot of the Crucified One in the Church of St. George in Prague. Pominěn, the Czech King’s Chief of Justice, worshipped and wiped his hand in the blood from the foot of the Crucified One.”691 The miracle appears to have been in response to a national threat for the preceding chronicle account reports widespread slaughter by Hungarians marauding Moravia. In 1283, at the end of the disastrous period of rule under Otto V, Margrave of Brandenburg, the Crucifix bled again;692 “On January 15, beads of blood dripped from the foot of the Crucified One.”693 Beads of blood: such as those depicted on fol.3r?
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685 John 6.54-56, N.E.B., 159.
686 Rubin, 14-35.
687 See Betina Bildhauer, Medieval Blood. Cardiff: University of Wales Press. 2006; also, Bynum, Wonderful Blood.
689 “pretiosi sanguinis fusi de pretioso corpore redemptoris,” NA, AZK O.B. St. George’s Charter, no. 209, April 6, 1251, quoted by Stehlíková, “Majestic seal,” 499. Note, this is more than a year before the chronicle recording of miraculous bleeding (p.96) therefore there must have been previous unrecorded events.
690 Margaret of Babenberg, previously been married to Henry VII of Germany, was twenty-six years Otakar’s senior (forty-eight), with no hope of issue - fifty-seven when the marriage ended – but she delivered Austria to the Czechs, Žemlička, Století, 73-76; Otakar II, seized Styria from the Hungarian King Béla IV in 1260, ibid., 115. He inherited Carinthia and Carniola in 1269, Jacques Le Goff, Medieval Civilisation, 400-1500, trans. Julia Barrow (London, 2011), 106.
692 Žemlička, Století, 154-161.
693 “Dne 15. ledna kapaly krupěje krve z nohy Ukritřovaného.” Pokračovaté Kosmovi, 185.
The French Arma Christi presents a “rain of blood” at the top of the image, “from the scourges with which he was punished for our sake”. The Passional fol.3r image illustrates a similar “rain of blood” on the Mount of Olives, represented as a blood-spotted, steep hill with a tree, where Christ’s “sweat was like clots of blood falling to the ground.” Christ himself is poignantly absent from this image allowing the devotee to project herself to the location of the Agony in the Garden. This provides a ready subject for contemplation, particularly if Cunegund herself was in a state of anguish and uncertainty for, as the original Greek ἀγωνία suggests, agony is conflict.

The Christian battle was declared by St. Gregory the Great, in a Lenten sermon, to be both defensive and offensive. Colda instructed Cunegund on fol.2r: “to withstand the snares of the Devil...if you want to fight against Satan”. Shannon Gayk similarly summarises the functional qualities of Arma Christi “as apotropaic “shields” offering protection against evil and earthly sufferings, whilst providing spiritual ammunition with which to attack the Devil.” Contemplation of Arma Christi might therefore protect one’s soul and alleviate it by pushing away “evil”. Cunegund may have sought physical and mental relief through meditation upon the “arms” on Christ’s shield. One of the lost prayers, which originally faced the fol.10r Man of Sorrows, contains the entreaty:

Give your shield as my rudder,
Liberate me on the sea.

Was the fol.3r image conceived as Cunegund’s guide, moral focus and means of release and relief? Colda entreated Cunegund, and her sisters: “Do not let the Instruments of his Passion away from your face; do not let them be torn from your heart; do not let them be taken from your eyes.” The artist provides the Andachtsbilder (fols.3r and 10r) to implement this.
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694 “des es/courgies dont il fut en lestache disciplineis / pour nous” Arsenal, MS 288, fol.15r5-7.
696 This may also be translated as contest.
698 Bynum, Wonderful Blood, 201.
699 “ut possitis stare adversus in/fidias dyaboli… Si vultis adversus sathanam / victoriose confiligere” fol.2ra24-27.
702 “Non recedant de ore; non avellantur a corde tuo; non au/ferantur ab oculis tuis suae passionis insignia” fol.9v2-3.
The invincible soldier referred to on Colda’s fol.1v speech banner,\(^{703}\) and in the fol.2v \textit{titulus},\(^{704}\) is Christ the Lover-knight, illustrated as the hero on fol.3v. He is described in the Ancrene Wisse, Part 7.\(^{705}\) Ancrene Wisse, a spiritual guide created for a group of anchorites in the West Midlands by an unknown author, was widely circulated and translated into French and Latin,\(^{706}\) and often the subject of Dominican teaching.\(^{707}\) The presence of the lover-knight in the Dominican Colda’s text and the fol.3v illustrations is therefore not unexpected. The sequence of images adorning the margin of fol.3v tells its own tales that are at once spiritual (Christ’s redemption of the soul presented in a \textit{sponsus/sponsa} relationship), chivalrous (the brave “Arthurian” knight rides to save the captive princess from her tower) and deeply personal (events perfectly mirroring Cunegund’s life). It is inconceivable that Cunegund was not be deeply sensible of all three layers of allegorical meaning.

Firstly, the \textit{spiritual} interpretation of the fol.3v iconography will be considered: the loss and redemption of the soul (represented by the bride – \textit{sponsa}) may be easily recognised.\(^{708}\) Colda’s explication (fols.4r-6r) equates this with Mankind’s descent into sin prior to being rescued by Christ’s sacrifice: illustrated by images of the Creation, Temptation and Fall. There is only one hint in the \textit{parabola} text that the nobleman is Christ:\(^{709}\) “And so then, because of his love of her he spent thirty-two years in exile”,\(^{710}\) the accepted length of Christ’s temporal life. The true identity of \textit{sponsus} and \textit{sponsa} only becomes explicit in the opening words of the following page’s \textit{expositio} (fol.4r): “this nobleman is the mediator between God and men, Lord Jesus Christ, son of the merciful God”,\(^{711}\) and a few lines down, “This…virgin is the rational soul and was created in the image and likeness of God.”\(^{712}\) The nobleman’s identity seems subtly exposed in the first of the small fol.3v images. This secular \textit{sponsus} appears, on close scrutiny, to be wearing a gory crown of thorns, or the memory of the bloody wounds it caused. Toussaint alone has

\(^{703}\) Pp.9-10.
\(^{704}\) P.89.
\(^{705}\) Ancrene Wisse, also known as Ancrene Riwle (e.g. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 402); see Geoffrey Shepherd ed., \textit{Ancrene Wisse}, Parts 6 and 7 (Manchester, 1972), ix-xiv; also, Lewis, “The Wound,” 204.
\(^{706}\) Shepherd, \textit{Ancrene Wisse}, ix-xii.
\(^{707}\) Toussaint, 78-79.
\(^{710}\) “Unde ob eiusmod amorem XXX du/obus annis in exilio degens...” fol.3v15-16.
\(^{711}\) “Homo iste nobilis est dei et hominum mediator homo / Christus hesus filius dei benedicti...” fol.4r1-2.
\(^{712}\) “Haec...virgo est rationalis anima quae creata ad dei imaginem et similitudinem...” fol.4r10-11.
remarked on the headdress, describing it as “a crown of red blossoms”: a *corona florum* which was a lover’s gift in the chivalric *Minnesang* tradition. This is true of the knight’s pink, rose-wreath in the fourth vignette. The sponsus’ headwear in this first fol.3v image, however, is depicted in red strokes of rubric, the medium used throughout the treatise to represent Christ’s spilt blood as on the head of the fol.10r Christ *Man of Sorrows* where it evokes the presence of the blooded, thorny crown. I believe this has not been noted before.

The first vignette depicts a betrothal with sponsus handing sponsa a ring: it is gilded, marking its special status. Ring-giving was hailed as a bounteous gesture by contemporary writers such as the Franciscan Ramon Llull. Cunegund was, of course, educated by Franciscan teachings. William Durand of Mende (c.1230-1296), in *Rationale divinorum officiorum*, c.1292-1296, interprets the significance of a bishop’s ring as “a pledge of the faith with which Christ has married his spouse, the Holy Church.” The fol.3v image illustrates a binding vow sealed with a ring. Durand further explains: “that the ring is gold and round signifies the perfection of the Spirit’s gifts, which Christ has received without measure, since in Him, the fullness of the Godhead dwells bodily.” Such a token is willingly and reverentially received by the modest sponsa.

The images of seduction, incarceration, rescue and redemption borrow iconography from established models of western Christian art. The villain offering the sponsa his gift, in the second of the fol.3v images, ironically parodies the traditional composition of the adoring magi kneeling before the Virgin and child. Toussaint observes a similarity between the subjugated sponsa of the third vignette and the image of Synagogue, both of whom are depicted bowed-down with tumbling crowns; the fol.3v image of incarceration compares with that of the *Damnation of Mankind* on fol.5r, which is the parallel account given in Colda’s explication; the knight riding his leaping horse recalls the equestrian images found in Apocalypse manuscripts, and his lance, which deals the *coup de gras*, may be interpreted as the holy lance which, according to the Gospel of Nicodemus was wielded by
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713 “ein Kranz mit roten Blüten.” Toussaint, 91.
714 P.102.
717 Ibid.
718 Toussaint, 97; see also, pp.209-210.
719 Pp.210 [fig. 4.133].
Longinus,\footnote{Nicodemus 16.7, The Gospel of Nicodemus or The Acts of Pilate, (reprint of The Apocryphal New Testament, translation and notes by Montague Rhodes James. Oxford, 1924), CrossReach Publications, 2015, 40.}\footnote{The lance was venerated in Jerusalem from the sixth century and after capture, 1098, its head was mounted into the hilt of Charlemagne’s ceremonial sword, part of the Holy Roman Empire’s insignia, Gertrude Schiller, Iconography of Christian Art, 2 vols. (London, 1971/1972), 2:189-190.} dealt Christ’s side-wound and became a precious relic;\footnote{Book of Hours, MS 288, fol.15r; p.93 and 161-162.} the rose-wreath worn by Christ the lover-knight may also reference Christian iconography, the rose petals representing Christ’s wounds as in the French Book of Hours referred to above [fig. 3.17].\footnote{Martha Easton, “The Wound of Christ, the Mouth of Hell: Appropriations and Inversions of Female Anatomy in the Late Middle Ages,” in Tributes to Jonathan J. G. Alexander: The Making and Meaning of Illuminated Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts, Art and Architecture, eds S. L’Engle and G. B. Guest (London, 2006), 395-414, at 405.} an analogy drawn by the Benedictine, St. Peter Damian (c.1007-1072/3),\footnote{These images are discussed with reference to English examples in Chapter 4.} the image of the nobleman guiding his sponsa by the hand from the flaming tower is overtly modelled on the traditional iconography of the Harrowing of Hell (as on fol.9r) and, of course, the final scene of restitution frankly evokes the Coronation of the Virgin.\footnote{“biset alabuten, hire lond al destruet, and heo al poure, in wið an eorðen castel,” CC Corpus Christi MS 402, fol.105r, transcr. Shepherd, Ancrene Wisse, 21.} The poetic and allegorical kinship between religious and secular expression enabled Colda to establish the theme of his first treatise through an ostensibly secular parable, elegantly illuminated on fol.3v. The anonymous author of the Ancrene Wisse also couched his spiritual guidance in a tale of courtly romance where, like sponsa in the third vignette, the “lady-love” is confined: “besieged all around, her land all destroyed and she, all impoverished inside a castle made of clay.”\footnote{“com to pruuien his luue & schwawe purh enihtschiepe þet he was luuwurðe, as weren sumhwile enihtes iwunet to donne; dude him i turuement...” CC Corpus Christi MS 402, fol.105r, transcr. Shepherd, Ancrene Wisse, 21.} Christ the Lover-knight in the Ancrene Wisse “came to prove his love and he showed through his knightly deeds that he was worthy of love, as knights were once wont to do; he entered a tournament.”\footnote{“of his kinedom, bead to maken hire ewen of al þet he ahte,” CC Corpus Christi MS 402, fol.105v, ibid.} This is Christ the Lover-knight of fol.3v’s fourth scene. The Ancrene Wisse’s Christ comes to the damsel’s aid, sweetly wooing her, telling, “of his kingdom, and he bid to make her queen of all that he had.”\footnote{“Surrexit iegitur dominis vere et sponsam de carcere / ad regnum transtulit; regniq ue sui participem secum fecit.” fol.9r18-19.} Colda explicitly echoes this on fol.9r: “therefore the Lord rose up indeed and brought his bride from prison to his kingdom and made her a partner in his royal rule.”\footnote{“Surrexit iegitur dominis vere et sponsam de carcere / ad regnum transtulit; regniq ue sui participem secum fecit.” fol.9r18-19.} This happy conclusion is illustrated by fol.3v’s final image of coronation.
The six fol.3v vignettes encompass the five grades of love expounded by Honorious of Autun (c.1080-c.1186) in the prologue to his Expositio in Cantica Canticorum, after 1132, and all of which were liberally represented in contemporary, secular Medieval Latin poetry. The artist depicts *visus* - the exchange of loving looks; *alloqium* - gesturing hands expressing speech; *contactus* - coyly reaching to touch one another in the giving of a ring; *factum* - the courageous deed proves the Lover-knight’s devoted love and ensures a happy conclusion. In the Passional illuminations, only *osculum*, the consummating kiss, is denied them for the sponsa was abducted, “before he [sponsus] could lead her [sponsa] to the bridal-chamber”. *Osculum* is manifestly fulfilled as illustrated on fol.16v.

The Ancrene Wisse and the Expositio in Cantica Canticorum are both religious texts but clearly couched in metaphors from the world of courtly love. This leads me to the second interpretation of the fol.3v image sequence where the iconography will be examined in the light of chivalrous legend. The artist brings Colda’s *parabola* alive by evoking a world which would have appealed to the Passional’s female religious audience; tournaments, chivalrous knights and their tales would have been a prominent feature in their earlier lives. Colda describes “A nobleman who having been captivated by the beauty of a certain virgin…” and later explicitly draws attention to his having, “descended from royal lineage.” The artist, in turn, offers cues to evoke the world of courtly love. He depicts the betrothed couple wearing the attire of contemporary Czech royalty. Tied across the chest with a band, their cloaks represent the archetypal garment worn by the medieval elite figuring, for example, on the donor sculpture of Uta in Naumberg Cathedral [fig. 3.18]. The heavy mantles worn by the young protagonists are adorned along the upper, opening edges with “crucial identifying elements, the ‘tongues’ (*languettes*)”.
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729 Matter, 58.
730 Ibid., 62.
731 “set antequam / ipsam in thalamum traducet nuptiarum.” fol.3v3-4.
733 The *Kronika Zbraslavská* provides much evidence of the extravagant tournaments put on by the Czech kings. The Prague court was also host to many Minnesänger, Thomas, “Between Court and Cloister”, 209; also, Sylvie Stanovská, “Rozkvět literatury v Českých zemích,” in *Přemyslovský dvůr - Život knížat, králů a rytířů ve středověku* (Prague, 2014), 54-74.
734 “Homo quidam nobilis decore cuius/dam virginis captus,” fol.3v1-2.
735 “ex regali ortus prosa/pia,” fol.3v10-11.
736 Gravestones of Cunegund of Hungary (St. Salvator, St. Francis’ Convent, Prague), Abbess Cunegund (Chapel of St. Anne, St. George’s Convent, Prague) and so-called Guta II (lapidary of National Museum, Prague) all display similar attire.
small, brown, overlapping pelts - possibly of strandling,\textsuperscript{739} which is the squirrel's rust-red, autumn coat - that feature on Czech royal family tombstones [fig. 3.3]. The fol.3v sponsa demonstrates how the band allowed the cloak to be worn open, displaying the dress beneath which, like the nobleman’s robe, appears buttoned at the cuff.\textsuperscript{740} Her over-long garments trail in a display of status and wealth.\textsuperscript{741} The nobleman’s blue surcote is fashionably slashed from hem to hip,\textsuperscript{742} revealing his green cote beneath:\textsuperscript{743} a detail shared with King David (fol.9r). (It appears to have escaped attention that the figures of the sponsus and King David are identical. This indicates the Passional Master’s competence and experience: he has distilled an image, creating a formulaic figure, deftly to be executed as required. The Passional Master’s use of stock figures is particularly significant in relation to the fol.3v sponsa and her image equivalents, the virgins on fol.22v, and will be evidentially crucial in my concluding chapter.)\textsuperscript{744} The betrothed couple are presented as a paradigm of courtly, romantic youth and beauty.

It has been noted that both Stejskal and Toussaint linked the shield imagery in the Passional with Gesta Romanorum,\textsuperscript{745} the latter pointing out a reference to the hanging up of the shield in the now-lost prayers that faced fol.10r.\textsuperscript{746} I detect a further association, and that is with English Arthurian legend. This finds expression not only in the illustrations on fol.3v but also in other images which will be explored below.\textsuperscript{747} Familiarity with the tales was widespread. A pan-European fascination with Arthurian legend, and its immediate incorporation into a Christian context, is demonstrated by an early-twelfth-century, carved relief in Modena Cathedral [fig. 3.19]: a depiction of knights, including “Artus de Bretania”, rescuing a lady, probably Guinevere, from a tower.\textsuperscript{748} With its roots in Celtic tales,\textsuperscript{749} William of Malmesbury’s (c.1095-c.1143) epic De Gestis Regum Anglorum,\textsuperscript{750} c.1125, paved the way for the vernacular History of the Kings of Britain, c.1136, by
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\item\textsuperscript{743} St. Bernard (writing c.1148-1153) took a dim view of this fashion among the clergy: “if the immoderate division in the robe does not as much as ever almost show their nakedness…the clothing I refer to indicates deformity of mind and morals,” St. Bernard of Clairvaux, \textit{De Consideratione}, Book 3, chapter 5, trans. George Lewis, in \textit{Saint Bernard on Consideration} (Oxford, 1908),93. By the fourteenth century, slits were an established aristocratic fashion, Scott, \textit{Medieval Dress}, 44. Those in the Passional appear quite modest.
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\item\textsuperscript{746} Toussaint, 82-25; “Hat sein Schild hier aufgehangen / zur Verehrung, siehe, Dir.” NKČR MS XVI.E.12, fol.22r18-19, (transcr. Toussaint, 195).
\item\textsuperscript{747} Pp.103-104, 143 and 161-162.
\item\textsuperscript{748} Andrea Hopkins, \textit{Chronicles of King Arthur} (London, 1993), 8 and 110, hereafter cited as Hopkins.
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\item\textsuperscript{750} Richard Barber, \textit{The Reign of Chivalry} (London, 1980), 78-80.
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Geoffrey of Monmouth (c.1100-c.1155). This brought King Arthur to life, capturing the hearts of its wide readership.\textsuperscript{751} Marc Morris writes that, “Arthur-mania knew no bounds…Richard of Cornwall, for instance, soon after gaining his earldom, spent considerable sums building the remote castle at Tintagel.”\textsuperscript{752} Otakar II’s close association with Richard will be recalled.\textsuperscript{755} Arthurian tales spread across Europe, popularised by the poems of Chrétien de Troyes (c.1135-c.1191)\textsuperscript{754} which were completed after Chrétian’s death by the late-twelfth/early-thirteenth-century French poet, Robert de Boron, and which not only developed the theme of Lancelot and Guinevere’s intense love affair but also established the story of the Grail.\textsuperscript{755} Both themes are woven into the Passional illuminations. De Boron further Christianised the subject matter in his three cycles of poems, providing favoured themes for sermons.\textsuperscript{756} The legend of Arthur was brought geographically closer to Prague in the popular \textit{Parzival} by Wolfram von Eschenbach (c.1160/1180-c.1220) \textsuperscript{fig. 3.20}. Wolfram received patronage from Landgrave Hermann of Thuringia (d.1217). Close political, social and artistic links between the Bohemia, Saxony and Thuringia have been noted,\textsuperscript{759} not least that Judith of Thuringia was Otakar I’s mother,\textsuperscript{760} and Cunegund, aged two, was betrothed to Frederick of Thuringia.\textsuperscript{761} Wolfram’s tales would have contributed to the Prague royal court’s chivalric culture from the reign of Otakar I; Cunegund was raised in the court of Otakar II, surrounded by musicians and poets.\textsuperscript{762} Thomas names three, famous \textit{minne} poets known to have attended the mid-thirteenth-century Czech court.\textsuperscript{763}

\textsuperscript{751} Hopkins, 8.
\textsuperscript{752} Morris, \textit{A Great and Terrible King}, 164.
\textsuperscript{753} P. 10.
\textsuperscript{755} Hopkins, 8-9 and 119.
\textsuperscript{757} Sixteen complete and more than eighty fragmentary copies survive, William Hasty, ed. \textit{A Companion to Wolfram’s ‘Parzival’} (Woodbridge, 1999), xi.
\textsuperscript{758} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{759} Pp.48-49.
\textsuperscript{760} Appendix IIb.
\textsuperscript{761} P.48; Žemlička, \textit{Století}, 129.
\textsuperscript{762} Josef Žemlička, \textit{Premysl Otakar II. Král na rozhraní věků} (Prague, 2011), 186, suggests Tannhäuser (died 1265, the year of Cunegund’s birth) attended the Czech court, Stanovská, “Rozkvět literatury,” 63 is more cautious.
\textsuperscript{763} Reinmar of Zweter (1200-1248), Friedrich of Sonnenburg (active, c.1250-1270), and Master Sigeher (active c.1250-?1278), Thomas, “Between Court and Cloister”, 209.
The first fol.3v illustration evokes Lancelot and Guinevere, the quintessential medieval romantic couple: beautiful youths, bodies swaying towards each other and fingers almost touching, united by the ring - their *annulus fidei*. In Arthurian legend, Lancelot assures Guinivere: “‘have no doubt, while I am living, I shall rescue you.’ And then he kissed her, and each gave the other a ring.” Just as *sponsus* in the fol.3v parable, Lancelot’s pledge to rescue is sealed by ring-giving [fig. 3.21].

The second image represents seduction and imprisonment. The dishevelled villain, beguiling *sponsa/lady-love*, is portrayed as an unattractive brigand: ugly, unkempt, bare-legged and in a short tunic. His thick, spiky, coarse hair follows the convention distinguishing him as a barbarian, and exemplifies Debra Higgs Strickland’s observation that “monstrosity was a metaphor for unacceptability, both cultural and religious.” The villain offers *sponsa* a love-token: another visual prompt evoking the world of knightly tales but here, as so often in medieval imagery, that world is turned upside-down. Toussaint notes that he adopts the *minne* pose of a lover offering his heart, believing the villain to be proffering a mirror, representing *vanitas*. The shading across half of this object, and comparison with the image overleaf, however, makes it clear that it is an apple, identical to that held by Eve (fol.4v). Colda’s text corroborates this: “the devil seduced the bride with forbidden fruit.” Further implications of this interpretation will be considered below. In the following scene, the same villain presses the lady-love into a flaming tower.

The fourth vignette portrays the lover-knight - a chivalrous, Lancelot-figure - rescuing his damsel in distress: a jousting lover on his leaping horse, legs thrust forwards and lance levelled. He jauntily sports his pink, rose-wreath upon his head; a traditional lady’s favour with several sexual connotations [fig. 3.22]. The famous *Minnesänger*, Ulrich von
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765 Bonn, Universitätshiblothek Lancelot-Grail Romance, MS UB 526, fol.371/381.
766 The principle of outer body reflecting inner being was established by the Greeks and adapted in the Middle Ages, Debra Higgs Strickland, *Saracens, Demons and Jews - Making Monsters in Medieval Art* (Princeton, 2003), 37-38, hereafter cited as Strickland.
767 Ibid., 38; Rosewell, 124.
768 Strickland, 8.
769 Toussaint, 92.
770 Ibid, 89 and 92.
771 This is also noted by Hana Runčíková, “Text a obraz Pasionálu abatyške Kunhuty,” in *Conference Proceedings of the International Conference of Studies in Doctoral Programmes*, Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Katolická teologická fakulta (Prague, 2015), 69-74, at 72.
772 “dijablus per fructum uetitum sedu/xit sponsam.” fol.4v10-11.
773 P.107.
Lichtenstein, jousted in Bohemia, Austria and Italy, in 1227, claiming to have broken 307 lances in a single month; a tally of which any knight of the Round Table might be proud. Contemporary Czech knights were themselves renowned in the lists as is clear from the account of the marriage celebrations in 1310 of Eliška and John of Luxembourg in Speyer where "on-lookers marvelled at the rounded and strong lance which the Czechs fewtered under their arm...when some young knight with a fewtered lance broke his horse into a gallop in an attack in the middle of the lists, all the people present shouted: ‘Look, a Czech!’" On fol.3v, Christ the Lover-knight, like a Czech champion in the lists, drives the lance directly through the villain’s throat. He is fashioned as a questing knight: the Arthurian hero from the legend of the Grail. The artist depicts him as a crusader-knight, bearing a shield with a red cross on field of white (the arms of St. George, as depicted on fol.1v), also recalling the shield won by Sir Galahad at a mystical abbey when riding out on his grail quest. The lover-knight’s lance, that which created Christ’s side wound, was not only a highly-prized Passion relic, but also played a significant role in the miraculous grail procession, observed by legendary, questing knights. The lance is specifically referred to in the fol.2v *titulus* yet is not pictured, as might be expected, in either of the Passional scenes of *Crucifixion* (fol.8r or 8v). It is, however, allocated positions of prominence on fols.3v and 3r (and, as will discussed, on fols.7v and 10r). In Arthurian legend, Perceval and Galahad observed the lance being processed with the Holy Grail in the Castle of King Pelles (or Anfortas). Pelles, the “Fisher King”, had been wounded with a “dolorous stroke” through his thighs by this very weapon, and the blooded lance was also the only cure for this morbid, never-healing wound. Did Cunegund require the artist to illustrate this miracle-working lance that she might seek relief from a chronic, physical ailment through contemplation of the healing, blood-

775 Barber, *The Reign of Chivalry*, 75.
776 "divili se...stojící oblým a silným kopím, které drželi Čechové při podvrhnutí pod svou paži, ale báli se jich i rýnští jezdci v příblížích...když některý mladý rytíř podvrhnuv kopí vskočil na cválajícím koni doprostřed okolů, volal všechn přítomný lid: ‘Hle, Čech!...’" *Kronika Zbraslavská*, 350.
777 Hopkins, 118.
778 P.122-123.
779 P.97-98.
781 The objects in the procession were the lance, candelabra, silver-platter and Grail, Hopkins, 127. Wolfram has the lance processed and exhibited on its own, Sidney Johnson, “Doing his own Thing: Wolfram’s Grail,” in *A Companion to Wolfram’s ‘Parzival’*, ed. William Hasty (Woodbridge, 1999), 77-95, at 84.
782 Pp.122-123 and 143.
784 Hopkins, 27.
785 Pp.122-123.
786 Hopkins, 141.
drenched spear? Was she perhaps loosing her sight for Wolfram twice refers to the curing of Longinius’ sight by the lance-wound blood? It is certain that the association between the blooded lance from grail legend and the lance of Christ the Lover-knight on fol.3v (and those illustrated on fols.3r, 7v and 10r) would be instantaneous in the mind of a medieval viewer.

In contrast to the villain’s violent push in the second vignette, the princely sponsus of the fifth image grasps his sponsa and pulls her, still crownless but unharmed, from the flames. Importantly, the theme of abduction and rescue from tower captivity, conspicuous in the fol.3v illustrations, is explicitly linked to Guinevere. The vigorous, stepping gait of sponsus demonstrates determined activity. His attire is royal, as in the betrothal scene, but his bloodied crown is replaced by a miniver-trimmed beret of the type worn by councillors [fig. 3.23]. Impressing the on-looker with Christ’s humanity, the artist depicts a contemporary judge and councillor, and counsellor, presumably referencing the prophetic words of Isaiah: “and his name shall be Wonderful, Counseller.” (Miniver, indicated in painting by distinctive, blue and white patterning, was considered a high-status fur, made from the grey and white winter coat of squirrels.) Christ transforms from nobleman, to knight, to wise ruler, wearing the same miniver-trimmed cap, his garb colour-swapped with that of his sponsa. In the closing scene, he forgives and crowns her, making her, “a partner in his royal rule.” Cunegund is offered a message of hope.

A loving and suffering Christ provided the ultimate role-model for the chivalrous knight. The dichotomy of love and sorrow even unto death, within a context of utter devotion, found expression not only in Christ as Man of Sorrows but in religious devotion to him: the proving of love through denial, and physical and psychological distress. It is also a theme of medieval love poems, songs and tales. Andrea Hopkins describes how Gottfried von Strassburg (d.c.1210) in his narrative romance Tristan and Isolde, written a century before the Passional, “raises romantic love to cult status. He deliberately echoes the liturgy and employs the language that the mystic divine poets, led by St. Bernard of Clairvaux,

787 Johnson, “Doing his own Thing,” 84.
788 Hopkins, 110.
789 Isaiah 9.6, Holy Bible, King James’ version (London, 1957), 653, hereafter cited as The Holy Bible; here, the archaic spelling of counsellor is employed.
790 Scott, Fashion, 15.
791 “regnique sui participem secum fecit.” fol.9r19.
792 See Bynum, Holy Feast.
used to describe the intense personal devotion of a monk for Christ or Mary. (“Nun” may be interpolated in place of “monk” in this quotation.) Impassioned and romantic writing and art - including the Passional images - stimulated empathetic imagining of the sufferings of Christ the Lover-knight. A nun could experience the exquisite sorrow that, according to Andreas the Chaplain (1150-1220) in his treatise The Art of True Loving, also defined medieval courtly love: “the lover must turn pale and tremble in the presence of his beloved, be unable to eat or sleep, and be obedient to her every wish.” This could equally describe a nun’s ecstatic response to Christ.

Courtly love was contructed around a highly-focused, and strictly exclusive, attachment between two individuals: the relationship between the medieval nun and Christ was an identically-intense, personal and private communication. The Passional images enable the devotee to establish such a “conversation” with a view to creating a spiritual bond Christ. The devotional dedication of nuns to a chaste union with Christ mirrored the chivalrous, equally idealistic, values and aims of knights and their courtly lady-loves, where the selfless, humble knight devoted himself to the service of a highborn, usually unattainable, lady: the nun, equally selflessly, committed herself entirely to an unattainable male, Christ. The hyperbolic, chivalrous verse by Ulrich of Lichtenstein [fig. 3.24], might effectively describe the fol.3v image of the Lover-knight:

Bring my shield here!  
Today you shall see me  
In the service of my dearest lady.  
I must win her to my love;  
She shall greet me or I  
Perish as I strive to serve.  

Replace “lady” with “Lord” and we might equally recognise the emotions of the medieval nun observing the Arma Christi of fol.3r in a typically-medieval inversion of the characteristics of the chivalrous knight expressed in this verse. It represents an aspect of the emotional and spiritual complexity of Brautmystik.

Finally, serious consideration must be given to the likelihood that the fol.3v images were biographical: holding a mirror to Cunegund’s own life-story. (It is helpful at this point to
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794 Hopkins, 96.
795 One of thirty-one rules of courtly love stipulated by Andreas Capellanus in Ars honeste amandi, composed for Countess Marie of Champagne, quoted ibid., 105.
796 P.103.
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recall Alexander’s advice on maintaining a receptive sensitivity when interpreting medieval images.)\textsuperscript{798} This link was astutely observed by Stejskal,\textsuperscript{799} but seems less favourably received by some of today’s Czech art historians. Even if the parallel was unintentional, which I doubt, it is impossible that Cunegund would not have immediately recognised her own, peculiar life-circumstances within these vignettes: another layer to the parable. Each scene appears tailored to lay bare Cunegund’s loss of virginity - in the manner of confession - her redemption by Christ and her hopes for a heavenly coronation and salvation.\textsuperscript{800} As will be shown, Colda’s text supports this theory. The first fol.3v illustration may be interpreted as Cunegund, a twelve-year-old princess - she wears a gilded crown and is dressed as a Czech royal \textsuperscript{801} taking vows as a Poor Clare. The crown and ring were crucial elements in every nun’s initiation service.\textsuperscript{802} The crown represented the wounding of Christ,\textsuperscript{803} and also the heavenly crown, as depicted on fol.1v, representing the crown of chastity from St. Jerome’s teachings and an ultimate, heavenly reward;\textsuperscript{804} the ring was her bridal-pledge in “marriage” to Christ. St. Clare’s first letter to St. Agnes is specific about this chaste union (she, like Colda, describes Christ as noble): “thus you are taking a spouse of more noble lineage, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will always keep your virginity unspotted and intact.”\textsuperscript{805} She echoes the words of the Song of Songs, “Thou art all fair, my love; there is no spot in thee.”\textsuperscript{806} Of course, Cunegund had failed to preserve this pure union.

The second and third scenes appear to represent Cunegund being lured from enclosure into marriage with Boleslav II, and an enforced exile in Mazovia. With the blindfold representing naivety and innocence in succumbing to the “seduction”, the artist portrays the heroine bowed-down in submission; the fallen crown, in this context, appears to signify loss of virginity and the breaking of a vow of chastity. A fleuron crown, as the name suggests, is a gold wreath of flowers. Czech folktales record the custom of girls plaiting flowers into wreaths, representing their maidenhead, to be symbolically cast into a river on St. John’s Eve: this is recorded, for example, in Božena Němcová’s 1856 novel “Wild
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\textsuperscript{802} Gisela Muschiol, “Time and Space: Liturgy and Rite in Female Monasteries of the Middle Ages,” in Crown and Veil – Female Monasticism from the Fifth century to the Fifteenth Centuries, eds. Jeffrey F. Hamburger and Susan Marti. (New York, 2008), 191-206, at 196-197.
\textsuperscript{803} Bynum, “Foreward,” xiii.
\textsuperscript{804} P.73.
\textsuperscript{805} Letter 1, before June 11, 1234, St. Clare of Assisi, 109.
\textsuperscript{806} Song of Songs 4.7, Holy Bible, 644.
Similarly, Camille interprets a “chaplet or ring” held by a lady’s attendant as she and her lover play chess, represented on a French, ivory mirror-back relief from c.1300 [fig. 3.25], as “a sign of her favours and her ultimate penetrability.” This adds a further connotation to the corona florum “favours” offered by maidens to their courtly lovers, as illustrated in the Codex Manesse [fig. 3.22]. Colda’s text is clear that the fol.3v sponsa did not give her favour but that it was taken by the villain. No room is left for misinterpretation: the verb constuprare is employed, explicitly translating as “rape”. He writes, “a wicked villain raped the newly betrothed by means of a deception.” The text continues, “the devil... seduced the bride and hurled her into sin, alas how foully he defiled her and took away the altar of her husband.” The “altar of her husband” being a euphemism for virginity. I suggest that by unequivocally expressing Cunegund’s loss of virginity, within her marriage to Boleslav II, as rape, Colda might allow for her exoneration, providing an important step towards spiritual vindication.

In contrast to the sponsa’s demure acceptance of the betrothal ring, in the second fol.3v image our heroine (identified as Cunegund) is depicted stretching out both hands to receive the villain’s offering. I suggest that this casts new light on her withdrawal from enclosure, providing compelling evidence for Cunegund’s complicity in leaving the Clarisse convent. She is shown willingly, even greedily, reaching out to grasp the inducement offered. The villain’s gift of an apple, identified above, should be read together with the fol.4v image of the Temptation of Adam and Eve for, typologically, Cunegund’s “fall” was prefigured by Eve’s. Was Cunegund’s own “forbidden fruit”, that she reaches out for with enthusiasm, the opportunity to return to courtly life, and to become a wife and mother? This might be a very attractive prospect to a confined young woman in her twenties. If so, it would appear from the fol.3v image that, at the time, she embraced it enthusiastically.

After eleven years at the Mazovian Court, Cunegund is saved by her faith in Christ, depicted as a chivalrous rescue by Christ the Lover-knight. That the artist depicts him bearing a shield emblazoned with the cross of St. George might indicate that Cunegund’s
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807 Božena Němcová, Pan učitel, Chudi lidé, Divá Bára (Třebechovice, 1942); see Alfred Thomas, The Bohemian Body - Gender and Sexuality in Modern Czech Culture (Madison, 2007), 71.
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811 “latro degener despon/satam decipitones constupravit.” fol.4v4-5.
812 “dijablus...sedu/sit sponsam et inpeccatum deiciens heu quam turpiter viola/vit arramque sponsi abstulit,” fol.4v10-12.
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recovery, enacted by Christ himself, lay in her return to Prague as Abbess of St. George’s Convent. This is reinforced in the fifth image where the artist borrows the redemptive iconography of the Harrowing of Hell, thus instilling optimism and joy into the heart of the medieval viewer as the sponsa is guided from her own, personal Hell. In contrast to the subulsive pose of the sponsa in the third image, here the artist depicts her with head raised, gazing directly upon her Saviour, recalling the seminal Christian phrase, “For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face.”814 This is also the gaze of Mary into Christ’s eyes (fol.16v): it is also the gaze of a nun upon Andachtsbilder.

Stejskal interprets fol.3v’s final image as her inauguration as Abbess of St. George’s Convent in 1302.815 I suggest, however, that, as on fol.1v, we are witnessing once again Cunegund’s projected, ultimate salvation; on this occasion, receiving her heavenly crown not from angels but directly from the hands of Christ himself. Similarly, this envisaged coronation scene might act performatively. This is supported by a redemptive message, which appears early in Colda’s somewhat rambling commentary: “after the fall of the first Mankind [God] renewed this act of betrothal”816 — just as Cunegund renewed her vows when joining the Benedictines. The fol.9r resolution - “Therefore the Lord rose up indeed and brought his bride from prison to his kingdom and made her a partner in his royal rule”817 - proves that Christ’s Resurrection has the power to reinstate the fallen bride, and therefore Cunegund may resume her state as Christ’s Bride. The text even intimates that, after death, she may also be allocated some heavenly authority, perhaps Colda’s compliment to Cunegund as abbess and princess. Colda unequivocally indicates that, through renewed betrothal, Cunegund’s lack of chastity need be no more of a barrier to her ultimate attainment of a place among the blessed in Heaven than it was for the sponsa of his Parable. Despite St. Jerome’s message that loss of virginity leads to forfeiture of a crown and irredeemable sacrifice of salvation,818 Colda and the artist seem at pains to reassure Cunegund that she will be saved and win her crown. In the image of Last Judgement on fol.9r, the artist depicts Eve - perpetrator of Original Sin and prototypical non-virgin - stationed on Christ’s right in the position of most favour. She is awarded her “blessed crown” from an angel in the self-same manner that Cunegund is envisaged

814 1 Cor. 13.12, Holy Bible, 184.
815 Stejskal, Pasionál, 56.
816 “Haec est sponsa/ia post lapsum primi hominis...renovavit.” fol.4r20-22.
817 “Surrexit igitur dominis vere et sponsam de carcere / ad regnum transtulit; regnique sui participem secum fecit.” fol.9r18-19.
818 P.73.
receiving hers on fol.1v. Cunegund is offered the ultimate example of redemption of a fallen woman through Christ, and a perfect precedent for her own salvation.

Colda’s *expositio* of the *parabola* extends over fols.4r-6r9 and is illustrated by six images the iconography of which, for the most part, does not stray from the traditional. The first four illustrations chart the creation of Mankind through his descent into sin; the last two represent Man’s salvation through Christ’s birth. It is interesting to observe that across the three images depicting the Fall of Man (fols.4v and 5r) the artist skilfully portrays Man’s decline into old age. In the fol.4r *Temptation of Adam and Eve*, Adam and Eve’s classical beauty is expressed not only through their hair and face but also by the smooth lines of their bodies, emphasising youth. Opposite, in the *Expulsion* (fol.5r), the smooth lines of their bodies give way to bulges and their previously sweet smiles to expressions of down-mouthed dismay. Below, in the illustration of their *Incarceration*, Adam’s sagging flesh is even more pronounced and he has a beard-growth. When, eventually, Mankind is led from Hell (fol.9r), he is depicted an aged man with a flowing beard and grizzled hair.

The iconography of the *Creation of Eve* on fol.4r is conventional except for the detail of Eve’s head appearing at the end of Adam’s rib.\(^819\) The accompanying rubric, however, a poetic line of leonine pentameter, carries a most remarkable message. It introduces the concept of “Adam’s Sin”, which was upheld by the early Christian church.\(^820\) Here is the first suggestion of a subtle shift of blame away from the female towards the male. The title reads, “Adam is created and the same, in time, will fall.”\(^821\) This move to exonerate Eve (and by extension all womankind) is further progressed in the rubrics on the following page (fol.4v).\(^822\) This makes it surprisingly clear that the male, Adam (perhaps representing Boleslav II, who took away her virginity, or Wenceslas who withdrew her from enclosure) will be condemned: the rubric title makes no mention at all of Eve. This, I suggest, reinforces the argument for Cunegund’s editorial control and her composition of the rubric titles.\(^823\)

The half-page illustration on fol.4v of the *Temptation of Adam and Eve*, although at first glance seemingly conventional in its iconography, appears to demonstrate Cunegund using

\(^{819}\) Runčíková, “Text a obraz,” 73, notes the direct eye-contact between Eve and God.


\(^{821}\) “Est adam factus et eodem tempore lapsus” rubric title, fol.4r. This is a quotation from widely-circulated, medieval verses, *On the Annunciation and Incarnation of the Lord*, Runčíková, “Text a obraz,” 72 n. 17.

\(^{822}\) See below, p.111.

\(^{823}\) Presently the subject of further research.
the artist to illustrate her personal concerns. A closer look at the disquieting, poisonous-blue serpent, insinuating its way up the Tree of Knowledge reveals not only that its head is female - not an unusual iconographic detail - but also that it is crowned. This crown, not dignified by gilding, is certainly an unfamiliar iconographic feature. I believe that its inclusion signifies Cunegund’s struggle: her attempt to reconcile her two incontrovertible, and seemingly incompatible, duties – religious and royal, as suggested above.824 If the interpretation of the iconography of the second image on fol.3v is correct, that she willingly accepted the chance to fulfil her royal duty through a marriage that would further the prosperity of the Premyslide dynasty, then the crown upon the snake’s head may be seen has her own fatal temptation and that royal interests seduced her from her religious commitment.825

In contrast to the commonly held opinion in the Middle Ages, introduced by the second-century theologian Tertullian (160-220), that all women were essentially Eve and therefore tainted by Original Sin,826 the Passional’s Temptation of Adam and Eve (fol.4v) presents a previously unobserved note of feminine strength, even defiance. The rubric title on fol.4r, “Adam is created and the same, in time, will fall,” has been commented on above.827 The rubric accompanying the image of the idealised Adam and Eve sharing the fruit from the Tree of Knowledge builds on this, and is equally surprising: intervening between the figures of Adam and Eve, the fol.4v title reads, “Adam took an apple for himself; wretched Eve.”828 Blame is blatantly shifted away from Eve: it is the actions of Adam (the male) that are sinful, while Eve (the female) must carry the burden of blame and despair. The artist of the Passional depicts (or, I suggest, was instructed by Cunegund to depict) both Adam and Eve holding fruit. As if to reinforce the more dominant female position, the artist has defined not Adam’s abdominal muscles but Eve’s in a curiously male representation. He also depicts Adam rather than Eve adopting a striding stance: Adam becomes the initiator of the action while Eve, in a static pose, appears as the passive recipient. This remarkable iconographic reworking that will be discussed in the final chapter.829 Cunegund’s husband Boleslav, and Wenceslas II in their separate ways, like Adam, “took for themselves”

824 P.75.
827 P.109.
828 “Adam pro malum se duxit eva misella” rubric title fol.4v; see also Chapter 3.
829 P.200.
causing Cunegund’s conventual vow of chastity to be broken thus jeopardising her eternal soul. Cunegund, like Eve, had good reason to feel “wretched”.

There is nothing iconographically unexpected about the *Expulsion* illustrated at the top of fol.5r. The stark and original lower image on fol.5r, obviously parallels the third fol.3v image that it interprets. It is a dark parody and reversal of the Harrowing of Hell. Drama was an important expression of nuns’ piety, and *ludus liturgicus paschalis* was performed by the nuns in the basilica with the Easter morning Matins liturgy. Two such plays appear in convent manuscripts from Cunegund’s era, a Processional, MS VII.G.16, and a Processional and Hymnal, MS XII.E.15a, both already referred to above. Stejskal recognised a link between the fol.5r image (and also fol.14r) and medieval drama, for the Devil featured in miracle-plays Europe-wide. Indeed, the satanic Belial’s “costume” even appears to end at the wrists. On fol.5r, “Belial rex,” personifying evil, presses the sinners into the inferno with the words, “Go, blasphemers into eternal fire!” The artist illustrates the almost savage rubric titles that accompany the image: “Now he goes blindfolded to many punishments in the torture of fire,” – “I want to bury you in the regions of Hell - and to attack you brutally for your sins without hope [of reprieve].” The extreme ferocity of these words, in the context of Cunegund’s marriage to Boleslav II and her stay in Mazovia having left the Poor Clares, speaks volumes.

The iconography of the *Annunciation* and *Nativity* on fol.5v is standard. The latter incorporates the detail of the ox and ass rearranging the hay comfortably around the Christ-child. From her Clarisse upbringing, Cunegund would have been familiar with the Franciscan account in the Meditations on the Life of Christ of how “the ox and the ass knelt with their mouths above the manger and breathed on the Infant as though they possessed reason and knew that the child was so poorly wrapped that He needed to be warmed.” It should be noted that here, and on fol.6r, St. Joseph is illustrated wearing a soft, Phrygian form of Jewish hat which, throughout the Passional, is used to signal the
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830 P.146.
831 Stejskal, *Pasionál*, 43.
832 NKČR MS VII.G.16, fol.95v-101v, pp.41-42, and NKČR MS XII.E.15a, fol.69v-74v, p.81
833 Stejskal, *Pasionál*, 27 and 35.
835 “Beliaw the king,” rubric title, fol.5r.
836 “ite maledicini in ignem eternum,” rubric title, fol.5r.
837 “Cecus it ad penas ignis cruciä nunc plenas,” “Imperiis baratri volo vos vincetos sepelire / ac in peccatis sine spe truculenter obire” rubric title, fol.5r.
838 Pseudo-Bonaventura, 33.
839 See Strickland, 105.
“benign Jew”. One such pleated cap is also assigned to Joseph of Arimathea on fol.8v where he is shown lowering Christ from the cross and then into the tomb. Contrasting the figures in so-called “biblical dress”, those deliberately identified as Jews are depicted wearing contemporary clothing.

Jews were prominent members of medieval-Prague society and represent an important iconographic element of the first-treatise illustrations. It is helpful, therefore, to have some insight into their standing in Czech society at the time of the illustration of the Passional. As early as 965 an Arabian/Jewish merchant and traveller, Ibrahim ibn Jakub (d.966) recorded Jews trading in Prague. The early, Jewish merchant community in Prague was augmented by the Ostsiedlung: described as a surge of German emigrants across Europe from West to East. Their increased presence caused Otakar II to draw up a Jewish charter, 1254, attaching Pope Innocent IV’s Bull in an attempt to quell rumours of blood libel. (In 1251, King Bela IV of Hungary, Otakar II’s father-in-law, following Frederick II of Austria’s example of 1244, had also created such a charter.) Otakar’s Statuta Judaeorum not only demanded Jews pay higher taxation directly to the king, but also protected their role as usurers (considered sinful by Christians), declaring them to be servi camerae regiae, and forbidding the populace to attack them, their property, their synagogues or cemeteries.

Jews were not only found in the merchant-class but also in the court. There was a history of eminent Jewish scholars living in Bohemia, including the twelfth-century Isaac ben Jacob ha-Lavan of Prague, Isaac ben Morecai of Prague (Ribam), Eliezer ben Jacob of Prague, Abraham ben Azriel of Bohemia and the thirteenth-century Isaac ben Moses of Vienna (or Zaru’a). Jits Van Straten notes that some forty words in Old Czech –
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840 P. 53.
844 Valley, 66.
845 Appendix Iic.
846 Valley, 7.
847 Ibid., 66.
848 The title “servants of the king’s chamber” was applied to Jews within the Holy Roman Empire by Frederick II in 1236, enabling exertion of judicial rights over them, Philip Hersch, “Anti-semitism, 1096-1306,” in Atlas of Medieval Europe, eds. David Ditchburn, Simon Maclean and Angus Mackay (Oxon, 2007), 180-182, at 180.
849 Valley, 7.
850 Jewish Virtual Library - incorrectly states they are all thirteenth-century scholars.
staročeština - appear in Abraham ben Azriel’s book Arugat habosem,\textsuperscript{851} demonstrating close linguistic and cultural links between Jews and Czechs in medieval society.\textsuperscript{852} Relations deteriorated under the reign of Cunegund’s brother, Wenceslas II, and were further aggravated by the appalling 1298 Rintfleisch massacres that claimed the lives of thousands of German and Austrian Jews.\textsuperscript{853} Wenceslas II offered his Czech Jews protection but through extortion;\textsuperscript{854} in 1296 he held Jewish leaders to ransom in order to raise funds.\textsuperscript{855} Cungund was absent from Prague between 1291-1302, at the court of Mazovia, and therefore not exposed to this sad interlude; perhaps happier memories of Jewry under her father’s reign engendered the not-wholly-negative view of Jews, expressed in the Passional illustrations.

As across Europe, Prague Jews were confined to their city quarter at night\textsuperscript{856} and, during the day, compelled to wear identifying badges and pilea cornuta\textsuperscript{857} as stipulated by the fourth Lateran Council, 1215.\textsuperscript{858} Along with shaggy beards and long, straggly hair, this distinctive large, funnel-shaped hat is prominently employed in Passional illustrations to signal evil-doing Jews.\textsuperscript{859} The Passional represents Jews according to thirteenth-century, stereotypical, propagandistic, iconographical norms.\textsuperscript{860} Strickland notes the denigratory nature of over-emphasised depictions of hats in Jewish imagery.\textsuperscript{861} Across Europe, Jews were made an easy target for vilification: marked out as responsible for Christ’s death. The Benedictine theologian, the Venerable Bede (672-735), judged that Christ’s wounds were preserved “to show them to the Jews at the Last Judgement that they may see how much He suffered through them.”\textsuperscript{862} The perceived guilt of Jews finds an almost casual expression in the, now lost, prayers that preceded fol.10 of the Passional:

\begin{quote}
Christ Jesus you hang upon the cross…
Attacked with rough words
By the harsh Jewish people
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{852} Ibid., 120-121.
\textsuperscript{853} Kronika Zbraslavská, 168-169.
\textsuperscript{854} Ibid., 168.
\textsuperscript{855} Valley, 8.
\textsuperscript{857} Enforced many centuries earlier in Moslem countries, John Y. B. Hood, Aquinas and the Jews (Philadelphia, 1995), 32; see Strickland, 105.
\textsuperscript{861} Strickland, 105.
\textsuperscript{862} Quoted by Schiller, Iconography, 2:188.
Free us from their consequences. 863

A similar sentiment is expressed by Mary in the Passional’s second treatise Lament:
“therefore have compassion and take pity on me at least you Christians, my friends, for the unheard-of mockery practised by the utterly cruel Jews against the beloved son of my womb,” and “he who has been taken away from me by the treachery, indeed the cruel ruthlessness, of the Jews.”864 (I consider it possible that the prayer and these passages were composed by Cunegund.) In the lament, a distinction is drawn between generous-hearted Christians and cruel Jews. Franciscans preached an anti-semitic message,865 to which the young Cunegund will have been exposed. The important iconographic significance of Jewish figures in the Passional will become apparent.

Colda’s interpretation of the Passion Instruments and the accompanying cycle of Passion images extends from fols.6r10-end of 9v.866 It will be noted that many specific details in the illustrations relate to Cunegund, her Franciscan up-bringing (particularly when imagery reflects that found in the Meditations of the Life of Christ) and the society in which she lived; and reflect a pious desire to empathise and unite with Christ through his wounds thus to gain salvation. Colda’s guide to the Passion Instruments commences with Christ’s first wounding and the illustration of the Circumcision on fol.6r. Highlighted in rubric within the text we read, “the knife, the first form of weapon.”867 Unusually, the artist presents St. Joseph performing the ceremony in a domestic setting rather than, as is iconographically common, a specialist priest – mohel - in the temple.868 It was, however, traditional for Jews to perform this act at home;869 this might indicate the artist’s familiarity with Jewish customs. St. Joseph is shown wielding an over-sized knife presumably to make it easier for the devotee of the Passional to meditate upon the instrument. He wears a houce,870 the same high-status garment worn by the King David, another benign Jewish figure. Apart from King David (fol.17v), the only identifiably-Jewish figures in Colda’s 1314 section of
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864 “Conpatimi/ni igitur michi et miseremini mei saltem/ vos Christiani amici mei quia inaudita exer/ cuerunt ludibia crudelissimi iudei indilecto/ filio uteri mei,” fol.11r19-23, and “quem michi ludeorum perfidia/ immo crudelis sevicia [abstulit- added in inner margin by another hand]…” fol.11v25-26; also, p.118, on “nocturnis spitus Iudeorum” - “the night-time spittle of the Jews,” fol.11r25.
866 P.22.
867 “Primum genus armorum cultrum,” rubric, fol.6r9; explanatory text fol.6r9-20.
869 Sandler, The De Lisle Psalter, 56.
870 Late thirteenth-/early fourteenth-century high-status outer garment with elbow-length cape sleeves, Scott, Medieval Dress, 79 and 88.
the Passional are the patriarchs and the central figure of the group of prophets in their heavenly mansions (fol.22v). Lucy Freeman Sandler notes that circumcision-iconography illustrating the cowering baby Jesus, references the Meditations’ description of the event, which describes the pain of his delicate, very human flesh.871 This is apparent in the fol.6r Circumcision. Importantly, the Franciscan’s account continues to describe how the baby, placed in the Virgin’s lap as in the Passional image, himself comforted his mother: “by His gestures, that she should not cry, because he loved her tenderly and wished her to cease crying.”872 Therefore, the baby on fol.6r is perhaps not turning away in fear but reaching out to embrace his mother, presaging the fol.16r embrace. Yet again, Franciscan overtones indicate Cunegund’s influence over the illustrations of her manuscript.

This image of circumcision opens the catalogue of weapons in Christ’s redemptive armoury. On fol.6r Colda reminds the reader of the Fall, illustrated on fol.4v, but highlights the purgative action of Christ’s circumcisional blood (fol.6r9-20): “The Knife...in the first mystery of the circumcision he [Christ] poured out his blood so that he might clearly show that the stain of Original Sin is to be destroyed through the subsequent Church sacrament.”873 Words written to the Corinthians by St. Paul must have seemed frighteningly apposite to Cunegund: “I betrothed you to Christ, thinking to present you as a chaste virgin to her true and only husband. But as the serpent in his cunning seduced Eve, I am afraid that your thoughts may be corrupted and you may lose your single-hearted devotion to Christ.”874 Cunegund might be reassured by Colda’s reminder that Christ’s purifying blood, the Eucharist, wipes clean that peculiarly female taint of Original Sin. Colda further expands his metaphor: “Furthermore, he [Christ] provided us with the example of a spiritual circumcision... This then is why, when being driven by perverse thoughts, we cut off the foreskins of our heart.”875 Cunegund would be familiar with the concept of spiritual circumcision from her Franciscan training. The Meditations states, “we must all undergo spiritual circumcision, that is, refuse all superfluous things.”876 In the Gospel of Nicodemus (a text valued by Cunegund and chosen for inclusion in two volumes

871 Sandler, The De Lisle Psalter, 56; this pose is traceable to and interchangeable with the iconography of the presentation at the temple, see Schiller, Iconography, 1:88-90.
872 Pseudo-Bonaventura, 44.
873 “Cultrum.../...protulit du in circumcisionis misterio primo san/guinem suum fudit ut evidenter ostenderet peccati origionis lis delendas maculam per succedens sacramentum ecclesiae,” fol.6r9-12.
874 2 Cor. 11.2-4, N.E.B., 311.
875 “Exemplum praeterea spiritualis nobis circumcisionis prae-ebuit... Tunc enim praeputia cordium circum/cidimus cums expulsis cognitionibus iniquis,” fol.6r15-19.
876 Pseudo-Bonaventura, 44-45.
gifted by her to the convent, in 1303,\textsuperscript{877} the year of her consecration, and in 1312,\textsuperscript{878} the year the Passional’s first treatise was produced), Pontius Pilate is described as “one that was uncircumcised, but circumcised in heart.”\textsuperscript{879} Colda offers Cunegund another cleansing procedure: excising sin through contemplation of the circumcision knife.

The lower image on fol.6r illustrates the Mount of Olives,\textsuperscript{880} accompanying Colda’s expilcatory text (fols.6r20–6v4). Continuing the theme of Passion blood, a bleeding Christ now inhabits the bare hillside depicted on the fol.3r Arma Christi. A hectic cascade of red droplets falls from his hands, wrists and feet, evoking the description in the Franciscan Meditations: “His most consecrated blood dripped copiously from all parts of His body...in this agony...it flows abundantly to the ground.”\textsuperscript{881} As with the fol.3r image, perhaps Cunegund was empathising with the agonised Christ.\textsuperscript{882}

Overleaf (fols.6v and 7r), Colda expounds on the tormenting of Christ illustrated by three images in which Jews, identified immediately by their pilea cornuta, are the main perpetrators. Colda’s text distinguishes in rubric the words “to the pillar,” “ropes, rods, whips” and “spitting”.\textsuperscript{883} (“Nails” and “hammer” are highlighted in rubric at the foot of fol.7v;\textsuperscript{884} “wounds,” “robe” and “dice,” and “forceps” and “ladder”, on the following two pages.\textsuperscript{885}) It is noteworthy, that the fols.6v and 7r images include an apparently non-Jewish malefactor: the Jews, therefore, are not the exclusive offenders. Illustrating Matthew’s account,\textsuperscript{886} the artist is inventive in the trio of figures forming the composition at the top of fol.6v. Christ is portrayed, as in the Franciscan Meditations,\textsuperscript{887} as patiently submissive. (Once again, the question of Cunegund’s input is raised.) Christ is put-upon by an unsympathetically-depicted “Roman” soldier - portrayed as a contemporary man-at-arms - and a physically unattractive Jew. The rubric title above the image reads, “Here, Christ the king is captured; behold he is dragged, bound.”\textsuperscript{888} The soldier is presented as a vicious, threatening figure: jaw and mouth set in grim determination. He wears protective, mail

\textsuperscript{877} NKČR MS XIII.E.14c, fols.2v-34v.
\textsuperscript{878} Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, MS XIV.E.10, fols.31r-53r.
\textsuperscript{879} Nicodemus 12.1, Gospel of Nicodemus, 25.
\textsuperscript{880} Luke 22.42.
\textsuperscript{881} Pseudo-Bonaventura, 323.
\textsuperscript{882} P.95.
\textsuperscript{883} “ad columnam,” fol.6v4, and again on fol.7r7; “funibus, virgis...flagellis,” fol.6v5; “conspuicionem,” fol.6v12.
\textsuperscript{884} “clavis” and “malleos,” fol.7v27.
\textsuperscript{885} “vulnera,” fol.8r4; “tunica,” fol.8r8; “sortes,” fol.8r16; “forceps,” fol.8v10; “scala,” fol.8v15.
\textsuperscript{886} “Then they spit in his face and struck him with their fists,” Matt. 26.67, N.E.B., 51.
\textsuperscript{887} Pseudo-Bonaventura, 325-326.
\textsuperscript{888} “Hic capitur Christe rex trahitur ecce ligatus,” rubric title, fol.6v.
garments with the mittens pulled down; in contrast, Christ is illustrated as offering no physical threat. The medieval viewer would recognise that the blow lined up by the soldier’s right mailed fist would be devastating. The soldier is also shown grasping Christ’s hair. This is a particularly interesting iconographic detail: despite not being mentioned in the gospels, a fistful of hair commonly features in Arma Christi. It represents a typological reference to the prophetic words found in Isaiah, “I gave...my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair: I hid not my face from shame and spitting.” A spitting Jew frequently figures among the Passion Instruments. Colda’s accompanying text reads: “Behold, beloved ones, you heard how many things the Son of God endured for our sins, whilst he was made contemptible by the assaults…and his face was obscured beneath the spittle of Jews.” (In the second treatise of the Passional, the Virgin Mary’s Lament, creates an unhappy anti-Jewish metaphor, “Look, his [Christ’s] whole head and his locks of hair are full of dew and night droplets; that is the night-time spittle of Jews.”) The spitting Jew in the upper image on fol.6v, his hair hanging in distinctive ringlets, is shown in profile, displaying a caricatured, prominent chin and large nose - a common artistic prompt. Jew and miscreant. The corner of his mouth is retracted into an unattractive leer as his jaw drops in an unsightly gape, reminding the onlooker, as Anthony Bale describes, that the mouth of the Christian was reserved for hymnody and receiving the sacrament, and the mouth of the Jew was associated with Judas’ kiss and spitting on Christ.

As with the three other identifiable Jews on fols.6v and 7r (all engaged in active violent acts) the Jew in fol.6v’s uppermost illustration is depicted in the dress of a medieval working man: shoeless, in knitted hose, robes pulled in at the sleeves and, together with two of the other Jews, represented with tunic-hem gathered and tucked into the belt for ease of movement. The Jews and the soldier on fol.6v all have one foot slightly raised as though hopping on the spot. This agitation is even present in the diminutive depiction of the Jew on fol.8v (middle illustration), Descent from the Cross, who appears to be “dancing” upon the ladder as he withdraws the nail from Christ’s hand. Nervously-energetic exertion seems an indicator of both Jewishness and ill-doing. It is quite unlike the

889 P.207.
890 Schiller, Iconography, 2:191.
891 Isaiah 50.6, Holy Bible, 687.
892 “Ecce audiistis dilectissimi quota pro nostris iniquitatis filius dei / pertulit dum despectus propter alapas factus vultum sub spu/tis iudeorum abscondit” fol.7r3-5.
893 “Intuemini quia caput eius / plenum est rore et cincinni eius guttis noc/tium id est nocturnis sputis iudeorum.” fol.11r23-25.
894 Strickland, 77-78.
896 Scott, Fashion, 78.
purposeful striding step of Gabriel - *Annunciation* (fol.5v) - or Christ - *Harrowing of Hell* (fol.9r) - which conveys not only movement but also the fulfilment of intent.

The lower fol.6v image of the *Mocking*, employs largely conventional iconography. Christ is robed, blind-folded, crowned with thorns and beaten over the head, however the Passional’s artist has chosen to replace the soldier-perpetrators, described in Mark’s gospel account,\(^{897}\) with Jews. As the rod presses the crown of thorns upon Christ’s head, an elderly man, with a long beard and caricatured profile, parodies reverence: he genuflects, grimaces and expectorates. His head is tilted back in a posture identified by William Jordan as being associated with portrayals of the sponge-bearer,\(^{898}\) Stephaton (his traditional name although not mentioned in the bible).\(^{899}\) Christ’s gaudy attire is an eye-catching departure from the uniform colours of other garments in the treatise; its highly-patterned design inferring opulence.\(^{900}\) Biblical accounts describe Christ’s robe severally as “scarlet”, “purple” and “gorgeous”: fol.6v appears to illustrate the latter, Luke’s version.\(^{901}\) The plaid strip beneath Christ’s feet is of the type depicted on the throne cushions (fol.1r and 20r) and serves to augment the extravagance of the apparel. Bright garb appears to have been a fashion-preference in the Czech court, judging by the extraordinary flamboyance of Wenceslas II’s entourage depicted in the Codex Manesse [fig. 3.14]. No less multi-coloured are the outfits worn by the plaid-bedecked archangels and bespangled occupants of the heavenly mansions, illustrated on fol.20r.

All the Jews on fol.s.6v and 7r extend their necks but none more than the menacingly-grotesque characters thrashing Christ in the fol.7r *Flagellation* (one Jew, one Gentile), whose bodies twist and necks crane “parallel to the sky”.\(^{902}\) Contrasting the opulent garb of the previous scene, Christ of the *Flagellation* is near-naked with only a loincloth loose about his hips. The iconography is traditional but the generous application of splashes of rubric around the crown of thorns, over Christ’s entire naked body and spattering outside its delineation, is an early example of heightened emphasis on Christ’s suffering and shedding of blood. Yet again, it conforms to accounts in the Meditations: “the Lord is therefore stripped and bound to a column and scourg’d in various ways…The royal blood flows, from all parts of His body. Again and again, repeatedly, closer and closer, it is done,

---


\(^{898}\) Jordan, “The Last Torment,” 34.

\(^{899}\) P.124.

\(^{900}\) Patterned cloth was rarely depicted in illuminations until the fourteenth century, Scott, *Medieval Dress*, 7.

\(^{901}\) Matt. 27.28, *N.E.B.*, 52; Mark 15.17 and John 19.3, ibid., 86 and 184; Luke 23.12, ibid.,142.

\(^{902}\) Jordan, “The Last Torment,” 34.
bruise upon bruise, and cut upon cut.”

And again, “You will see a fine youth, most noble and most innocent and most lovable, cruelly beaten and covered with blood and wounds.”

The emotive fol.7r Flagellation contrasts Colda’s text: a mere allegorical exegesis on the rope of love binding Christ’s hands (fol.7r-27) prefaced by the briefest mention that “He was wounded... and beaten with whips.”

The bleeding wounds (fols.7r and 10r) may, however, reference Colda’s fol.6v comments: “we thought of him as a leper, beaten and indeed humiliated,” and on fol.7r, “thus he is seen as a leper.”

(Cunegund’s Franciscan piety is again exposed in these images for, as Sarah Beckwith points out, Franciscanism effected “violently inverting tactics replacing health with sickness, embracing the leprous and the maimed”).

Colda’s remarks echo Isaiah’s typologically prophetic description of the Suffering Servant: “we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted.”

Significantly, Isaiah continues, “with his stripes we are healed.”

Christ’s multiple wounds, so graphically illustrated on fols.7r and 10r, would be broadly interpreted by contemporary viewers as Christ sharing in their own disease and infirmity in an age when cures were few. Visual, talismanic, images of Christ’s “healing stripes” offered hope for the alleviation from pain and sickness, again suggesting that the aging Cunegund may have suffered ill health.

The apotropaic and curative power of images was well-rehearsed in the Middle Ages, and protection from illness or untimely death was frequently sought through devotion to Christ’s wounds. Passional images portraying a tunic-less adult Christ are reserved for the Flagellation, Crucifixion, and the Man of Sorrows (fols.7r, 8r and 8v, and 10r): all moments of Christ’s most acute suffering. These are images designed to elicit the most powerful sympathetic responses.

The artist depicts Christ wearing the blue, seamless tunic in the fol.7v of the Christ carrying the Cross: commonly in this image, he is represented in either cloak or loincloth.

The rubric title above this upper image reads, “It is your task, Christ, to carry the burden of the cross to the place of Calvary / therefore, Christ, overpower the cruel
[ones] with the rod of the cross.”

“Ad loca calvarie tibi Christe crucem baiulare / ergo crucis Christe crudeles opprime fuste” rubric title, fol.7v.

Pseudo-Bonaventura, 331.

Simon was pressed to carry Christ’s cross, Matt. 27.32; Mark 15.21; Luke 23.26.

See Strickland, 105.

“Illa namque dies desponsationis exitit quia Christe in cruce moriens / ecclesiam sibi per proprium sanguinem copulavit.” fol.7v11-12.

This may also be seen as a contrast to Colda’s earlier use of the verb constuprare, see p.107.

Pp.70-71; Letter 2, between 1234 and 1239, St. Clare of Assisi, 113.

Suzanne Lewis, Reading Images: Narrative Discourse and Reception in the Thirteenth-centu

Stejskal, Pasionál, 34; Toussaint, 166-7.

Pp.79-81.

Looking once again to the description of Christ given in the Meditations, we read: “on His shoulders the venerable wood of the long, wide, very heavy cross, which the most gentle Lamb patiently takes and carries...he is led and hurried and saturated with taunts...bowed down by the cross and gasping aloud. Feel as much compassion for Him as you can.”

The Passional artist depicts a meek Christ, apparently pushed and “hurried”, rather than assisted, by Simon of Cyrene whose coarse facial features - the now familiar, highly-caricatured “Jewish” profile, beetle-browed, with prominent nose and chin, and gaping grimace - make for an unattractive figure.

Simon’s robes are tucked up and he wears an over-large pileum cornutum; this suggests he may represent the “cruel” of the rubric title. The sharpened point of the foot of the cross, guides the viewer’s gaze to Colda’s text: “For that day of betrothal happened when Christ, dying on the cross, bound the Church to himself through his own blood.” In the context of betrothal and Brautmystik, Colda’s use of the verb copulare for “binding”, might be interpreted as a physical coupling; it will be recalled that St, Clare’s letter to St. Agnes, assured her that she will be taken “to his bosom in the heavenly bridal chamber.”

The powerful blood that binds is the cleansing blood of the Eucharist.

Beneath this image is one of the most iconographically creative and significant illuminations in the Passional: the fol.7v Supplicant Nun before Christ. It exemplifies the medieval proclivity for attempting, as Suzanne Lewis describes it, “to conflate past and present, here and there, speaker and audience, and characters.”

Stejskal and Toussaint both noted the obvious association between the kneeling supplicant and Mary Magdalene in noli me tangere iconography. Although initially painted for, and therefore probably representing, Cunegund, the nun is not identified or named and might also represent any of the sisters: the Passional’s intended future readership. Cunegund’s important, personal, empathetic relationship with Mary Magdalene has been noted and is manifest in this image. The artist purposefully melds into the single figure of the penitent nun not only
the Magdalene but also the other Franciscan female role model, the Virgin Mary, signalled by a blue tunic visible beneath the penitential black garments worn by the Benedictine nuns of St. George’s Convent.\footnote{Hanuš considered the figure to have been correctly over-painted, Hanuš and Vocel, 235 n. 26.} In a truly medieval manner, the artist expresses the accustomed mutability of \textit{personae}.\footnote{E.g., Christ as mother, see Bynum, \textit{Jesus as Mother}, 110-169.} Just as the female protagonist in the Song of Songs, the model for \textit{Brautmystik}, could exist simultaneously as “my sister, my spouse”\footnote{E.g., Song of Songs 4.10.}, so the female devotee is capable of embodying nun, Virgin Mary and Magdalene in a synthesis of past and present. Michael Camille observed that, “Medieval people loved to project themselves into their images”.\footnote{Camille, 15.} Cunegund aligned herself with those enjoying the closest male/female relationships with Christ, a fact also demonstrated in the Passional Laments.\footnote{Second and third treatises: fols.11r-17v, the Lament of the Virgin and fols.34v-36v, the Lament of Mary Magdalene, respectively.} Her identification with Mary Magdalene in the fol.7v image is particularly germane for the Magdalene received Christ’s total absolution, as Luke recorded: “‘And so I tell you, her great love proves that her many sins have been forgiven; where little has been forgiven little love is shown.’ Then he said to her, ‘Your sins are forgiven.’”\footnote{Luke 8.47-48, \textit{N.E.B.}, 108.}

The fol.7v supplicant concentrates her gaze deeply into Christ’s side wound, tantalisingly exposed, as Christ leans over her with his arm raised: a crimson gash, visible through a tear in his robe. The borrowed \textit{noli me tangere} iconography - these emotive words are, however, absent from text and rubrics - embodies the anathema of women’s touch.\footnote{Pp.146-147, “Jesus saith unto her, ‘Touch me not; for I am not ascended to my Father:’” John 20.17, \textit{Holy Bible}, 122.} The inability to touch serves to invigorate the power of the gaze.\footnote{Barbara Baert, “The Gaze in the Garden - Body and Embodiment in Noli me Tangere, with an Emphasis on Fifteenth-century Low Countries,” in \textit{Netherlands Yearbook for History of Art} (2007): 37-61, at 40. http://www.academia.edu/5334085/ viewed from 18.09.2015.} The obeisant nun is so close to Christ that the hem of her gown appears to brush his wounded foot and her fingers to rest lightly against his robe; indeed, she appears to topple towards him. Once again there is a performative aspect to this image: anticipating and visualising the devotions enacted by the devotee before the fol.10r illustration of Christ’s side wound. The supplicant’s gaze responds to Christ’s entreaty that runs in a ribbon of rubric parallel to her kneeling figure: “Behold,”\footnote{Aspice - behold - second person singular present active imperative - look/gaze on/at, see, observe, behold, regard, face, consider, contemplate, William Whitaker’s words.} Jeffrey Hamburger and Robert Suckale, following

\textit{Aspice vulnera...”} rubric title, fol.7v.
Toussaint’s lead, translate the complete phrase as: “See the wounds and the horrible blows that I have borne.” This assumes the transcription: “Aspice vulnera severaque verbera que toleravi”. The title in the manuscript, however, has no diacritical mark to denote a contraction in the third word; I therefore offer an alternative transcription: “senaque”. This renders the translation: “Behold the wounds and the six injuries I endured” – the five wounds of Christ, a medieval focus for devotion and referred to in the fol.2v titulus, and I suggest, the additional wound to his heart which, as will be shown, is crucial to this image. This sentence, spoken by Christ, initiates an intimate, two-way dialogue recorded in the rubrics. The supplicant, with arms uplifted in an open gesture of adoration and speech, replies: “Christ, Son of God, have mercy upon me.” If, as I believe, Cunegund had over-arching editorial control over this manuscript, it would be her voice we hear begging for mercy: accepting guilt for Christ’s suffering, whilst seeking absolution.

The rubric title beneath the fol.7v image continues the conversation: “I beseech, surrender your entire self to me; that I may not be separated from you.” This preludes the closing words of Colda’s first treatise (preserved in German translation) which run: “let us for eternity never be separated from his sweetest embrace, which may God work in us, who with the Father and the Holy Spirit lives and reigns in all eternity. Amen.” A remarkably similar sentiment was incorporated into the later prayer, Anima Christi, recited at the Elevation of the Host: “Hide me inside your wounds. Do not allow me to be separated from you.” The Passional rubric expresses a “communion” of souls, and a spiritual blending between Christ and the nun who gazes: that union so deeply desired by Brides of
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935 “siehe die Wunden und die grausamen Hiebe, die ich ertragen habe.” Toussaint, 173.
936 Hamburger and Suckale, “Between this World,” 96.
938 P.89.
939 The gesture commonly adopted by Mary Magdalene in noli me tangere iconography, Jean Luc Nancy, Noli me Tangere: On the Raising of the Body (New York, 2009), 32.
940 “Fili Christe dei tu miserere mei” rubric title, fol.7v.
941 Later, the voice of subsequent nuns using the Passional.
942 “Queso mihi da te totum ne disgreger a te” rubric title, fol.7v.
Christ. Christ, the devotee or both could speak these words. It is a moment of mutual yielding and acceptance, depicted in a strikingly individual iconographic manner.

The fol.7v image illustrates the nuns’ desire to be incorporated into Christ’s body through the side wound: to penetrate to Christ’s very heart.\footnote{Bynum, “Patterns of Female Piety,” 181.} *Sacré Coeur*, Christ’s sacred heart, was the object of intense adoration in the medieval Church,\footnote{Newman, “The Visionary Texts,” 161.} instigated, according to tradition, by Sts. Gertrude the Great and Mechtild from Hackeborn.\footnote{Bynum, *Wonderful Blood*, 14.} On fol.7v, the lance stands erect but unlabelled beside Christ. It appears incongruous in this setting but recognisable as the weapon recorded in doctrine, and legend,\footnote{Pp.97-98 and 103.} to have forced entry to Christ’s heart. Indeed, adjacent to this image, is Colda’s most elucidatory text: “He [Christ] wanted his side to be spread open by the spear so that, by this wound, the flesh would be removed so that his heart could be seen within.”\footnote{“Lancea latus aperiri voluit ut amota per vulnus / carne hoc cor eius in tus positum aspicietur” fol.7v16-17.} The particular importance of this description of the lance forging its passage through the wound towards the Sacred Heart, peeling back Christ’s skin to provide a clear view, will become obvious when looking at the iconography of the fol.10r Man of Sorrows.\footnote{Pp.139-140.} In the fol.7v illustration, Longinus’ lance reaches from the very top of the painting’s field to its lower border. As in other Passional representations of this holy object - fols.3r, 3v and 10r - the lance-head appears deadly-sharp. Sidney Johnson describes how, in the various grail legends, the lance is described as either bleeding, or blooded - *bluotec* - as in Wolfram’s account.\footnote{Johnson, “Doing his own Thing,” 84.} With the exception of fol.3v’s representation, the lance is similarly *bluotec* in the Passional: the metal tip is outlined by beads of rubric. The profound grail significance of this Instrument has already been alluded to.\footnote{P.103-104.} The unique image on fol.7v breaks the sequence of Passion cycle illustrations but serves to draw the reader’s attention to the lance (referred to in the text on fol.7v16-27) and to its effect; also to Christ’s wounds and in particular his side wound (fol.7v16-17).

The first of the two Passional Crucifixion illustrations fills the border with an extended image on fol.8r. The accompanying text expounds on the hammer and nails (fol.7v27-8r4), the wounds, the seamless robe and the drawing of lots (fol.8r4-8, 8-16, 16-21). The latter discourse flows into an account of Christ’s thirst (mentioning the sponge but, unlike the
other Instruments, not highlighting it in rubric), and of his final moments (fol.8r21-fol.9r3): “Oh, how bitter was the final draught that he drank; how hard the bed on which that powerful knight slumbered.”\textsuperscript{954} In this illustration, Christ is depicted as still alive, the rubric title above recording a brief conversation. Stejskal observed that this reads as a concise, dramatic dialogue between the Virgin Mary and Christ:\textsuperscript{955} “Son – What, Mother? – Are you God? – I am – Why are you hanging there? – So that humanity is not led to destruction.”\textsuperscript{956} (As mentioned, drama was an important aspect of nuns’ piety, and its influence is apparent in several of the images in the second treatise.)\textsuperscript{957} The composition and poses in the fol.8r Crucifixion are customary and familiar but there is an unusual amount of blood illustrated - a recognisable feature of the first treatise images - spurting and streaming in undulating rivulets from Christ’s wounds. The seamless robe, as on fol.3r,\textsuperscript{958} is spread out for meditative contemplation.\textsuperscript{959} Beside it, a group of Jews, easily identifiable by their pilea cornuta and shaggy beards, are seated upon a bench casting lots. Their rubric heading, also in direct speech, includes them in the drama, quoting John’s account, “‘We must not tear this; let us toss for it,’”\textsuperscript{960} although, in this image and its rubric title, the four Roman soldiers referred to in the gospel are replaced by three Jews presumably representing Pharisees.\textsuperscript{961} The artist takes pains to distinguish one of their number who wears a broad, miniver-trimmed collar with matching, hybrid hat which is reminiscent of the nobleman-Christ’s on fol.3v but crowned with a pink pileum cornutum. Flashes of miniver peep from the lining of his outer robe. Although not a “positive” image, this Jew’s fur trimmings intimate wealth and high rank and, I suggest, acknowledge the degree of respect afforded to elite Prague Jews. The figures draw lots: not far removed from the practices of bartering and usury for which Jews were required and renown.\textsuperscript{962} The sponge-bearer described in the gospels,\textsuperscript{963} is traditionally depicted as a Jew.\textsuperscript{964} Here, he appears complete with conical hat, tucked-in robe and with his head distinctly thrown back.\textsuperscript{965} He grasps the rod in right hand and bucket in left; Jordan observes that this is how Stephaton is usually reproduced.\textsuperscript{966} Along the lines suggested by Strickland in relation to

\textsuperscript{954} “O quam ama/ra et potio quam bibit quam durus lectulus in quo hic miles / strenuus obdormivit.” fol.8r1-3.
\textsuperscript{955} Stejskal, Pasionáli, 27.
\textsuperscript{956} “Fili quid mater deus es sum cur ita pendens? / Ne genus humanum tendat ad interitum” rubric title, fol.8r.
\textsuperscript{957} Pp.110-111, 146-147 and 149.
\textsuperscript{958} P.92.
\textsuperscript{959} P.46.
\textsuperscript{960} John 19.24, N.E.B., 185; also, brief accounts, Matt. 27.35-36; Mark 15.24; Luke 23.34.
\textsuperscript{961} John 19.23-24.
\textsuperscript{962} Hood, Aquinas, 23-25.
\textsuperscript{963} Matt. 27.47-48; Mark 15.35-36; Luke 23.36-37; John 19.28-30.
\textsuperscript{964} Jordan, “The Last Torment,” 34.
\textsuperscript{965} P.118.
\textsuperscript{966} Jordan, “The Last Torment,” 34.
over-large hats, the depiction here of an out-sized rod-shaft may be considered pejorative; its length also ensures that the bearer is allocated an ignominious position at the bottom of the scene.

Overleaf, on fol.8v, three undivided images run down the margin in a story-telling manner reminiscent of the series of fol.3v vignettes. The uppermost image, a second illustration of the Crucifixion, echoes that on fol.8r, but now Christ is dead: his body hangs heavily from the nails in his hands and his head lolls. Significantly, blood continues to flow copiously from his wounds (an important reminder of the Eucharist and of sanctity). Mary’s open-handed gesture signals that she speaks the words of grief that appear in rubric above the image: “I am crucified/tortured by your death, son, I suffer together with you; may you not allow me to die; save [me, in order that] you may spare the sinner.” These words of empathy, compassion and supplication would be equally apposite when uttered by a nun gazing upon the image of the Crucified Christ. Pictured below, again employing conventional iconography, is the Deposition. As noted, the agitated figure of a Jew, identifiable by his pileum cornutum, removes the nail from Christ’s hand. He, like Stephaton on the previous page, is depicted with his neck sharply extended so that his face is parallel with the arm of the cross. He handles a pair of pliers: these number among the Passion Instruments highlighted in rubric and elaborated upon in the text (fol.8v9-15). The ladder upon which this tiny figure stands is the last Instrument of the Passion discussed in the text prior to Colda’s concluding message (fols.8v9r15-14). The sequence of images on fol.8v ends with an iconographically conventional Entombment, the most striking feature of which is the artist’s representation of marble. This, and the uppermost illustration on the facing page, the fol.9r Resurrection, demonstrates the Passional artist’s own, distinctive recipe for fictive-marble: green painted outlines, creating trilobular patterns of unpainted parchment (fols.8v, 9r, 14r, 15r).

The three scenes on fol.9r, each divided from the next by a thin, yellow strip, are jubilant and redemptive. In the top image, Resurrection, the figure of Christ stepping from the tomb is unusual for his being fully clothed; he carries a red pennant signifying his
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victory over death. Immediately arresting, and surprising, is the presence of the harp-playing figure of King David, not portrayed in “biblical dress” but in the guise of a contemporary king with a gilded, *fleuron* crown and wearing high-status, miniver-lined robes. (In 1352, the father of Charles V of France possessed a *houce* - the same garment worn by King David in his fol.17v portrait - made from 440 squirrel-abdomen pelts and trimmed with six *languettes.*) Just as *sponsus* and *sponsa* on fol.3v, King David is depicted on fol.9r with *languettes* on his cloak: three along each upper edge, as worn by Czech royalty [fig. 3.3]. Strickland notes that, “especially positive treatment is given to certain important figures, such as David, seen as typological models for Christ and contemporary kings.” Through dress, *sacra stirps*, the concept of sacred lineage is referenced by creating an analogy between King David, Jesus’ illustrious ancestor – note how Christ’s royal heritage was highlighted in the *parabola* - and the Premyslide rulers. King David’s command, following the line of his harp in rubric, calls for Christ’s Resurrection: “Rise up, my glory.” These words echo those repeated again and again in Colda’s accompanying text (fol.9r15-18). They are germane in also summoning up a longed-for Premyslide, dynastic revival - the male line was extinguished with the assassination of the sixteen-year-old King Wenceslas III, August 4, 1306, and when the 1312 section of the Passional was made the dynastic future lay with Cunegund’s niece, Queen Eliška, and John of Luxembourg. Cunegund would have known God’s declaration to Abraham: “a father of many nations have I made thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee.” She would have considered Bohemia as among these “nations”; the Premyslides as among the “kings”. Abraham was David’s ancestor, and in contemplating Christ’s royal lineage Cunegund might simultaneously fulfil the requirements of a medieval nun in contemplating and praying for her own, Premyslide dynasty. In reference to Ottonian female, religious communities, Helene Scheck commented that their chief role was “as a
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spiritual and memorial support system for the dynasty”.\textsuperscript{985} Having witnessed the downward spiral of the Premyslides, it was Cunegund’s duty and responsibility to fulfill the valued obligation of \textit{memoria},\textsuperscript{986} and to pray for her family’s resurrected pre-eminence. The rubric title above the fol.9r \textit{Resurrection} reads, “Christ, you conquer the power of death; the brave lion arises.”\textsuperscript{987} (I have added the punctuation; ‘Christ’ is in the vocative, linking it with the first clause of the sentence.) I suggest, therefore, that the ‘the brave lion arises’ also references the rampant lion of the Premyslide coat of arms, pictured on fol.1v, performatively predicting and invoking a resurgence of Premyslide power.

In the fol.9r \textit{Resurrection}, the artist depicts diminutive, unconscious tomb guards,\textsuperscript{988} hovering against and merging with the tomb’s marbled surface. They appear almost decorative rather than as solid flesh. Their, most unusual, Jewish, attributes appear to have escaped notice. The guard on the left wears the distinguishing \textit{pileum cornutum} above his helmet; his shield is adorned with the three balls that are the sign of a pawnbroker, a trade that was the province of Jews and Lombards in the Middle Ages,\textsuperscript{989} the other guard’s shield is emblazoned with a red \textit{pileum cornutum}. There can be no doubt that this depiction is a negative statement against Jews.\textsuperscript{990} Matthew, the only canonical gospel mentioning tomb guards, describes the Jewish chief priests requesting that a guard might be present to prevent the fulfilment of the Resurrection prophesy.\textsuperscript{991} Pontius Pilate agreed and responded, presumably providing Roman soldiers. Perhaps the image acknowledges this Jewish/Roman collaboration by assigning Jewish emblems to “Roman” guards (dressed as contemporary medieval knights, as on fol.6v), which label them incontrovertibly as the “enemy”.

The middle image on fol.9r is the \textit{Harrowing of Hell}. Standard iconography is employed although, once again, Christ wears tunic and robe rather than cloak alone, as is more customary.\textsuperscript{992} This scene is iconographically important as a parallel to that on fol.3v of

\textsuperscript{985} Helene Scheck, “Reading Women at the Margins of Quedlinburg Codex 74,” in \textit{Nun’s Literacies in Medieval Europe - The Hull Dialogue}, eds. Virginia Blanton, Veronica O’Mara and Patricia Stoop (Turnhout, 2013), 3-18, at 5.
\textsuperscript{986} Hamburger, Marx and Marti, “Time of the Orders,” 62.
\textsuperscript{987} “Vim supera\textit{ti}s mortis \textit{surgi}t Christe \textit{leo fortis}” rubric title, fol.9r.
\textsuperscript{988} “At the sight of him the guards shook with fear and lay like the dead,” Matt. 28.4, \textit{N.E.B.}, 54.
\textsuperscript{989} The origin of the three balls sign is possibly derived from the three, gold dowry-portions in St. Nicholas’ legend, see Raymond De Roover, “The Three Golden Balls of the Pawnbrokers,” in \textit{Business History Review} 20 (October 1946;) 4:117-124; see also, Jacobus de Voragine, \textit{The Golden Legend}, 11-15.
\textsuperscript{990} The political use of heraldry in Resurrection iconography, pp.193-194.
\textsuperscript{991} Matt. 27.62-66.
\textsuperscript{992} E.g., BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.132v, Sandler, \textit{The De Lisle Psalter}, 70-71.
sponsus rescuing sponsa from her tower-incarceration. In the fol.3v illustration, the artist employs an intimate palm-to-palm grasp: that of a bridegroom clasping his bride. On fol.9r, Christ grips aged Mankind by the wrist, whilst stepping forward in a lively manner to release him from his tower inferno. Man’s redemption is shown to be complete in the scene below, Last Judgement: the final, small image in the first treatise. Christ in Judgement, seated within a mandorla, is only unusual in that the artist avoids using the traditional, full-frontal gaze portraying Christ turning his head towards John the Baptist, Adam and Eve. This reinforces a message of salvation through baptism, and Adam and Eve’s soteriologically significant, total absolution, referred to above. The presence of Adam and Eve, representing redeemed mortals, and Joachim and Anna, Christ’s grandparents - perhaps alluding once more to dynastic heredity - makes this a unique image.

The final and indisputably the principal image of the first treatise (if not the entire Passional) is the fol.10r Man of Sorrows with the Instruments of the Passion. It is a comprehensive Andachtsbild, providing a programmatic set of mini-images on which the devotee may fix her attention and focus her penitential act, performed through fervent, pious and empathetic meditation upon each item, seeking a spiritual response. Recall Colda’s telling words, directly instructing Cunegund: “Do not let the instruments of his passion away from your face; do not let them be torn from your heart; do not let them be taken from your eyes.” Each blood-spattered Instrument summons up the horrors of the Passion in the viewer’s imagination as it is considered and concentrated upon in empathetic, meditative prayer. Imaginative visualisation before images, particularly of Christ’s Passion, was widely practised, and, as Beckwith puts it, “its emphatic fetishizing of Christ’s torn and bleeding body as the object, indeed subject, of compassion and passion.” As part of Franciscan affective practices of imitatio, conformatio and devotio, it would have formed part of Cunegund’s religious observances as a Poor Clare. The desired response to this Andachtsbild is expressed in words from the Meditations:

“Weep, my eyes, and melt, my soul, in a fire of compassion for wounding this lovable Man
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996 “Non recedant de ore; non auferantur ab oculis tuis suae passionis insignia” fol.9v2-3.
998 Beckwith, Christ’s Body, 52.
999 Swanson, “Passion and Practice,” 12.
whom you see in so much meekness, afflicted with so many sorrows.”¹⁰⁰⁰ Such meditative devotion was also designed to provoke visionary or ecstatic revelations: a particular feature of medieval, female, devotional piety.¹⁰⁰¹ There is no record, however, of this response within the Convent of St. George. The artist sought to encapsulate all aspects and implications of the Crucifixion and Resurrection, conjuring feelings of sympathy, guilt and awe in the onlooker. This image suited the demands of Colda in setting out the “weapons”;¹⁰⁰² by embodying the pathos of Christ’s plight and his obedience to God’s will, it suited the demands of medieval, religious piety; and presumably it also suited Cunegund in providing a penitential tool for empathetic, meditative prayer as a means of atonement.

A dramatic, and crucial, discovery was made during my analysis of this image. Written along the lower margin of the page, to the left of the foot of the cross, is a faint inscription. It was considered largely illegible by Jan Gelasius Dobner in the eighteenth century, who was only able to decipher the first three words of the sentence: “‘GAZE INTO THE WOUND’: the remainder has been worn away and covered by mustiness.”¹⁰⁰³ Since then, it has passed unmentioned by later commentators. Close examination of the digital image has enabled me to decipher it fully.¹⁰⁰⁴ This revelation profoundly influences the interpretation of the image, providing vital evidence for the artist’s objective in painting the enlarged side wound, and strengthening our understanding of Cunegund’s personal piety. Firstly, I discerned a faintly visible, “amen”, to the left of the foot of the cross: this transforms the directive into both dictum and prayer. Further examination revealed more letters, including two distinctive rücken “g”s,¹⁰⁰⁵ employed by Beneš, throughout the Passional text. This discovery led to the deciphering of the missing words, “ut gignam”. The complete injunction therefore reads, “Contemplare in plagam ut gignam amen” - “Gaze into the wound that I might give birth, amen” [fig. 3.26]. The onlooker is personally addressed by Christ in the familiar second person singular, present, active, imperative, contemplare¹⁰⁰⁶ - gaze; the first person singular, present, active, subjunctive, forms a direct, personal statement from Christ, ut gignam¹⁰⁰⁷ – that I might give birth. A bargain is

¹⁰⁰⁰ Pseudo-Bonaventura, 357.
¹⁰⁰² Pp. 88-89, 95.
¹⁰⁰³ “CONTEMPLARE IN PLAGAM, reliqua abstersa & mucore obsita sunt.” Dobner, 6:333.
¹⁰⁰⁵ Derolez, 88.
¹⁰⁰⁶ Trans. - observe/notice, gaze/look hard at/regard/contemplate/consider carefully, William Whitaker’s words.
¹⁰⁰⁷ Trans. - give birth/bring, ibid.
struck: if the supplicant contemplates the wound, Christ will bestow salvation. “To give birth” expresses the primary meaning of the verb; it also communicates a metaphorical, soteriological concept familiar to its medieval readers.

The viewer is directed to scrutinise the enlarged image of Christ’s side wound which dangles like an inverted teardrop, suspended in the space beneath the arm of the cross, an enlarged image of side wound located “at the right hand” of Christ: the position of greatest respect and honour. Recent scholars, stimulated by the wound’s frequent iconographical reorientation from horizontal to vertical, have suggested a vaginal interpretation. Bynum acknowledges that in many medieval images Christ’s side wound was “offered for veneration as a gaping and often erotically charged longitudinal slit.” There is an undeniably passionate element to a Bride of Christ’s desire to be fully united with Christ, expressed in St. Clare’s correspondence with St. Agnes. Labelling such passion “erotic”, however, with all its modern overtones, risks demeaning the nuns’ intent to use their entire emotional repertoire to achieve complete devotion. Rather than explicit sexual connotations, on the strength of the fol.10r subtitle – “that I might give birth” - it becomes clear that any vaginal analogy is specifically directed to the function of delivery: to parturition. Flora Lewis described the perception of Christ’s side wound in thirteenth/early fourteenth-century piety as the “place of parturition for the individual soul”. The side wound becomes, as in a Caesarean section, the passageway through which Christ gives birth to the votary’s renewed soul. St. John’s description of the issue of blood and water from the side wound is commented upon by Colda on fol.7v: “And so,” said John, ‘the lance of the soldiers opened his side and blood and water flowed out continually.’ Blood used as a reward, water as a sacrament for the washing away of filth.” This is replicated in the act of giving birth which precipitates a gushing flow of blood and “water” (amniotic fluid).
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On fol.10r, the flecks of rubric over the Man of Sorrow’s entire body may now be interpreted not only as representing the sweat of blood shed by Christ on the Mount of Olives, and the wounds of Flagellation, but also the sweat of parturition as described by the French Carthusian nun and mystic Marguerite d’Oingt (1240-1310) who died two years before the creation of this image: “when the time approached for you to be delivered, your labor pains were so great that your holy sweat was like great drops of blood…For when the hour of your delivery came you were placed on the hard bed of the cross…And truly it is no surprise that your veins burst when in one day you gave birth to the whole world.”

Having borne at least two children, Cunegund had first-hand experience of childbirth and would have been familiar with that painful and bloody process leading to joyous elation at the arrival of something new and pure into the world. The wound image may have been intended to act as a catalyst, triggering her recollections of the pain of parturition, possibly Cunegund’s most intense experience of suffering, thus enhancing her empathy with Christ through *imitatio*.

Christ “delivered” salvation through his wound; in response, the nuns may have sought a reciprocal “travelling in”. (It will be recalled that the companion rubric legend on fol.7v, “I beseech, surrender your entire self to me; that I may not be separated from you,” relates to the Anima Christi and therefore to the act of hiding in Christ’s wounds.)

Aelred of Rievaulx (1110-1167), whose writings Cunegund included in her 1303 gifted volume, instructed the anchoress to whom he addressed his *De Institutione Inclusarum*, to: “Crepe into that blessed side from whence the blood and water came, and hide ther as a culuer in the stoon, wel likynge the dropes of his blood, til that thy lippes be maad like to a reed scarlet hood. Abyde a-while.”

By gazing into a painted image of Christ’s wound the nuns would similarly attempt to gain entrance; to travel to the heart of their beloved; to “hide inside the wounds” and to “abyde a-while”.
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Gaze and vision were central to medieval worship: physical sight offering a means of attaining inner vision.\textsuperscript{1020} There was an acceptance of the Aristotelian assertion, reinforced by St. Augustine, that contemplation to some degree enabled the viewer to assimilate the object of his gaze.\textsuperscript{1021} To see was also to receive: the viewed object might enter the soul of the viewer. The verb \textit{contemplare}, used in the fol.10r inscription, is an augmentation of the verb \textit{aspicere} which was used on fol.7v, entreating the supplicant nun similarly to peer into Christ’s side wound. The translation “gaze” must be understood to express not only the act of looking on in rapture but also of concentrated consideration and absorption of the scrutinised object. Both \textit{contemplare} and \textit{aspicere} denote affective devotion requiring the individual to perform all aspects of “seeing”. The act might be coloured by emotional fervour coupled with a desire to achieve a rapturous, mystical response. On fol.10r, even the figure of Christ the \textit{Man of Sorrows} himself appears to stare intently into the enlarged side wound.

Cunegund’s influence over the subject matter of this image is suggested by the fact that it perfectly fulfils St. Clare’s instructions to St. Agnes,\textsuperscript{1022} which must have been deeply impressed upon Cunegund during her formative years:\textsuperscript{1023}

> Your spouse…was despised, beaten, scourged many times over his whole body, then suffered the agony of the cross and died. Most noble queen, gaze upon him, consider him, contemplate him in your desire to imitate him. If you suffer with him, you will reign with him; if you grieve with him, you will rejoice with him; if you die with him upon the cross of tribulation you will gain the heavenly mansions in the splendour of the saints, and your name will be written in the Book of Life and be immortal among men.\textsuperscript{1024}

The imaginative and spiritually-inspired onlooker, empathetically meditating upon the fol.10r \textit{Man of Sorrows} might metaphorically “die with him upon the cross of tribulation”. This was not seen as an end in itself but, as St. Clare expressed it, to “gaze…consider…contemplate…imitate…and suffer with him” would be rewarded, serving as the means to “reign…rejoice…[and] gain the heavenly mansions”: Cunegund’s main concern, and the subject of Colda’s, 1314, Passional treatise (fols.18r-31v). Despite her humility,\textsuperscript{1025} Cunegund might even have appreciated her name remaining “immortal among men”.\textsuperscript{1026} St. Clare provided Cunegund with the recipe, and the artist (in providing

\begin{thebibliography}{10}
\bibitem{1020} Camille; Suzannah Biernoff, \textit{Sight and Embodiment in the Middle Ages} (New York, 2002), 41-57.
\bibitem{1021} Ibid. 96-97.
\bibitem{1022} P.71.
\bibitem{1023} P.10.
\bibitem{1024} Letter 2, between 1234 and 1239, St. Clare of Assisi, 114-115.
\bibitem{1025} P.75.
\bibitem{1026} P.215.
\end{thebibliography
the fol.10r image) the means to follow not only Colda’s instructions to keep the Instruments always in sight, heart and mind, but also, even more crucially, Christ’s personal entreaty inscribed at the foot of the fol.10r image which, until now, had remained indecipherable for many centuries.

The full-length image of Christ, Man of Sorrows, may owe a debt to the Byzantine, iconographic influence of epitaphios: a sacrificial image depicting the dead Christ laid upon the anointing stone, often painted or embroidered on cloth [fig. 3.27]. Representing Christ’s shroud, it was laid upon the altar as an important part of Eastern Orthodox liturgical practice. Significantly, Christ of epitaphios often appears isolated, excluded from the drama, differentiating the image from Deposition or Lamentation iconography. Christ as Man of Sorrows appears in utter isolation, caught between death and eternal life: the figure of epitaphios translated from horizontal to vertical, although usually with eyes open. The unsupported Man of Sorrows on fol.10r, exhibiting his wounds, anticipates the standing Man of Sorrows referred to by Panofsky as “mimschaktiven Standfigur” which, in following centuries, particularly in Northern art, was associated with the iconography of the mass of St. Gregory.

The fol.10r Man of Sorrows image conforms to type in stressing Christ’s humanity, representing his continued suffering caused by Man’s continued sinning. The figure of Christ, however, does not dominate the page but is displayed alongside the other elements of the Passion to be examined and dwelt upon with prayerful intensity. Christ as Man of Sorrows is the typological counterpart of the Suffering Servant of the Fourth Canticle, Isaiah 53, alluded to by Colda on fol.6v20-7r2. “He is despised and rejected of men: a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.” Christ crucified, yet sustained by the Holy Spirit: not dead, but upright in preparation for the Resurrection. Isaiah typologically states, “as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall God rejoice over thee.” Responding to his humanity, seeking to give joy to the sorrowful Christ, nuns offered

---

1027 P. 128; fol.9v2-3.
1028 Cunegund’s personal association with the East, p.93; appendix Iic.
1029 Panofsky, “‘Imago Pietatis’,” 261.
1031 Trans. A figure apparently standing erect.
1032 Panofsky, “‘Imago Pietatis’,” 293.
1034 Isaiah 53:3, Holy Bible, 689.
1035 Isaiah 62.5, ibid., 695.
themselves as bride to this bridegroom: the sentiment expressed in St. Clare’s letters to St. Agnes.\footnote{1036}

Following the Fourth Crusade and the capture of Constantinople in 1204, numerous religious images were imported to the West.\footnote{1037} An early western example of the Man of Sorrows, from 1293,\footnote{1038} employs Byzantine iconography [fig. 3.27]: a half-length Christ figure, head drooping towards his right shoulder, with the closed eyes of \textit{Christus Patiens} - standard eastern iconography for Christ Crucified from the ninth century and for eastern images of Man of Sorrows.\footnote{1039} I consider it significant firstly, that this example appears in a Franciscan prayer book, demonstrating a resonance between the image and Franciscanism and its adoption by the order, and secondly, that the manuscript is from Genoa.\footnote{1040} This important Italian port, the centre of a Maritime State, carried crusader traffic from Constantinople.\footnote{1041} Plundered goods passing through the port would have included the easily portable, two-sided processional boards bearing the image of the Man of Sorrows on one side.\footnote{1042} Significantly, through his first marriage to Margaret of Babenberg,\footnote{1043} Otakar II extended Czech power towards Italy.\footnote{1044} He was declared captain-general of Aquilea, having assisted its besieged Patriarch in 1267,\footnote{1045} and then in 1272, Lord of Pordenone, in which role he offered his protection to Treviso and Verona.\footnote{1046} Nearby Venice was another main port for eastern trade routes from Constantinople, Antioch and Alexandria.\footnote{1047} As in Genoa, the Man of Sorrows image would have been freely accessible for copying. It is possible, therefore, that under Otakar II’s rule, the strong links with the Veneto created opportunities for a renewed impulse of Byzantine artistic influence and for the importing of eastern devotional images into the Czech Lands.

\footnotetext[1036]{1036}{For example, p.108.}
\footnotetext[1038]{1038}{Florence, Laurentian Library, MS Plut XXV.3, Supplicationes variae, fòl.183v.}
\footnotetext[1039]{1039}{Ogilvie, \textit{Iconography}, Chapter II.}
\footnotetext[1042]{1042}{Pp.57 and 145 [fig. 3.37].}
\footnotetext[1043]{1043}{P.94.}
\footnotetext[1044]{1044}{Le Goff, \textit{Medieval Civilisation}, 106.}
\footnotetext[1045]{1045}{Ibid., 119.}
\footnotetext[1046]{1046}{Ibid., 123.}
October 1, 1311-May 6, 1312, the influential Bishop John IV of Dražice, who installed Cunegund as Abbess of St. George’s Convent, attended the crucially important Council of Vienna. According to Thomas Aquinas’ biographer, Bartholomew of Lucca, the Festival of Corpus Christi - the celebration of Christ’s living body in the eucharistic species, viz. the host - was reconfirmed by Pope Clement V at this gathering. This council convened in the same year as the dedication of the Passional, and just c.200 miles from Prague. Bishop John IV’s presence at that meeting may account for Cunegund’s inclination towards Corpus Christi devotion: the office appears in her breviary together with the famous, vernacular “Cunegund’s prayer”. The re-established Festival of Corpus Christi provided the Man of Sorrows image with an apposite western context. The Church required representation for this reinvigorated, religious focus: one demonstrating both Christ’s sacrifice and enduring presence by embodying the mysteries of transubstantiation. The eastern image of the Man of Sorrows seems to have been consciously adopted to fulfill this role: this might explain the proliferation of western examples from the early fourteenth century onwards. It was fit for purpose, concentrating on Christ’s bodily wounds and blood - the sacrificial meal of Eucharist - conveying the pathos of his suffering and anticipating his Resurrection. The Man of Sorrows commonly appeared on altarpiece predella panels, as in Simone Martini’s St. Catherine polyptych [fig. 3.28], enabling the presiding priest to hold the image before his eyes whilst preparing the sacrament. This was to become de rigueur following Pope John XXII’s 1330 indulgence which required invocation of the image during the Elevation, reenacting St. Gregory’s miraculous mass.

Supporting the doctrine of Corpus Christi, the Man of Sorrows had the advantage, unlike other Passion iconography, of being unrelated to any specific biblical Passion event. The Karahissar Gospels, c.1260-1270, contain two Byzantine illustrations [fig. 3.29] accompanying, but not illustrating, Crucifixion texts: Matt. 27.35-37 and Luke 23.33.

Each Man of Sorrows appears before a cross, chest up, arms by his sides, head bare and

1048 P.78.
1049 Bobková, “From an Inexperienced Youth,” 201.
1050 Originally established by Pope Urban IV, in the 1264 bull Transiturus and celebrated the Thursday following Trinity Sunday, Rubin, 176-181.
1051 Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, Breviary, MS VII.G.17d, fols.146v–151v; see p.143.
1054 Ibid., 7. St. Petersburg, National Library of Russia, MS. Gr.105, Karahissar Gospels, Codex Petropolitanus, fols.65v and 167v, respectively.
inclined towards his right shoulder, and eyes closed. The fol.10r Man of Sorrows matches this in many respects but, unlike Byzantine images which were cut off below the chest, the Passional Christ appears full-length against the cross, nails withdrawn from his feet and hands, held aloft by divine forces, open-eyed, in defiance of death despite his slumped and damaged body, whilst actively gesturing with his right arm.

Hans Belting refers to the object on the right of the Karahissar fol.167v image as: “the awkward addition of the tomb represented as a domed building.” It is difficult to decipher, however the “dome” might alternatively be interpreted as a lamp or jar of anointing oil (both commonly found among Arma Christi), with the winding sheet draped over the rectangular stone of the open tomb illustrated beside it down the righthand-side of the image. If this is so, this could be the earliest surviving example of the incorporation of items referencing the Passion into Man of Sorrows iconography. The role of the fol.167v objects would be to contextualise. The Instruments of the Passion in the Passional fol.10r image, however, serve to enhance the pathos of Christ’s plight. It is the agony, not the story, which is invoked.

Christ as Man of Sorrows on fol.10r is shown piteously suffering under the added burden of the sins of the devotee/Mankind. His flesh is pockmarked by small, bleeding scourge wounds applied in red ink. Bynum considers such depictions as anomalous since crucifixion was not a bloody death; it was flagellation, however, not crucifixion that supplied Christ with these wounds. On fol.10r he appears suspended, hovering before the cross, his feet illustrated side-by-side, ensuring that both wounds are displayed in accordance with Franciscan piety which laid particular stress on stigmata. The cult of the five wounds, together with veneration of the cross and nails, developed from the twelfth century to the beyond the sixteenth century. It should also be recalled that the five wounds were specifically alluded to in the titulus accompanying the fol.3r Andachtsbild. Christ’s side wound gapes: a dark, horizontal gash in his chest wall, thickly surrounded by a broad band of blood-like minium, wavy streams dribbling towards his left hand. Both hands expose a dark circle surrounded by rivulets of flowing blood where the nail was withdrawn. Previously unremarked upon are the additional wound images, depicted as

1058 Bynum, Wonderful Blood, 1.
1059 Schiller, Iconography, 2:190.
faint, ruddy ghosts, on the arms of the cross, reminiscent of the bleeding foci noted on the fol.3r *Arma Christi* shield.\textsuperscript{1061} Christ’s right hand, palm out displaying its wound, limply gestures towards a banner bearing a motto addressed to the viewer:\textsuperscript{1062} “Thus, as a man, I stand here for you [ie. your sake] when you sin; so cease [to sin] for me [ie. my sake].”\textsuperscript{1063} This entreaty reinforces the intimate relationship between image and onlooker, who is once again addressed directly by the Man of Sorrows, as in the title at the foot of the page. It is a reiteration of the final words - Colda provided St. Bernard of Clairvaux as his source - in a significant quotation from the last paragraph of Colda’s first treatise (preserved, as mentioned above, in German translation).\textsuperscript{1064} “I allowed the lance to spear open my side: in various ways I was torn open by many injustices, I have sweated blood: they gave you my soul as a wife, and you divorced yourself from me\textsuperscript{1065}…‘O Man, see what I have to suffer for you…”\textsuperscript{1066} These words would have had particular resonance for Cunegund who sinned by quitting enclosure had indeed divorced herself from Christ.

The isolated image of the side wound on fol.10r is reorientated to the vertical [fig. 3.30]. A rubric title beside it reads, “Hæc est mensura,”\textsuperscript{1067} assuring the onlooker that this is an authentic “measure”, with all the talismanic and curative properties such images conferred.\textsuperscript{1068} Paul Binski described how, “the connection of measurement and sublimity was…a symbolic reflex, a way of fleshing out significance.”\textsuperscript{1069} The enlarged wound image on fol.10r allows for detailed, clinical inspection: a receding orifice created by shades of red, ring on ring. The outermost layer, bordered by a frill of dark red specks which suggest the cut edge of the skin, carries a rubric motto inscribed, as if in blood, through the pealed-back dermal layers. The soteriological message assures the viewer of the wound’s redemptive power: “He redeemed [us] by hanging on the holy cross, showing us his wound…with his wound for all us transgressors.”\textsuperscript{1070} The deeper, muscular tissue, is depicted as a thick, dark red/black band around which blood appears to ooze and clot; at

\textsuperscript{1061} P.91.

\textsuperscript{1062} This is a variation on a couplet used in sermons. “In cruce sum pro te; qui dessine pro me. / Dessine, do veniam, dic culpam, retraho penam,” Lewis, “The Wound,” 211.

\textsuperscript{1063} “Sic homo sto pro te cum peccas desine pro me” rubric banner, fol.10r.

\textsuperscript{1064} Pp.22-23.

\textsuperscript{1065} Pp.73-74.

\textsuperscript{1066} “Ich hab den Speer meine Seithen aufspehren / lassen: Ich bin auf unterschiedliche weiß mit / Vielen ungerechtigkeiten zerfleischet worden, / Ich hab Blut geschwitzet: Sie haben meine Seel / dir zum Eheweib gegeben, und du scheidest / dich von mir…O Mensch siehe // was ich wegen deiner leiden mus...” NKČR MS XVI.E.12, fols.21r-21v1, transcr. Toussaint, 194.

\textsuperscript{1067} See Rywiková, “V chlebnej tváři,” 374.


\textsuperscript{1069} Binski, *Westminster Abbey*, 13, on measuring St. Paul’s Cathedral in a twelfth-century consecration rite.

\textsuperscript{1070} “Redemit pendens in cruce sancta ostendens vulnere [...] illegible [...] bus nos vulnere omnibus transisentibus” fol.10r, transcr. Dobner, 6:332.
the centre the colour is not dissimilar to that of Christ’s robe in the adjacent illustration and has a paler, almost luminescent strip along the left side that lends the wound depth. The artist has captured the clean cut of a lance thrust; presumably commonly enough seen in the early fourteenth century. Michael Bury suggests that, although devotion to the mensura vulneris was widespread across Europe throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth century, only recent evidence shows it to have been a feature of fourteenth-century piety. The Passional fol.10r illustration therefore provides a very early, datable and entitled example.

A clean area of parchment on the wound’s right margin suggests, as Dobner wrote in the eighteenth century: “the sacred words have been erased in the intervening time, no doubt by frequent kisses.” The same effect is seen on a French wound image from 1320 [fig. 3.30]. Remembering that the blood and water issuing from the side wound was considered the source of communion wine, it is important to return to Colda’s text, quoted above, stressing its redemptive and purging nature. These were qualities indentified by Sts.Gertrude the Great and Mechtild of Hackeborn who, as Bynum notes, dwelt on the “nourishing and cleansing liquid from the side of Christ.” The magnified, side wound with its wide lips, dangling in space beside Christ on fol.10r, was also sizable enough to enable the nuns to kiss it as if drinking Christ’s blood directly from its restorative source, recalling St. Mechtild’s description: “his wounds...stood open: the wounds gushed;...so that the soul became alive and completely healthy, when he poured the bright red wine into her red mouth.”

Ritual kissing was accompanied by vocalising, reciting aloud, crying and chanting: actions integral to meditatio. The interaction between the written word and the painted image would have been profoundly obvious when the fol.10r Man of Sorrows with the Instruments of the Passion was faced by the now-absent prayers. Prayers, read as spiritual, mantric incantations, might effect the indulgence or protection offered by an image, and provide a rhythm evoking a deep, meditative state conducive to mystical or visionary

---

1072 “Intermedia nempe crebis osculia Sanctimonialium delata sunt.” Dobner, 6:332. Escalation in this practice followed the promise of seven years indulgence, instigated by Pope Innocent VI (pope 1352-1362) for devotional kissing of the mensura vulneris, Rubin, 304. The wear on fol.10r may therefore have been compounded by later generations.
1073 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS fr574, fol.140v.
1074 P.130; fol.7v18-21.
1075 Bynum, Wonderful Blood, 14.
1076 Mechtild, Fließendes Licht, quoted by Bildhauer, Medieval Blood, 124.
I note that the prayers accompanying the fol.10r image specifically instruct supplicants to express their emotions physically by sighing aloud, prior to addressing and hailing the personified wound: “Devout sighing for the side-wound of the Lord. Greetings to you, side-wound of the Saviour Jesu Christ.” Similar greetings, addressed directly to Christ’s wounds, are found on the verso of a wound-measure image with Arma Christi from Leuven, in the Flemish Brabant, painted for nuns’ devotion c.1320. In common with the Passional, it also has a title inscribed on the wound’s outer lip [fig. 3.31]. The poem accompanying this image addresses seven membrorum Christi: feet, knees, hands, side, breast, heart, face. The Passional prayers also invoke Christ’s body parts and wounds, as well as the Passion Instruments:

Knife, Rods, Hammer, Scourges, Pliers, Nails, Thorns, Irons, Head, Neck, Shoulder, Hands and Feet Bites, deeply torn Skin.

The “bites,” not mentioned in the gospels, and the “deeply torn skin,” seem particularly shocking memoria passionis.

The text of the second treatise, a lament of the Virgin Mary, also highlights the great size of the side wound in a vivid and visceral description: “the side is pierced by the lance, the ribs laid bare, heart and inside of the body exposed on account of the large, outspread, gaping wound.” The fol.10r, bloody, gaping wound was designed to stir deep emotions. The artist appears to have attempted to illustrate these words in the most remarkable manner, as will be now demonstrated, not only in the illustration of the large side wound.

At the very centre of Christ’s chest on fol.10r Man of Sorrows, is an extraordinary, small, oval hole [fig. 3.32], which has escaped the notice of previous commentators. Unlike a flaw or a flay hole, its perfect symmetry – particularly noticeable when viewed from fol.10v [fig. 3.33] – demonstrates that it has been purposefully delineated and excised. It

---

1080 Brussels, Bibliothèque royale, Vita Sanctorum, MS 4459-70, fol.150v.
1083 P.92.
1084 “cum latus / lancea perforatur coste nudantur cor / et interiora corporis ex magnitudine / panduntur aperti vulneris.” fol.12v2-5.
1085 First observed and discussed, Vlček Schurr, “The Man of Sorrows,” 220.
appears that perforations were made around the perimeter to aid the neat, surgical removal of a small portion of parchment. The resulting aperture would have enabled the nuns directly to invoke Christ’s wounded heart, which appears literally opened up to receive the supplications of the faithful. Colda’s words, accompanying the fol.7r image of the Suppliant nun before Christ, are recalled: “He [Christ] wanted his side to be spread open by the spear so that, by this wound, the flesh would be removed so that his heart could be seen within.”\textsuperscript{1086} The tissue of the manuscript becomes Christ’s actual skin; the flesh over his heart is physically removed as described in Colda’s text. As Kathryn Rudy points out, pious rituals of the period “treated the manuscript as an interactive object...[including]...as a repository for small devotional objects.”\textsuperscript{1087} Although there is no evidence beyond medieval practice and supposition based on Cunegund’s preferences, I cautiously put forward the suggestion in the spirit of Jonathan Alexander’s advice,\textsuperscript{1088} that a consecrated host might have been placed behind this aperture, visible to the nuns through it, representing and being venerated as Corpus Christi.\textsuperscript{1089} Transubstantiation transferred the status of relic upon the host,\textsuperscript{1090} and protecting it within the Passional would equate with the common practice of placing a host within a recess in the chest of an image of Christ.\textsuperscript{1091} This would also correspond with Cunegund’s apparent inclinations towards host-piety,\textsuperscript{1092} born of her Franciscan upbringing: iconographic representations of St. Clare present her carrying a host-bearing monstrance [fig. 3.33]. Fol.10v is a lacuna: no text or illustration would be harmed. Housing the host within the fol.10r image would enhance the power of the Andachtsbild and afford the nuns prolonged, private access to contemplate Corpus Christi. It would offer the greatly-valued, “ocular” or spiritual communion achieved by gazing on the consecrated host.\textsuperscript{1093}

Comparison between the scattered objects on the fol.10r and fol.3r Andachtsbilder reveals interesting variations. The cross, carrying its “wound memories”, appears in both images; the hammer, nails and pliers (which removed the nails form Christ’s hands and feet), ladder, circumcision knife, lance, birch rods, Mount of Olives and crown of thorns are all

\textsuperscript{1086} “Lancea latus aperiit voluit ut amota per vulnus / carne hoc cor eius in tus positum aspiceretur” fol.7v16-17.
\textsuperscript{1087} Rudy, “Kissing Images,” 4.
\textsuperscript{1088} P.68-69.
\textsuperscript{1089} From the moment of consecration, transubstantiation made protection of Christ’s body within that host an imperative. Consecrated wafers could be reserved for up to a week for special occasions/visiting the sick, Rubin, 43-46.
\textsuperscript{1090} Binski, Westminster Abbey, 94.
\textsuperscript{1091} Duffy, The Stripping of the Altars, 30.
\textsuperscript{1092} P.134.
\textsuperscript{1093} Rubin, 150; on assimilation through sight, p.133; also, Vlěek Schurr, “Contemplare in plagam.”
highlighted in rubric in the text and appear on both images. On fol.10r, the vinegar cup becomes a sponge, however the seamless robe and the lots are absent presumably as both items were also illustrated on fol.8r *Crucifixion*. Other items from the Passion story, suitable for visualisation purposes, are also included on fol.10r yet not highlighted for discussion in Colda’s text: lanterns, cudgels, swords and torches, the bucket of gall and the hand, labelled *alapa*. These last two are depicted unusually large: might the one, carried by Stephaton who was depicted as a Jew on fol.8r, evoke bitter thoughts and represent a symbol of Jewish guilt? And since it may be argued that a slap is a peculiarly female form of aggression, might the other symbolise the nuns’ sinful, personal insults to Christ?1094

On fol.10r, blood-red dashes mark the Man of Sorrors’ head with the memory of the twisted, rope-like crown of thorns, depicted as a separate item upon which to meditate. These *minium* strokes recall the *sponsus’* headdress on fol.3v, uniting the opening of the Parable with the closing *Andachtsbild*: the noble *sponsus* with the Suffering Servant. The Man of Sorrows’ bare head conforms to eastern *imago pietatis* iconography; the bloody imprint, to western iconography where the crown of thorns is usually depicted. The birch rod and *flagella*,1095 featured on fol.7r, are shown on fol.10r clasped to Christ’s chest. Their function here may be to represent an encapsulation of all the pain inflicted upon him: Christ embracing his suffering. The gesture also recalls the common practice of penitential self-flagellation.1096 Surviving extended periods of self-mortification numbered among the miracles of thirteenth-century female saints.1097 Benedictines were not required to practice this particular penitential act, however they were called upon to fast in moderation;1098 fasting and feeding upon the sacred host were, however, central to the Clarisse way of life.1099 We know from the letters that St. Agnes, Cunegund’s mentor, was over-rigorous in this respect and that St. Clare pleaded with her to stop: “I beseech you, dearest daughter...to show wisdom and good sense and give up that unwise and excessive rigour in fasting which I know you have taken upon yourself, that you may live to praise the Lord…”1100 The fol.10r Man of Sorrows was probably intended solely to inspire strictly spiritual *imitatio*. Significantly, the closing prayer of the first treatise contains references to

---

1094 Reminiscent of the wall painting subject of the *Christ of the Sabbath-breakers*, see E. Clive Rouse, *Discovering Wall Paintings* (Hertfordshire, 1971), 42.
1098 Letter 4, 1253, St. Clare of Assisi, 119.
the important actions of both feasting and contemplation.\textsuperscript{1101} It ends with the ultimate achievement of a place in heaven:

\begin{quote}
Jesus, let us feast our hearts
On your bitter suffering
For we shall never be satiated
Contemplating its source.
Let us serve you faithfully
So that we may earn for ourselves
In place of this transience
The eternity of your heaven.\textsuperscript{1102}
\end{quote}

The ladder dominates the right-hand side of fol.10r. Its rubric title, written between the rungs, quotes the Rule of Benedict, Chapter VII, \textit{De gradibus humilitatis}, “This ladder has twelve rungs of humility.”\textsuperscript{1103} To the left, this title has also been translated into Old Czech in a later, cursive hand.\textsuperscript{1104} The Rule provided the Benedictine sisters of St. George’s Convent with the central tenets of their Order and a pattern for their life; imaging the ladder, therefore, may again intimate Cunegund’s influence. Benedict’s rule on the twelve-step ladder, developed from St. Bernard of Clairvaux’s paradigm,\textsuperscript{1105} dictates that the adherent should descend from Pride and ascend in Humility.\textsuperscript{1106} It will be recalled that Colda highlighted humility as Cunegund’s particular virtue.\textsuperscript{1107}

The column of the Flagellation, pressed close to the inner margin on fol.10r, is represented spattered with blood, as in the fol.3r \textit{Arma Christi}. Cunegund could refer to the Meditations for authentication of this detail: “the Historia says that the column to which He was bound shows traces of His bleeding.”\textsuperscript{1108} (The text of the Meditations also provides evidence of the column’s preservation: “as I know from a brother of ours who saw it.”)\textsuperscript{1109} Beside the column, the artist has placed the Mount of Olives; Christ is present, in contrast to the devotional image on fol.3r. His mantle is of the same scarlet as the cloth binding the hips of Christ, Man of Sorrows, perhaps presaging his inevitable sacrifice. His gaze is fixed on the blessing Manus

\textsuperscript{1101} The final prayer originally would have faced the fol.10r image, see p.22.
\textsuperscript{1102} “Jesu in Dein bittren Leyden / Laß uns unßere Hertzen weyden // Das wür werden nimmer satt / In betrachtung dieser Saat. / Gieb unß Dier getreu zu dinen / das wir unß mögen Verdienen / Stadt dießer Zergänlichkeit / Deine Himmels Ewigkeit.” NKČR MS XVII: E. 12, fols.23r-24r, trans. Toussaint, 196.
\textsuperscript{1103} “Hec scala habeus duodecum gradus humilitatis” fol.10r; St. Benedict of Nursia, in \textit{The Rule}, 24-29.
\textsuperscript{1104} “Tento Rzebrzik má Dwanaçti Stupnium pokory” fol.10r.
\textsuperscript{1107} P.75.
\textsuperscript{1108} Pseudo-Bonaventura, 329.
\textsuperscript{1109} Ibid., 326.
Dei, emerging from Heaven in a flurry of stylised, blue and red clouds. Manus Dei frequently featured at the centre of thirteenth-/fourteenth-century patens, as did Agnus Dei, and the face of Christ, representing Christ’s actual presence in the wafer [fig. 3.34]. The adjacent fol.10r Veronica may be interpreted as a eucharistic symbol, consistent with Cunegund’s Corpus Christi sympathies, rather than as a vernicle per se: a *Vera icona* - true likeness - in the form of the host. This portrait of Christ is not on a cloth but appears as a disembodied face within the complete circle of his halo. His face is symmetrically placed; his stylised, stranded hair over-spills the border; his attenuated features are carefully modelled in light and shade. It compares closely with the Laon Vernicle [fig. 3.35], sent in 1249 by the future Pope Urban IV to his sister, Abbess of the Convent of Montreuil-les-Dames. The Laon image’s cyrillic inscription betrays its Slavonic origins, possibly Serbia, Bulgaria or Russia. Recalling that Otakar II’s rule extended to the Adriatic port of Aquilea, and Cunegund’s personal links with the East, it is not impossible that the fol.10r image was inspired by an eastern icon in Cunegund’s personal possession. The host-like fol.10r Veronica also strongly evokes the overtly eucharistic lines of the so-called “Cunegund’s prayer,” honouring Corpus Christi:

```
Thou dost take the wine and wafer,
Making them thy blood and body.
In the face of bread thou hidest,
All thy godly brightness hidest;
In the Host thou art all present.
```

The Veronica “host” and the adjacent chalice are both proportionally large and centrally placed above and on either side of Christ, implying their important eucharistic connotations. The chalice is highlighted in white and shaded in blue-grey, suggesting silver, and an attempt has been made to illustrate the wine within: brimful. To the right of the chalice, the blood-covered tip of the lance overtly references the side wound as the

---

1112 P.134.
1113 P.93; appendix IIC.
1114 NKČR MS VII.G.17d, fols.146v9–151v7.
1116 Schiller, *Iconography*, 2:193, interprets the enlarged Chalice as the sum of Christ’s agony.
source of the “blood of the covenant”. To the medieval viewer, the chalice would also represent the Holy Grail of Arthurian legend, described by Robert de Boron as the cup from which Jesus drank at the Last Supper and in which Joseph of Arimathea collected the blood from Christ’s side wound at the Crucifixion.

Illustrated beside the wound-measure, discussed above, is another talismanic mensura: a rule labelled, “This sixteenth measure shows the length of Christ”. Despite its obvious inaccuracy (indicating that Christ was approximately 6’10” tall), the very presence of a “measure” was deemed tangible evidence of Christ’s actual existence. Mensura longitudinis corporis was described in an early-twelfth-century catalogue of Passion relics preserved in Hagia Sophia, Constantinople, as “the measure of Christ taken by pious men of Jerusalem”. It was fashioned under Emperor Justinian into a gilded cross which stood at the skeuophylakion entrance, in Hagia Sophia. A thirteenth-century English roll enumerates the talismanic properties afforded to the bearer/ beholder of a fifteenth measure of Christ as: no sudden death, not hurt or slain by any weapon, reasonable wealth and health one’s entire life, never succumbing to one’s enemies, no person or false-witness to ever cause distress, not dying without sacraments, defense against “wykked spirites, tribulacions & dissesis, & from all infirmitees & of sekenes of þe pestilence” and for help in child-birth. The list ends with the assertion, “þis is registird in Rome” suggesting that the nuns in St. George’s Convent might also have been availed of the talismanic benefits attached to their sixteenth measure. Preserved among the relics at Constantinople, according to the early-twelfth-century list, were the crown of thorns, the scourge, the rod and sponge, wood from the Cross, nails, the lance, Christ’s blood: all Passion items presented on fols.3r and 10r, and which might function as proxy relics allowing a confined nun to perform a virtual pilgrimage to Constantinople, perhaps through contemplation, and even to receive the attendant indulgences.

---

1118 Hopkins, 119.
1119 P.137.
1120 “Haec linea sedecies ducta longitudinam demonstrat Christi” fol.10r. This, and Christ’s speech banner, also has a later, faint, Old Czech translation running beside it.
1121 Quoted by Belting, Likeness and Presence, 527.
1122 Trans. - sacristy/treasury.
1125 These items were held within the palace chapel, Belting, Likeness and Presence, 527.
1126 P.140.
1127 Pp.149-150.
An unlabelled,1128 pleated cloth is placed on Christ’s left on fol 10r. Rywiková identified this as “either in reference to the Virgin Mary’s veil or the actual shroud.”1129 She also suggests it could represent Veronica’s cloth, separated from its image, representing Christ’s physicality and, as textile, is also equatable with the curtain of the temple.1130 Another possible suggestion might be that it represents the cloth with which Christ wiped the feet of the apostles which was also preserved as a relic in Constantinople and which, according to a list drawn up c.1220 by Nicholas Mesarite (d. c.1220), remained miraculously damp.1131 It seems more feasible, however, for this blood-spattered cloth to represent the blindfold which is frequently illustrated among the Instruments of the Passion, and which is depicted in the mocking of Christ on fol.6v.1132 The narrow folds into which the cloth is pleated in the fol.10r image would seem to support this.

Turning the page, the reader is faced with the first image of the second treatise. The large, devotional image, Grieving Virgin, sets the tone for the Virgin’s Lament even before a word is read. Head bowed in grief, she appears to wipe away tears with the back of her limp, left hand, sweeping her gathered veil past her cheek. The iconography is recognisably that of the Virgin at the Crucifixion: her pose mirrors St. John’s on fol.8r. Her isolation, like that of the Man of Sorrows, makes her sorrow the more poignant. Her cote, or tunic, is the traditional blue but this is dominated by swathes of scarlet cloth, recalling Christ’s bloody sacrifice, subtly modulated in light and shade with highlights created by absence of paint in the artist’s accustomed manner. These colours are echoed in the blue initial ‘E’, decorated with red filigree scrolls, cells and tendrils.1133 The rubric makes the introduction: “You see Mary bitterly weeping and bitterly sorrowful.”1134 The Passional artist employs monumental figures to illustrate key, emotional moments: the Grieving Virgin (fol.11r), and the preceeding full-page image, the Man of Sorrows (fol.10r), are both grief-stricken [fig. 3.36]. I consider their juxtaposition, one after the other, to be a conscious recollection of those two-sided processional boards bearing images known as akra tapeinosis (utmost humiliation) - Christ depicted as imago pietatis (image of pity - Man of Sorrows) on one panel face, and the Virgin as mater dolorosa (the lamenting mother) on the other1135 - which were used during Good Friday devotions in the Byzantine

1128 Presumably Beneš’s scribal omission.
1130 Ibid.
1131 Belting, Likeness and Presence, 526.
1132 Mark 14.65; Luke 22.63-64.
1133 P.23.
1134 “Intuemini mariam amare flentem et amare dolentem” rubric title, fol.11r.
Church, and which have been pointed out as being among the easiest, church furnishings to export following the fall of Constantinople. Belting cites the twelfth-century icon from Kastoria as the earliest surviving example [fig. 3.37]. This twinning was frequently repeated as in the later Bohemian Karlsruhe Diptych [fig. 3.38].

Five, unillustrated pages follow the minor Andachtsbild of the Grieving Virgin (fol.11r). The Marian-themed illustrations of the second treatise further strengthen the argument for Cunegund’s editorial control, as will become clear. They continue on fol.14r with two scenes involving the three Maries: Three Maries visiting the Tomb and Three Maries greeting Christ. These, and the two scenes over-leaf, illustrate and amplify Cunegund’s affiliations to the Virgin and Mary Magdalene, and reinforce the female-orientation of this Passional lament’s narrative and images. Markings in the margin on fol.13r, in an apparently different hand, indicate a division of the text: “The reading finishes for Good Friday”, followed by, “The reading starts for the Easter vigil”. Stejskal suggested a relationship between these images and the convent ludi paschalis. Dramatic, Easter-tide interludes, combining words and actions, emerged from a tenth-century tradition, exemplified by six, small works composed by Hroswitha (935-1002), a nun from Gandersheim Convent, Saxony; these interludes were chanted as tropes accompanying the liturgy. Known Europe-wide, they included the antiphon “Quem queritis”. Both the St. George’s Convent manuscripts, contain “Quem queritis” plays in which an angel says, “come and see the place”. The plays’ rubric instructions tell Mary Magdalene to lean in and inspect the sepulchre as pictured in the upper fol.14r image of the Three Maries visiting the Tomb. The iconography employed by the artist is

---

1136 P. 133-134.
1139 Urbáňková, 16, suggests Beneš forgot the division and added it later.
1140 “Explicit collatio in parvabus” fol.13r21.
1141 “Incipit collatio in vigilia pasche” fol.13r23. (Eighteen lines lower another spidery cursive margin-note marks an alternative starting point. “Incipias hic” – “you start here,” fol.13v16.)
1142 Stejskal, Pasionál, 27.
1144 Ibid., 20.
1145 Trans. - whom do you seek? See also Jarmila F. Veltruský, A Sacred Farce from Medieval Bohemia. (Michigan, 1985), 46.
1146 Ibid. P.111.
1147 “Venite et vidite locum.” NKČR MS XII.E.15a, fol.7v; NKČR MS VII.G.16, fol.96v. On fol.96r of MS VII.G.16, the three Maries approach an ointment seller; this theme was later developed into the bawdy mid-fourteenth-century Passion Play Mástičkár - “Ointment Seller”, see Havránek and Hrabík, eds. Výbor, 247-261; also, Alfred Thomas, Reading Women in Late Medieval Europe - Anne of Bohemia and Chaucer’s Female Audience (New York, 2015), 55-61.
conventional,\textsuperscript{1148} yet may be linked with these reenactments of the Easter story that allowed the nuns to experience Christ’s death and resurrection as a lived encounter.

The lower image on fol.14r of the Three Maries greeting Christ, on the other hand, is most unusual, although borrowing from the iconographic model of noli me tangere, as on fol.7v.\textsuperscript{1149} There is a cinematographic quality to this scene, conveying an intense sense of urgency, as the three women tumble forward in a cascade in their eagerness to kiss Christ’s feet.\textsuperscript{1150} This complements a brisk account of the events around the Resurrection given from a female perspective that, appropriately enough, from fol.13v onwards refers repeatedly to running.\textsuperscript{1151} The fol.14r image illustrates Matthew’s account: “He [Christ] gave them his greeting, and they [the women] came up and clasped his feet, falling prostrate before him.”\textsuperscript{1152} The artist vividly captures the women’s unfulfilled desire to have physical contact with Christ. There is the charged anticipation of touch, perhaps acknowledging the Magdalene story’s inherent taboo recalled in the image of the supplicant nun on fol.7v: a much-debated topic in the medieval church.\textsuperscript{1153} The ability to touch Christ is, nevertheless, blatantly expressed in the text accompanying the, once again, “theatrical” image of Mary Magdalene reporting to the Virgin on fol.14v. It reads, “we saw with our eyes, we touched his feet with our hands.”\textsuperscript{1155} It seems that Cunegund would not disallow the possibility of physical contact with Christ. The intimate and “touchable” Passional Andachtsbilder recall how the Abbess/Cunegund “affectionately kisses” and handles the cloths representing Christ’s burial linens in the MS VII.G.16 Easter play.\textsuperscript{1156}

Both illustrations on fol.14v are iconographically unique but recall, in a now familiar manner, accounts found in the Meditations.\textsuperscript{1157} The upper image illustrates Peter joining

\textsuperscript{1148} P. 192.
\textsuperscript{1149} Pp.120-121.
\textsuperscript{1150} The women are named, Mark 16:1. Here, in rubrics: “Mary, mother of James the Lesser “brother” of the Lord, the James who is the son of Alpheus”- “Mater / Maria Jacobi / minoris fratri domini qui jacobus est filius / alpha”,”Mary Salome who is the daughter of Salome and mother of James and John the evangelists”- “Maria Salome id est / filia Salome et mater / Jacobi et Johannis evangelistae.” Mary Magdalene is given no qualification.
\textsuperscript{1151} Eight references to running, fol.13v3 and 5; fol.14r5,6,9 and 14; fol.14v8 and 15r10; and two that they came swiftly, fol.14r16-17 and 14v26.
\textsuperscript{1152} P. 121.
\textsuperscript{1153} See Susan Haskins, Mary Magdalen: Myth and Metaphor (London, 2005), 19 and179.
\textsuperscript{1155} “oculis ipsius / nostris conspeximus manibus pedes eius conti/ginus…” fol.14v22-24.
\textsuperscript{1156} P.86; NKCR MS VII.G.16, fol.101v.
\textsuperscript{1157} It should be remembered that Colda is not credited with having composed the lament and therefore is unlikely to have exerted control over the illustrations.
the Virgin and her companions who are grieving with John in a closed room.\textsuperscript{1158} In the Meditations’ account, the disciples talk about Christ, and Mary Magdalene listens attentively; in the fol.14v illustration, the Maries are the protagonists, imparting their news secretly to the Virgin while the men are consigned to mere eavesdropping. This boldly places the females centre stage and recalls the feminine strength illustrated and in the rubrics of the fol.4v \textit{Creation of Eve}.\textsuperscript{1159} On fol.14v, the rubric title describes this intimate, female exchange which is illustrated by the artist: “Mary Magdalene addresses the mother of Lord Jesus Christ / Peter and John over-hear.”\textsuperscript{1160} The image is once again full of movement as the disciples lean in to listen, and the Maries scurry to make their report. Mary Magdalene bends to confide and whisper into the Virgin’s ear reworking the dynamic pose of the previous image of the \textit{Three Maries greeting Christ}. The artist captures the urgency, excitement and intimate secrecy of the moment, creating his own iconography for this unique composition.

The lower fol.14v image prefigures the fol.16v \textit{Christ embracing his Mother},\textsuperscript{1161} once again illustrating an apocryphal account, recorded in the Meditations,\textsuperscript{1162} of Christ making his first post-resurrection appearance to Mary his Mother. The fol.16v image adheres to the text of the Meditations by presenting the pair alone with one another,\textsuperscript{1163} whereas here, on fol.14v, the moment is shared with angels and women. Men are excluded. In this image the attendant women are not identified as the Maries therefore these anonymous female witnesses offer the viewer the opportunity to project themselves into this tender scene of revelation. This previously-undiscussed illustration is full of pathos: the demeanor of the attendant angels and the Maries expresses the empathetic feelings that Franciscans were constantly encouraged to nurture. Christ and Mary wrap arms around one another’s shoulders in an intimate image of grief, expressed in the turned-down mouth of the supporting angel whose hand rests comfortably on Christ’s arm. Mary bends her head, resting her cheek on Christ’s right hand,\textsuperscript{1164} poised to kiss his wound. In contrast, echoing the words of Colda’s text,\textsuperscript{1165} the tone of the rubric caption is optimistic. Once again it is in the form of a dialogue: “The angels say to the blessed Virgin, ‘See, the triumphant Lord comes with joy to you, his mother; rejoice, Queen of Heaven, at meeting the Lord, your

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1158} Pseudo-Bonaventura, 348.
  \item \textsuperscript{1159} P.110.
  \item \textsuperscript{1160} “Maria Magdalena matrem domini Jhesi alloquitur / Petrus cum Johanne auscultate” rubric title, fol.14v. Pp.151-157.
  \item \textsuperscript{1161} Pseudo-Bonaventura, 359.
  \item \textsuperscript{1162} Ibid., 359.
  \item \textsuperscript{1163} Ibid., 359.
  \item \textsuperscript{1164} The significance of this pose is explored below, p.203.
  \item \textsuperscript{1165} “Behold, the Son, the triumphant, comes to you, rejoice”. “Ecce, venit / ad te triumphans filius Gaude,” fol.15r2-4.
\end{itemize}
Son.’ Mary to Jesus, ‘Give renewed thanks and praise to the world on your behalf.’”¹¹⁶⁶ This apparition is marked out for special attention in the Passional text by the first, and most carefully executed,¹¹⁶⁷ feather-like *manicula*, placed in the inner margin at the foot of fol.14r [fig. 3.39]. The text it points to reads, “he first appeared resurrected to his sweetest mother as she suffered many times more than the others.”¹¹⁶⁸

The images on fol.15r continue the story of the Resurrection, illustrating John’s gospel account,¹¹⁶⁹ commencing with John and Peter’s scrutiny of the linens in the empty tomb (labelled in rubric).¹¹⁷⁰ John is shown having out-striped Peter, as in the gospel, and the energy of the earlier lament illustrations is resumed. This scene was dramatised in both of the convent Easter plays referred to above.¹¹⁷¹ The artist then moves on to illustrate the story of the *Road to Emmaus*, told by Luke and briefly referred to by Mark. This unfolds in the lower two scenes on fol.15r.¹¹⁷² The first illustration shows a lively Cleopas, and unusually Luke,¹¹⁷³ meeting Christ upon the road; the second pictures Christ breaking bread at the subsequent, shared meal. In both images, as the rubric caption of the first image states, Christ is “in the guise of a pilgrim.”¹¹⁷⁴ He is depicted by the artist wearing a typical, medieval, pilgrim outfit, complete with broad-brimmed hat, boots - like those of the shepherd in the *Nativity* (fol.5v) - and a staff known as a *bourdon*, a large pouch or *scrip*,¹¹⁷⁵ and a cape. His are the short tunic and leggings of the medieval working-man.¹¹⁷⁶ The anachronism of Christ’s contemporary dress, displaying St. James’ cockle-shell emblem,¹¹⁷⁷ would not have disturbed the medieval viewer with their more malleable

¹¹⁶⁶ “Angeli dicunt ad beatam virginem Ecce venit ad te / matrem suam triumphator dominus gaude et / laetare regina caeli occurens deo filio tuuo; / maria ad ihesum / Gaudia da gratia p / te mundo reparata,” rubric title, fol.14v.

¹¹⁶⁷ In the Passional, there are four leaf-like, stylised pointing hands, *maniculae*, which have not previously attracted the attention of commentators: fol.14r; fol.29r, tucked into the spine at the foot of the text; fol.30v, at the foot of the text; fol.34v, mid-way down the text. Fol.30v’s example enigmatically points away from the text, into the spine. Since all the examples point to the right, I suggest that their author was dominantly right-handed and therefore unable fluently to execute the *maniculae* with the finger pointing to the left.


¹¹⁷⁰ Pp.42-43.

¹¹⁷¹ “Currebant duo simul et ille / allius discipulus precucurrit cicius pe/tro et venit prior admonumentum” NKČR MS XII.E.15a, fol.74r; “Currebant /duo simul et ille alius discipulus / precucurrit cicius petro et venit // prior ad monumentum” NKČR VII.G.16, fol.100v.


¹¹⁷³ Cleopas is named in Luke’s account but not the other traveller; the rubrics on fol.15r supply the name “Lucas” suggesting that Luke himself was present.

¹¹⁷⁴ “Ihesus in specie peregrine...” rubric title, fol.15r.

¹¹⁷⁵ Rosewell, 68.


¹¹⁷⁷ St. James the Great was martyred, Jerusalem, 44 AD and his pilgrimage emblem was instated after his body’s translation to Compostela, *St. James the Great*. http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08279b.htm - ed. Kevin Knight - viewed from 29.11.2015.
understanding and expression of time.\textsuperscript{1178} Of particular note in this representation is the smudging over Christ’s face.\textsuperscript{1179} I have suggested that the Passional illustrations may have been used by the nuns in the performance of virtual pilgrimages: a penitential form of devotion originating in convents.\textsuperscript{1180} Known as “pilgrimages in the spirit,”\textsuperscript{1181} they were intimately linked with Passion piety.\textsuperscript{1182} Perhaps this image of Christ, as a fellow pilgrim and chaperone, was touched to mark the beginning and end of such an exercise. Turning back to the first treatise, a nun might perform such a pilgrimage through contemplation of Christ’s Passion in a mental progression, not unlike the Stations of the Cross, towards the culminating image on fol.10r. It has been noted that many of the Passion relics, described and catalogued as being preserved in Constantinople, were laid before them on this page.\textsuperscript{1183} The final fol.15r illustration, \textit{Supper at Emmaus}, is iconographically unoriginal although Christ is shown once again wearing his medieval, pilgrim’s hat. The knife, laid upon the table, may also reference the circumcision. The eucharistic symbolism is overt as Christ is illustrated breaking bread: the table becomes the altar. It is quite bare although directly before Christ is a single bowl piled full of food: might the artist be referencing the acute famine of 1312, two years before the execution of this image, and their survival by God’s grace?\textsuperscript{1184}

Fol.15v illustrates three miraculous, revelatory appearances of Christ to his apostles. \textit{Christ appearing to his Disciples}, the \textit{Incredulity of St. Thomas} and the \textit{Miracle on the Sea of Tiberias}, are illustrated in sequence as they occur in John’s gospel.\textsuperscript{1185} In the top illustration, a centrally placed, fully-clothed Christ directly faces the viewer and exhibits his wounds in an open-handed gesture often associated with the Man of Sorrows.\textsuperscript{1186} This, coupled with the words of the rubric title, creates an intensely eucharistic image: “Jesus, standing in the middle of eleven of his disciples, shows his hands and feet, the wounds through which we obtain good things because we drink.”\textsuperscript{1187} It embraces the concept of drinking directly from Christ’s wounds, mentioned above.\textsuperscript{1188} Christ wears mantle and

\textsuperscript{1178} Pp.74-75.
\textsuperscript{1179} See also pp.84-85; Toussaint, 13, notes this but offers no explanation.
\textsuperscript{1181} Ibid., 73.
\textsuperscript{1182} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1183} P.144.
\textsuperscript{1184} P.53.
\textsuperscript{1185} John 20.18-24; 24-29; 21.1-14, \textit{N.E.B.}, 187-188.
\textsuperscript{1186} Particularly, in later images of Mass of St. Gregory, p.135.
\textsuperscript{1187} “Ihesus stans in medio XI discipulorum suorum ostendit / eis manus et pedes vulnera per qua nobis bona quia proprinam” rubric title, fol.15v.
\textsuperscript{1188} P.138.
tunic and, as on fol.7v, this is ripped open to reveal Christ’s side wound. On this occasion, however, Christ displays his wound directly to the reader of the Passional. The importance of touch, mentioned above, is intensified in the second scene on fol.15v as the artist depicts Thomas thrusting his fingers deep into Christ’s wound, as if prising it open. The disciple appears to measure the wound by the spread of his fingers, dipped enthusiastically into Christ’s side. This recalls the wound-measure on the fol.10r Andachtsbild. (Thomas’ gesture is mirrored above in Christ’s blessing.) Christ’s unambiguous order tumbles in rubric between them: “Put your finger in.” St. John’s account is equally explicit: “reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side.” Christ offered Thomas reassurance and confirmation through this tactile act; presumably the nuns sought the same in touching the fol.10r magnified wound image. The last of the three miracles, that on the Sea of Tiberias, is uncommonly represented. Iconographically noteworthy is the companionable detail of the burning grate, illustrating the gospel text: “they saw a charcoal fire there, with fish laid on it...Jesus said, ‘Come and have breakfast’.” The image’s accompanying rubric title, rather than highlighting the miracle of the catch, also refers to this intimate detail of the story: “Jesus invites the fishermen to a meal.” Not only does the sharing of food invoke Holy Communion, it also presents Christ as the provider, recalling the filled bowl on the previous page’s image of Supper at Emmaus. Again, the image might have been seen to provide talismanic protection, remembering the 1312 famine. The opposing page (fol.16r) carries a rhetorical narrative that preludes the account of Christ and Mary’s first encounter: it is therefore unillustrated. This also avoids the possibility of leached colour interfering with the principal painting of Christ and Mary embracing, illustrated on the verso.

The fol.16v image of Christ embracing his Mother is deeply significant and iconographically complex as well as being one of the most emotive and skilfully executed images in the Passional. There can be little doubt that this half-page image, depicting that apocryphal, first encounter between Christ and his mother, would have functioned as an Andachtsbild. It is anticipated, as mentioned above, by the small scene at the foot of

---

1190 “Infer digitum tuum” rubric title, fol.15v.
1191 John 20.27, Holy Bible, 122.
1192 P.195.
1193 John, 24:9-12, N.E.B., 188.
1194 “Jesus piscantes invitat ad prandium” rubric title, fol.15v.
1195 On the significance of feeding in medieval nuns’ piety see Bynum, Holy Feast.
1196 Pp.53 and 150.
1197 P.23.
Five pages earlier, the text of the lament revealed to its audience: “Hidden here is a secret mystery of which you are ignorant, and which not even the pen of the evangelists, which is in all respects sacred, is able to explain.” Christ appearing first to his mother would be no “secret mystery” to Cunegund who, as a former Clarisse, would be familiar with the scenario which is presented in the Franciscan Meditations. Was Cunegund sharing this story with her Benedictine sisters who might well be “ignorant”?

To understand the fol.16v image of Christ embracing his Mother, it is necessary to appreciate how profoundly the concept of Brautmystik, which shaped the lives of all medieval nuns, was built around the the framework of the Song of Songs. The romance, lyricism and eroticism of the Song of Songs appealed to a female readership, and within its mysterious and exotic verses nuns sought the means to develop behaviours and rituals that might enhance their bride/bridegroom relationship with Christ. Its extravagant metaphors and similes chimed with the medieval obsession with allegory, allowing scope to search for “truths”. The nuns’ response to Christ was intensely felt, and often melodramatic, emulating the passionate, reciprocal love referred to in the Song of Songs. This is quoted freely by St. Clare in her correspondence which, as has been noted, must have shaped Cunegund’s piety.

In the last surviving letter to St. Agnes we read:

...may your heart be inflamed more and more with the fervour of this love! And as you go on to contemplate his ineffable delights, the riches and eternal honours he offers, and as you sigh for them in the boundless desire and love of your heart, cry out: ‘Draw me after you, and we will run after the fragrance of your perfumes, heavenly spouse! I shall run and never weary, until you bring me into the banqueting hall until your left hand cradles my head and your right hand embraces me in happiness, and you kiss me with the most happy kiss of your lips!’

In “marriage”, the bride-nuns sought a complete, spiritual union with Christ the bridegroom through prayer, meditation and, occasionally, visionary experiences. They

---

1198 P. 148.
1200 Pseudo-Bonaventura, 359.
1201 Narrated in the first person singular, this has implications for the argument for Cunegund having written the lament.
1202 P.71-72.
1203 Letter 4, 1253, St. Clare of Assisi, 122; see p.156.
1204 See for example, Jeffrey F. Hamburger and Susan Marti eds., Crown and Veil: Female Monasticism from the Fifth to the Fifteenth Centuries (New York: Columbia, 2008); Caroline Walker Bynum, Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages (Berkley, 1982); idem, Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women (Berkley, 1988); idem, Wonderful Blood: Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond (Philadelphia, 2007); Rosalynn Voaden, God’s Words, Women’s Voices - The Discernment of Spirits in the Writings of Late Medieval Women Visionaries (York, 1999); Jessica Barr, Willing to know God - Dreamers and Visionaries in the Later Middle Ages. (Columbus, 2010); see also p.128.
could feel included in the Song of Song’s female audience, addressed throughout in a repetitive refrain as the “daughters of Jerusalem.” Stejskal noted that, on fol.30r, Colda drew a direct parallel between the bride of the Song of Songs and Cunegund. Colda paraphrases a quote from the biblical love-poem, “How beautiful are thy feet with shoes, O prince’s daughter!” with the words, “O prince’s daughter, how beautiful are your footsteps in sandals”. The biblical bride, with her attendant queens, is also a princess and therefore enjoys the same status as Cunegund. Recall Cunegund’s fol.1v title: “…daughter of his majesty.”

Origen (184/185-253/254) interpreted the Song of Songs as the expression of the soul’s love for Christ as a bride’s love for her bridegroom (the premise of Colda’s parable). This interpretation was developed over centuries by theologians, but it is through St. Jerome’s famous Letter 22, that the ancient love-poem gained its place at the heart of Brautmystik. Drawing heavily on the Song of Songs, he wrote:

Ever let the privacy of your chamber guard you; ever let the Bridegroom sport with you within. Do you pray? You speak to the Bridegroom. Do you read? He speaks to you. When sleep overtakes you He will come behind and put His hand through the hole of the door, and your heart shall be moved for Him; and you will awake and rise up and say: ‘I am sick of love.’ Then He will reply: ‘A garden enclosed is my sister, my spouse; a spring shut up, a fountain sealed.’

The importance of the biblical text was promoted by St. Bernard of Clairvaux, whose writings are included in the volume given to the convent by Cunegund in the 1303. Cistercians, in the thirteenth century, adopted his influential third sermon on Song of Songs 1:2 which was then universally embraced. Cunegund’s codex, donated in 1312, the year of the completion of the Passional’s first section, includes a Soliloquy by the renown, Parisian academic, Hugh de St Victor (1096-February 11, 1141), who was St. Bernard of Clairvaux’s contemporary, as well as dialogues between the Bridegroom and

1205 Song of Songs 1.5; 2.7; 3.5; 3.11; 5.8; 5.16; 8.4.
1206 Stejskal, Pasionál, 35.
1207 Song of Songs 7.1, Holy Bible, 646.
1208 “o filia principe quia pulchri sunt / gressus tui in calceamentis” fol.30r28-29.
1209 Ibid., 6:8-9.
1210 P.7; “regis domini… filia” rubric title, fol.1v; Colda also refers to her as this, fol.2ra4-6.
1211 P.96.
1212 Barr, Willing to know God, 70.
1213 St. Jerome, Letter 22, section 25; reference to Song of Songs 3.1;4.12; 5.8; 5.4.
1214 St. Jerome, Letter 22, section 25; reference to Song of Songs 3.1;4.12; 5.8; 5.4.
1215 Barr, Willing to know God, 70.
1216 NKČR MS XIII.E.14c; trans. – groomsman.
1217 Barr, Willing to know God, 70.
1218 Mater, 123.
1219 Ibid., 133.
Soul, and the Bridegroom and Paranymp.1220 Pseudo Cassiodorus’ “Exposition of the Song of Songs” also appears in the medieval, convent library in a volume, dated 1300-1330.1221 In Matthew’s gospel, Jesus infers that he is sponsus: “Jesus replied, ‘…The time will come when the bridegroom will be taken from them.’”1222 Bridegroom and Bride provide a metaphor for the loving relationship between Christ and the Human Soul (anima) / the Virgin Mary (Maria) / the Church (ecclesia) – this last, a New Testament analogy introduced by St. Paul.1223 The metaphor may be extended to Christ and nun. Matter points out that anima and ecclesia are both feminine nouns and therefore comfortably join the Virgin Mary, and of course nun, in offering themselves for interpretation as the female voice in the Song of Songs.1224

With the Song of Songs as the cornerstone of Brautmystik, it is unsurprising to find echoes in the Passional’s fol.16v image of Christ embracing his Mother. The rubric title above reads, “Jesus greets his mother with a kiss of peace and says…”1225 and Christ’s words are then expressed in a line of leonine hexameter that reads, “Hail, Virgin Mary, my honey-sweet flower”;1226 a greeting more redolent of a lover’s than a son’s. The bride in the Song of Songs is described as having lips like honeycomb, with honey and milk under her tongue.1227 The lament’s text echoes this, describing the Virgin’s words as “honeyed”.1228 This recalls a similar epithet in rubric above the Annunciation (fol.5v), “Trust in us, O gentle, sweet and honeyed one.”1229 (Visionary thirteenth-century literature also often described blood from Christ’s wounds as honey:1230 sweet and nourishing, a delicacy and a covert pleasure.) The reference to Mary as a “flower” also echoes the female voice of the Song of Songs who describes herself as a rose and a lily.1231 The artist portrays Christ and Mary appearing to whisper the intimate dialogue which is recorded in the accompanying text (fols.16r24-16v27). The depiction of a confidential, murmured conversation here, as on fol.14v when Mary Magdalene whispers into the Virgin’s ear, conveys the author of the lament’s previously noted, conspiratorial tone (“Hidden here is a secret mystery…”1232)

1220 NKČR MS XIV.E.10, fols.157r-175v.
1221 Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, Florilegium, MS XII.D.13, fol.147r-251v.
1222 Matt. 9.15, N.E.B., 16.
1223 2 Corinthians, 11.2-4 and Ephesians 5.25-29, see Cooper, “Bride of Christ,” 530.
1224 Matter, 135.
1225 “Ihesus salut matrem suam osculo pacis dicens” first line of rubric title, fol.16r.
1226 “Salve mellita mea floscula virgo maria” second line of rubric title, fol.16r.
1227 Song of Songs 4.11.
1228 “illa verba / melliflua” fol.16r18-19.
1229 “Nobis o clemens o dulcis et melita crede” first line of rubric title above Annunciation, fol.5v.
1230 Bynum, “Patterns of Female Piety,” 181.
1231 Song of Songs 2.1.
1232 P.151; “Latet hic secretum misterium…” fol.14r23.
when presenting the intelligence that the Virgin Mary was the first witness to the Resurrection. Christ addresses his mother in the affected and affectionate language of the Song of Songs: his final words - “arise, my beloved, my dove, my beautiful-one, my chosen-one,” consciously emulate phrases from the Song of Songs, such as, “Rise up, my love, my fair one…O my dove.”

The kiss, referred to in the rubric title, and illustrated by the artist, would conjure the second sentence of the Song of Songs which reads: “Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth: for thy love is better than wine.” Honorius Augustodunensis (1080-1154), known as Honorius of Autun, author of a widely circulated, *Expositio in Cantica Canticorum* which predated St. Bernard of Clairvaux’s by several decades, suggested that Mary gave and received her son’s kisses with “rapture”. St. Bernard’s third sermon, entitled, “The Kiss of the Lord’s Feet, Hands and Mouth”, comments similarly that “anyone who has received this mystical kiss from the mouth of Christ at least once, seeks again that intimate experience, and eagerly looks for its frequent renewal.” The nuns of St. George’s Convent might, like St. Bernard, long to joyfully receive Christ’s kiss. In the fol.16r image, the artist captures the intense experience of a lover bestowing a kiss upon his bride, and suspends the act in that anticipatory moment before the lips meet. This is a repetition of the highly-charged, “almost touching” depicted in the illustration of the *Supplicant Nun before Christ* (fol.7v), and the *Three Maries greeting Christ* (fol.14r), and even the illustration of the Virgin about to kiss Christ’s hand-wound (fol.14v). Any ambiguity suggested by this illustration would not unsettle the medieval observer, familiar with the notion of the Virgin Mary as simultaneously Mother and Bride of Christ. With true medieval mutability of *personae*, “bride” can encompass any recipient of Christ’s love. The fol.16r image perfectly illustrates the words of St. Clare, quoted above: “you kiss me with the most happy kiss of your lips.” The image of *Christ embracing his Mother* is explicitly sensual. According to Bynum, Gertrude of Helfta provided her fellow nuns
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1234 “Tu autem surge dilecta mea colomba mea speciosa mea electa…” fol.16v24-25.
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1238 Matter, 156.
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1242 Matter, 15.
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with, “an articulation of an encounter with Jesus and his mother that seems located in the very flesh of the adherent”. The Passional artist has achieved just this. The prominent display of the *stigmata* establishes this as a post-resurrection event, therefore one in which a nun might herself partake; gazing upon the illustration as into a mirror; identifying with Mary and projecting themselves into the image; anticipating Christ’s kiss for themselves.

In the Song of Songs, the kiss - “Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth…” - and the embrace - “His left hand is under my head and his right hand doth embrace me,” - are separated by twenty-one verses. The fol.16v *Christ embracing his Mother* perfectly illustrates these words only transposing left and right to create a mirror-image. St. Clare, in her final letter to St. Agnes, overtly references the above phrase from the Song of Songs as she writes, “I shall run and never weary…until your left hand cradles my head and your right hand embraces me in happiness.” This letter, together with the Meditations which also describes this intimate embrace, must be included among the influences on the iconography of this image, presumably informed by Cunegund. The Meditations describes the secret meeting as follows: ‘Her son said, ‘My sweetest mother, it is I. I have risen and am with you.’ Then, rising, she embraced Him with tears of joy and, placing her cheek to His, drew Him close, resting wholly against Him; and He supported her willingly.” (It will be recalled that the *manicula* on fol.14r highlights Christ addressing Mary as, “sweetest mother”.) On fol.16v the artist represents Mary clearly leaning in towards Christ, cheek-to-cheek, and almost wrapping herself around her son. The artist captures a sense of security, coupled with urgency and joyful expectation, as Mary passionately seeks Christ’s physical support, face uplifted towards him; he, in return, tenderly cups her cheek in his right hand and draws her to him with his encompassing left arm.

In this image, the artist depicts the Virgin and Christ pressing their cheeks together in an expression of mutual love, employing iconography normally used in imaging the Madonna
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and child: a pose known in Byzantine art as *Eleousa*, which was extensively adopted in medieval art in both the East and West [fig. 3.40]. Belting observed that this mother/child iconography fulfilled the role of *prolepsis*, anticipating the Virgin’s future loss: the Passional artist underscores this in his tender rendition on fol.16v [fig. 3.41]. 

*Eleousa* expresses Mary’s intuitive, maternal fear and protectiveness; in *Christ embracing his Mother*, this is inverted and Christ becomes the calm protector and the Virgin the one reaching up, child-like, seeking an affectionate, reassuring hug. Mary and Christ gaze intently into one another’s eyes as if desperate to hold the moment, aware of impending separation. It is at once an ecstatic reunion, and a tragic farewell. All nuns would be aware of St. Jerome’s instructions that women devoting themselves to Christ should, “cling to the bridegroom in a close embrace.” Colda repeats this in his closing words at the end of the first treatise (preserved in German translation): “therefore send us the only begotten son of the Virgin so that we may at all times reverently remember his bitter suffering, let us for eternity never be separated from his sweetest embrace, which may God work in us, who with the Father and the Holy Spirit lives and reigns in all eternity. Amen.”

In the devotional prayers that followed (preserved in German translation), that embrace is turned around yet again:

I embrace you Son of God,  
have mercy upon me,  
you have suffered so much  
because of the burden of my sins…

The supplicant author - I suggest Cunegund - offers her own comforting embrace to Christ, in recognition of the suffering her sins inflicted upon him. *Christ embracing his Mother*, is an *Andachtsbild* offering comfort, consolation and completion: the aspiration of every nun to “embrace” and to be embraced by Christ. It is one of the Passional’s great artistic achievements.

It has passed unremarked that Mary’s pose in the illustration of *Christ embracing his Mother*, on fol.16v, is replicated and reversed in the much smaller image of the *Dormition*
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at the foot of the opposite page (fol.17r) [fig. 3.41]. (The Dormition appears beneath the iconographically unadventurous images of the Ascension and Pentecost on fol.17r.)

Here, Christ holds the child-soul of his mother to his cheek in another reinvention of Eleousa, imparting a sensitive, affectionate embrace, in death as in life. Mary’s soul, in a gesture exactly mirroring the fol.16v image, reaches eagerly to place an arm about Christ’s neck as he enfolds the little figure with his robe. Son becomes father-figure; Mother becomes child-like. Another previously unreported detail is the miniscule, rubric fleuron crown, gilded and outlined in rubric, worn by the little “soul-child”. The viewer is shown the Virgin, sponsa, ready-crowned at her death, and in the arms of Christ, sponsus: perhaps an intimate rehearsal of the fulfilment of Christ’s promise, and Cunegund’s own ardently-desired soteriological climax?

The Lament of the Virgin closes at the foot of fol.17r with an intercessionary prayer which reinforces the feminine nature of the text by calling upon Mary: “Now, therefore, most beneficent mother…” Cunegund, herself a mother of three, and irrevocably separated from two of her children, was in a particularly suitable position to empathise with Mary the “beneficent mother” who had lost her son. The intercessionary petition leads the reader over the page to the lament’s closing images on fol.17v, one of which represents Mary’s celestial coronation. This, and its companion Christ embracing Joseph of Arimathea, together with the opening illustration of the third treatise on fol.18r, make a powerful, double spread where the artist shows off his excellent draughtsmanship, framing his subjects in adroitly-executed architecture. On fol.17v, the artist depicts a solid, raised and canopied dais, the tomb-like lower portion of which houses an image of King David playing his harp beneath an arch, as if on a balcony or at a window; above, Christ and Mary are seated on a throne similar to that on fol.1v but roofed-over by two, confidently-drawn, gothic gables with tall, intervening pinnacles. In the adjacent scene, Joseph emerges from a stylised representation of a fortified tower, shaded in red, the blocks of stone neatly delineated with double lines. Complementing these on the opposing page, the artist balances the solid, many-bayed tower on the outer margin - topped with an ogival arch and housing music-making angels - with an architectural fantasy which meanders into space with the same weightlessness as the winged soul which it shelters.  
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The fol.17v illustrations of the *Coronation of the Virgin* and *Christ embracing Joseph of Arimathea* are full of those cultural codes referred to by Alexander,\textsuperscript{1262} and those of personal significance to Cunegund. King David’s presence here has been noted as carrying a convincing message of *sacra stirps* with implications for the Premyslide dynasty’s continuity.\textsuperscript{1263} He appears as a medieval, crowned monarch, in secular dress, as on fol.9r, the cape of his miniver-lined *houce* flicked back over his right shoulder allowing freedom to play the harp, displaying his fashionably-wide sleeves buttoned in at the wrist, like those of Beneš on fol.1v:\textsuperscript{1264} clearly as convenient for harp-playing as for scribal activities. Of all the examples of the *Coronation of the Virgin* in the Passional (fols.1v, 3v, 9r, 17r, 17v, 20r and 20v), this is the most arresting, and its prominent position at the close of the lament (the second treatise) reinforces the persistent theme of heavenly coronation: that act described by St. Jerome as unattainable for the unchaste.\textsuperscript{1265}

The inclusion of the image of the fol.17v *Christ releasing Joseph of Arimathea* is most fascinating for it bears no relation to the Passional text. The scene portrays a significant event in the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus depicting Christ grasping Joseph of Arimathea by the wrist in a gesture of deliverance familiar from fols.3v and 9r and replicated on the facing page as Christ leads the soul heavenwards. Christ guides him from the house into which he had been sealed by the leaders of the synagogue who were displeased at his having begged for Jesus’ body to place in his new tomb.\textsuperscript{1266} Cunegund clearly valued this text for it was included in two volumes gifted by her to the convent: the one, given in 1303,\textsuperscript{1267} immediately following her instalment as abbess, the other, in 1312,\textsuperscript{1268} the year she received the first treatise of her Passional. The gospel, intimately familiar to the nuns, speaks of washing, anointing and putting to bed. A nun might long to receive such ministrations from Christ. The artist achieves an emotive image of Christ rescuing, embracing and kissing: it is an image of salvation, and thus suitable to the theme threading its way through the text and illustrations of the entire Passional.

On fol.17v, the artist mixed a purple hue for Joseph’s cloak denoting his status as “counsellor, of the city of Arimathea”.\textsuperscript{1269} As Christ embraces Joseph, the men’s lips are as
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close as those of Christ and Mary in the preceding, evocative fol. 16v image. The artist also portrays a re-enactment of the intimacy captured in the fol. 8v Deposition as Joseph comes cheek-to-cheek with Christ as he lowers him from the Cross.\textsuperscript{1270} Scattered liberally over the background of the fol.17v illustration are twenty-two, large, five-petalled roses, immediately recognizable to a medieval viewer as symbolic of Christ’s five wounds.\textsuperscript{1271} They are red and white, unquestionably representing the blood and water that flowed from Christ’s side.\textsuperscript{1272} Sharp thorns emerge between the petals: an artistic juxtaposition employed as Christian allegory, described by Camille as, “sweet fragrant beauty and sharp pain… This mingling of pain and pleasure, beauty and horror.”\textsuperscript{1273}

A remarkable discovery lies within the library volume given by Cunegund in 1312.\textsuperscript{1274} One I deem revelatory in the search for an explanation for the unique iconography of this image. The artist illustrates the passage from that manuscript, describing the scene of Joseph’s rescue by Christ. (For the purposes of comparison, I have underlined certain phrases): “someone lifted me up from the place where I had fallen and he bathed me with an abundance of rose water and sprinkled from the head all the way to the feet, he placed around my nostrils the perfume of wondrous ointment and he wiped my face with the same water, washing me and kissing me.”\textsuperscript{1275} It explicitly declares that Christ bathed Joseph in rose water. Compare this with the somewhat pedestrian text translated by Montague James. Here, there is a total absence of roses: “And one took me by the hand and removed me from the place whereon I had fallen; and moisture of water was shed on me from my head unto my feet, and an odour of ointment came about my nostrils. And he wiped my face and kissed me.”\textsuperscript{1276} In Cunegund’s florid account, the ointment becomes “wondrous”; the impersonal, “moisture was shed on me” becomes the intimate, “he bathed me” followed by, “washing” and “kissing” “with the same water” – ie. rose water. The rubric title, written in hexameter against the inner margin of fol. 17v, describes the scene and the kisses (in plural) and also remarks upon the shower of rose blossoms, linking them with this specific act of cleansing:

Joseph of Arimathea gives devoted kisses to Jesus,
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You released from prison; you scattered blooms of roses, Cleanse us from sin, bathed by a wave of breeze.1277

Rose water was used by the elite not only for handwashing (a purifying act, albeit secular) but also to delicately flavour exotic dishes at banquets.1278 This expensive and indulgent commodity would have been familiar to the high-born Benedictine sisters: in Cunegund’s version of Nicodemus, this luxury is available “in abundance”. It is notable that the 1312 volume provides a full and detailed account whereas in the 1303 manuscript it is very abbreviated. Despite its brevity, the earlier text does include a reference to rose oil and the kiss. The entire event is summarised in just a few words: “He bathed me in rose oil and, wiping my face, he kissed me.”1279 I suggest that Cunegund instructed the artist to include the powdering of rose blooms specifically to illustrate the rendering of the text in the volume that she dedicated to the convent in 1312 - the same year the first Passional treatise was completed.

Heightened sensual awareness was a feature of the visionary experiences desired by many nuns.1280 This image summons the senses: sound (the accompanying poetic verse, which I consider may well have been composed by Cunegund); sight (the devotional image with all its associations); touch (the imagined kiss); smell (evoked by the image of roses and the recollection of their scent: “the perfume of wondrous ointment” filling Joseph’s nostrils); taste (perhaps a reminder of the delicate rose-flavourings in opulent dishes). The account in Nicodemus is reported in first person singular, allowing the reader - Cunegund and her nuns - to adopt the role of the recipient to whom Christ administers purifying perfume and rose water and kisses.

The question must be asked, why is Joseph of Arimathea allocated such a prominent place on this page when he has no place in the text of the lament? I suggest that the answer lies, as on fol.3v,1281 in the popular Arthurian literature of the period which, as has been noted, was regularly mined for Christian allegory,1282 and with which the socially-elite sisters of the convent would have been conversant. Joseph of Arimathea, illustrated three times in

1277 “Oscula Christe pia daris Joseph ab Arimathea, / Carcere solvisti roarum flore fudisti, / Crimine nos inunda perfusos flaminis unda” rubric title, fol.17v.
1279 “rosis que perfudit / me et extergens facie / neam osculatus est me” NKČR MS XIII.E.14c, fol.17ra8-10.
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the Passional (twice on fol.8v, and also on 17v), was the first guardian of the Grail. Christ’s blood - believed to have been caught by Joseph of Arimathea in the chalice used by Christ at the Last Supper - flowed directly from his side wound and was the origin of sacramental wine: note Colda’s words "the stain of Original Sin is to be destroyed through the subsequent Church sacrament."  

Recall also how the Passional’s lover-knight, blooded lance and enlarged chalice all carry associations with the Grail. (It was Robert de Boron who changed the Grail from a flat dish into the chalice but it is also described as a stone, a dish, or a cup.) Significantly, Stephen Knight points out that the tale of King Pelles, the Fisher King, represents a weakened king who is restored to strength, and that “regeneration of royal power” is a crucial element of the story. The devastating decline of the Premyslides and Cunegund’s duty to protect the dynasty, of which she was once heir, through prayers, devotions and acts of memoria, which has already been observed to have had an important bearing on the Passional’s iconography and its function, may have made the link with grail legend extraordinarily important.

The Arthurian Legend of the Grail fascinated medieval Europe, thrilling its audience with its mystery and adventure, and its promise of absolution. The Grail “whose nature is most pure” – perhaps represented by the large image of the chalice on fol.10r – also had significant powers including, as described by Wolfram, the capability to provide adequate food for all. The dire famine of 1312 comes yet again to mind. Wolfram elaborates on the Grail’s power: “never was man in such pain but from that day he beholds the stone, he cannot die in the week that follows immediately after. Nor will his complexion ever decline...If that person saw the stone for 200 years, his hair would never turn grey. Such power does the stone bestow upon man that his flesh and bone immediately acquire youth. That stone is also called the Grail.”  

Was Cunegund ill and in pain? Did she fear aging and her approaching death? The fol.17v image – an image of
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release and a return to Christ’s protection - illustrates the salvation of the Grail’s first
guardian by Christ and might, therefore, also allay her own, eschatological anxieties.
Andrea Hopkins describes the Grail as: “a symbol of divine grace, which is freely
dispensed by God to all men. But only the truly pure in heart can attain the ultimate gift of
grace, a rapturous union with the heart of divine mystery, like that achieved by Sir Galahad
just before his death.” This wholly accords with what might be assumed to be
Cunegund’s aspirations.

The third section of the Passional, Colda’s treatise on the heavenly mansions, opens on the
facing page (fol.18r) with another iconographically unique image: Christ guiding Souls to
Heaven. On fol.19v, in words addressed directly to Cunegund, Colda acknowledges her
personal concerns about the after-life and her place within it: “Behold, you,
Cunegund…never cease to demand of me that which Dionysius deems impossible”, namely an account of Heaven and its hierarchy. Cunegund is clearly anxious for her eternal
future and, on fol.18r, the artist imaginatively, and reassuringly, pictures for her a place of
companionship and delight supervised over by Christ who, in this opening illustration,
grasps the soul firmly by the wrist to guide and deliver it to Heaven. The scene recalls
the Meditations’ account of thousands of souls that “enter into the supernal Home for the
first time…on the first day…the angels particularly celebrated, and the Lord Jesus showed
or made some special familiarity and consolation.” The “celebrating”, music-making
angels inhabit a tower: a firm structure from which the architecturally-impossible series of
arches and pinnacles stretch across the page. The extraordinary relationship between text
and image (scribe and artist collaborating) has been discussed above. The architecture,
the figure of Christ and the accompanying souls are all suspended in space imparting a
sense of other-worldliness. Colda’s second treatise, opens: “Thus after a long
peregrination, after a terrible battle and glorious and amazing victory…” Christ has
ascended, as the psalmist foretold. He wears a benign and concerned expression as he
gazes down on the little group of expectant souls (notably, all female). They, and the soul
in flight, all turn their faces to Christ their Saviour. The text recounts how, “it was difficult
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1301 “Post peregrinacionem igitur longam / post diram pugnam post gloriosam ac miram / victoriam” fol.18r1-3.
for the bride to gain [her place] there."1302 Recall how Cunegund must have considered her soul to be in serious soteriological peril, having broken her vows.1303 Interestingly, directly on a level with the little soul winging its way to Paradise, Beneš has strategically managed to place Colda’s words: “here he [Christ] urges forwards, with the actual ascending multitude in the form of a church assembly, a certain empathetic bride.”1304 Perhaps a predictive and performative prolepsis of Cunegund’s certain absolution?

The final two illuminations both depict the Heavenly Mansions (fols.20r and 22v). They are fine, full-page images of the Divine and Mortal realms in heaven, peopled by composed and colourful, if stereotypical, figures. The nine Dionysian orders of the Divine hierarchy are illustrated on fol.20r, housing the angels three to a bay, with the exception of two thrones and four virtues. They are also categorised in the description of heavenly festivities in the Franciscan Meditations.1305 As noted above, Colda states that Cunegund will ultimately reside in the realm of the nine orders of angels.1306 Fol.22v illustrates the abodes of Blessed Mortals who occupy more cramped accommodation with four,1307 five, and even six1308 to a bay. The elegant architectural design, ascribed to the heavenly mansions by the artist, showcases his consummate draughting skill with layer upon layer of arches and pinnacles. On each page, the structures rise to a canopied Coronation of the Virgin.1309 The theme of heavenly coronation is pursued throughout the Passional illustrations to the very end.

It has been demonstrated that the iconography of the Passional is honed to meet the very specific needs of its patron. On the one hand, its uniqueness makes it extraordinarily interesting to study, particularly in light of Cunegund’s individual social and religious circumstances; on the other, it reduces the number of iconographic examples that might be shared with English manuscripts and, therefore, further support my thesis. Despite this, the following chapter will demonstrate just how similar the style and iconography of the Passional is to that found in Westminster-related art. The following detailed comparative analysis aims to provide strong and credible evidence for my thesis: that the artist who painted the Passional illuminations was a master artist of two courts.

1302 “sponse quam tam difficul/ter acquierat” fol.18r8-9.
1303 Pp.73-74.
1304 “volut / cum ipso ascenencium / turbam in / persona ecclesia hic spon/sam intelligam” fol.18r14-18.
1305 Pseudo-Bonaventura, 382-383.
1306 Pp.72-73.
1307 Patriarchs, top left.
1308 Married couples, bottom right.
1309 P.26.
4. **THE PASSIONAL MASTER – An artist of two courts?**

We discover nothing about the illuminator of the Passional from the manuscript.\(^{1310}\)

This assessment by Antonín Matějček at the beginning of the twentieth century could not be further from the truth. The artist’s name may not be inscribed in the manuscript but a comparative study of the illuminations offers a quantity of information that acts as an artistic signature, and can lead to an informed evaluation of the artist’s origins. This chapter is devoted to reading that signature as I lay down the evidence for my hypothesis that, before moving to the royal court in Prague, the artist of Abbess Cunegund’s florilegium was a master painter and draughtsman who had worked in Westminster at the beginning of the fourteenth century.

1310 saw England’s finances completely drained by Edward II’s squanderings;\(^ {1311}\) the same year, a very young Luxembourghian king and a Premyslide queen were married and set about establishing their new rule in Prague.\(^ {1312}\) As a result, the royal courts of Westminster and Prague were both in a state of considerable upheaval. Both had new rulers who were very different from their predecessors, determining the style and atmosphere of their courts whilst controlling the political outlook of their respective nations. There was pessimism in the court at Westminster as the profligate new king, Edward II (April, 25, 1284 – September 21, 1327),\(^ {1313}\) emptied the coffers to pay for his personal extravagances and to lavish wealth upon his favourite, Piers Gavestan (1284 – June 19, 1312).\(^ {1314}\) In contrast, there was optimism in the court of Prague as the young King John of Luxembourg and his Premyslide Queen Eliška began their reign following a period of civil unrest and misrule, 1307-1310, under Henry of Carinthia (1265 – April 2, 1335) who was married to Eliška’s older sister Anne (October 15, 1290 -September 3,
An enterprising artist might well seek to move from a declining artistic environment to one with prospects.

Known contacts between the two courts will be briefly considered before assessing the socio-political and economic circumstances that might have led a master to quit one court and travel to another. Certain specific, stylistic and iconographic details of the Abbey paintings from the period around the coronation of Edward II, together with new insight into the working practices of the Westminster painters’ workshop, will then be shown to shed light on the master’s artistic origins. The preceding study of style and iconography has already established that the artist of the Passional of Abbess Cunegund was a master painter and draughtsman, employing a western, Gothic style of art. His obvious skill, and the fact that he was chosen by the most senior female royal princess to illustrate her exceptional work, must surely earn him his long-deserved title of the Passional Master.

It is a grave mistake to consider the medieval Czech Lands as Eastern Europe; one bred from familiarity with a twentieth-century, political map. It will be recalled that, although Bohemia maintained links with the East, it was part of the German Empire and consequently, strongly orientated towards the West. Martin Roth points out that “nobles, churchmen, merchants, pilgrims and artists were well aware of their contemporaries abroad, and often travelled widely in Europe and beyond.” The extent and frequency should not be underestimated. Before considering the movement of artists, some recorded contacts between the royal courts are of note. Separated by some 730 miles, the courts of Westminster and Prague were nevertheless familiar to one another. Indeed, considering the journeys of crusaders, Bohemia would not have been seemed so very remote from England. There were significant points of contact between the courts of Prague and Westminster, for example, in 1226 English emissaries were sent to Prague on behalf of the young Plantagenet King Henry III (October 1, 1207-November 16, 1272), seeking the hand in marriage of the then fifteen-year-old Premyslide princess Agnes (Cunegund’s great aunt and mentor, St. Agnes). The Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II, recently widowed, was also pressing his suit, and discussions were politically sensitive.
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1315 Tomek, Dějepis, 1:189.
1316 Pp. 48-49.
1318 Appendix IIId.
1319 Soukupová, 31-35.
and protracted, lasting two years before both parties withdrew. Agnes then adopted the life of enclosure and, under guidance from Pope Gregory IX (pope 1227-1241), she established her Clarisse convent in 1233, becoming Mother Superior in 1234. It was not unusual for Henry III of England to seek an alliance with distant Bohemia through marriage: already in the tenth century, Holy Roman Emperor Otto I, in neighbouring Saxony, had chosen an English bride, Edith, grand-daughter of Alfred the Great, a fact recorded in the Chronica Boemorum. Such alliances were based on mutual, geopolitical interests. Thirty-one years after Henry III’s advances to the young Premyslide princess, Otakar II, Cunegund’s father, was receiving favours from the King of England’s brother, Richard of Cornwall: most famously the privilegium, mentioned above, granting right of accession to Czech princesses.

During the reign of Cunegund’s brother, Wenceslas II, the English and Czech nations were united by a fascinating event which took place in November 1302, just two months following Cunegund’s consecration as Abbess of St. George’s Convent. Gotfried, Wenceslas II’s chaplain, was sent to London on a diplomatic mission. His remit included a request for relics, conceivably at Cunegund’s instigation. An entry in the Westminster Patent Rolls, November 10, records a grant for, “Safe-conduct until Easter, for Gotfried, 1320

1320 Agnes was betrothed aged eight, 1211, to Frederick II’s son, Henry VII of Germany (1211-1242). Henry VII married Margaret of Babenberg, later declaring the marriage void (Margaret then married Otakar II), ibid.; see p.136. 1321 Ibid., 33-34. In 1231, Frederick II reinitiated his advances to Agnes, as did his son, Henry VII of Germany; Agnes approached Pope Gregory IX who was against her marriage to Frederick II and he wrote to Otakar I, his wife and his wife’s brother, urging them not to betroth Agnes, Soukupová, 34. Soukupová adds that, in disfavour, the pope commanded Frederick to travel to the Holy Land. Eamon Duffy, Saints and Sinners: A History of the Popes (London, 2009), 164-5, however, states that Frederick went on crusade despite excommunication. Ibid., 163, Duffy points out that Gregory IX supported the new orders and canonised St. Francis, 1228, two years after his death. It is possible that the pope’s personal friendship with Sts. Dominic and Clare may explain his encouraging Agnes to establish a Franciscan monastery/convent in Prague, and perhaps also how she came to correspond with St. Clare. 1322 Soukupová, 27-35. 1323 Married in Quedlingburg basilica, 930, Rienäker, The Collegiate Church, 4. 1324 Cosmas, Cosmas of Prague, 67. 1325 P.10. 1326 Květ, Iluminované rukopisy, 24. 1327 Cunegund’s attitude to relics would have been influenced by St. Agnes. Pope Innocent IV (pope 1243-1254) favoured the Franciscan convent by donating several precious items in 1251, Pokračovatelé Kosmovi, 107. These included a portion of the True Cross and of Christ’s robes, Soukupová, 152-153. Cunegund’s father, Otakar II, transferred St. Nicholas’ finger from Olomouc to the Clarisse convent in Prague where Cunegund was a nun, ibid., 155-157. Cunegund’s niece, Queen Eliška, was also an avid collector of relics: 102 were itemized in her will, Zdenka Hledíková, “Závět Elišky Přemyslovny,” in Královský Výsehrad III. Sborník příspěvků ze semináře Výsehrad a Přemyslovců (Prague, 2007), 128-141, at 132. This Premyslide trait was manifest in Cunegund’s great-nephew, Emperor Charles IV (May 14, 1316 – November 29, 1378), who was also an obsessive collector of relics, Soukupová, 157.
chaplain and envoy of the king of Bohemia and Poland, returning home”. The Close Rolls also retain a copy of Edward I’s message to Wenceslas II, recorded three days later:

To W. King of Bohemia and Poland. The king has received his letter of credence presented by Godfrey, W’s chaplain, the bearer of the presents, and he understands what the chaplain wished to say to him on W’s behalf. He has caused the relic of St. Thomas, sometime archbishop of Canterbury, which the chaplain prayed on W’s behalf might be sent to the king, and also other relics to be sent by the chaplain to W. Whom he prays to receive them and to have and keep them in fitting reverence. Foedera. Close rolls recorded secret transactions and the Foedera, or treaty, assigned to this entry, suggests that the chaplain imparted confidential, political information, acknowledged by Edward I when he “understood” Wenceslas II’s communiqué. There was collaboration between the courts of Prague and Westminster.

Two references have been made above to an image in the late-thirteenth-century, Bohemian, Franciscan Bible, which illustrates a diminutive, kneeling donor figure of a Franciscan with the title, FRAT. GODEFRIDUS [figs. 2.23, 2.39]. This was thought by Lenka Panušková and Hana Hlaváčková to represent the master illuminator of the manuscript, an identification first ascribed by Jan Květ. I suggest that it is plausible that this donor image represents none other than Wenceslas II’s chaplain, Gotfried, a man clearly of considerable standing in the court since, in 1302, he was trusted to represent the Czech king, bearing confidential information to the English monarch.

The Thomas à Becket’s relic delivered into the hands of Gotfried/Godfrey may, I suggest, have been kept “in fitting reverence” within a small, reliquary box, which has survived [fig. 4.1]. Upon the lid of this box is engraved a catalogue of contents, concluding that it contains the relic “of the blessed and illustrious martyr Thomas.” Stehlíková appears to have mistranscribed this section of the engraving as, “felicis / et adaucti martyrorum”.
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1330 Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, Franciscan Bible, MS XII.B.13, fol.171v.
1331 Pp.55 and 58.
1333 See Soukupová, 163.
“thomae”, translating it as, “[of] Felicius and Adaucti martyrs, Thomas.” My translation, given above, is based on a revised transcription: “felicis / et adaucti martyrhis thomae.” (The words “blessed and illustrious” are not names of martyrs but adjectival epithets applied to Thomas the martyr.) Within this little box, Thomas’ relic was companion to an exceedingly precious collection of relics including among others those of Sts. Andrew, George, Stephen, Catherine, Wenceslas, James the Great, Maurice, Christopher and Ludmila, also fragments of the Cross and Christ’s seamless tunic. Were these the original “other relics” mentioned in the treaty? This reliquary box was in the safe-keeping of the Prague goldsmith’s guild by 1876, but in the fourteenth century it, and its contents, must have been considered among Prague’s most sacred possessions.

The war-hungry English King Edward I may also have provided an influence as a Christian monarch role-model for the young John of Luxembourg who was one month shy of his eleventh birthday when the old Plantagenet king died; John certainly harboured similar, bellicose tendencies. Luxembourg is geographically close to England, and Edward I and his uncle the King of France Louis IX (April 25, 1214 - August 25, 1270), later St. Louis, with whom he went on crusade in 1270, were both subjects of enthralling mythologies in which they featured as formidable, crusader kings. Matthew Reeve notes that Edward I’s reputation as a crusader appears to have carried a particular resonance: the dagger with which Edward was nearly slain in Acre was preserved as a sacred relic by the monks at Westminster. Edward I and John of Luxembourg were both quintessential warrior-kings: Edward I’s, possibly apocryphal request, to be boiled down after death and his bones to be carried, relic-like, into battle against Scotland, matched the eccentricity of the blind John of Luxembourg’s final ride into battle, to fall, ironically, at the hands of the English at Crécy, August 26, 1346.
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1335 Ibid., 143; [fig. 4.1] St. Thomas’ relic does not appear to have survived among the labelled fragments.
1336 St. Agnes received fragments of Cross and tunic from Pope Innocent IV, 1251, Pokračovatele Kosmovi, 107.
1337 Stehlíková, “Reliquary tablet,” 143.
1338 Appendix IIId.
1341 Brayley and Britton, The History of the Ancient Palace, 100.
The House of Luxembourg also came into specific contact with the art of Westminster when John’s father, Henry VII of Luxembourg (c.1275- August 24, 1313), the soon-to-be German King and Holy Roman Emperor, attended Edward II’s ostentatious coronation ceremony at Westminster Abbey, February 25, 1308. The decked-up Abbey included amongst its extravagant decorations a dais in the chancel (no doubt also painted by the Westminster workshop) upon which the young king and queen sat: “wainscotted about, and so much elevated that men-at-arms, namely earls, barons, knights and other nobles, might ride under the same”. Henry VII of Luxembourg could hardly have failed to be impressed by the stage-set in all its freshly-painted glory. Perhaps the Westminster celebrations inspired the comparably lavish and showy wedding celebration arranged two years later by Henry VII of Luxembourg, across the channel in Speyer, for his son John and Eliška Premyslide. Having witnessed the high quality of the art in Westminster, might Henry VII have even recommended their services to the young, newly-wed couple?

The explosion of work generated by the 1308 coronation is evidenced in the King’s Remembrancer which lists the palace works’ accounts. It names hundreds of workmen and artists commissioned to transform Westminster Palace and its environs between July 8, 1307- July 9, 1311, recording page after page of carpenters, for whom, and for woodwork in general, the eccentric Edward II demonstrated a particular fondness. It is important to note, however, that following Edward II’s wedding celebrations in February, 1308, no painters appear in the accounts for the following three years. All painting appears to have ceased and by 1310, Edward II was in no position to employ artists on a large scale. The King’s Remembrancer lists many other craftsmen employed between 1308-1311: the final two pages list almost exclusively carpenters. (Despite lack of funds, he retained between twelve and twenty household carpenters, accompanying him everywhere,
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1345 Immediately following Edward’s marriage to Isabella of France (1295 – August 22, 1358), in Boulogne, January 25 – they were engaged in 1303, ibid., 91.
1348 London, National Archives, E101/468/21, The King’s Remembrancer, (July 8, 1307- July 9, 1311).
1349 In 1325, he entertained carpenters, and sailors from the royal barge, to dine in the Royal Chamber, Phillips, Edward II, 72.
1350 NA, Kew E101/468/21, fols.87r-105r.
1351 P.174.
presumably not only undertaking repairs, but also creating sets for entertainments. One favoured painter, John Albon, is recorded in 1326 not for his prowess as an artist but for delighting the king by dancing upon a table.)

The King’s Remembrancer provides invaluable information on the Westminster palace works and painters’ workshop for the period directly leading up to the coronation: between July 1307 – February, 1308. It demonstrates the structure and employment practice of the painters’ workshop revealing it to closely resemble a present-day film art department: a loose assemblage of many free-lance painters and craftsmen, brought together to complete a specific commission. Magister Thomas of Westminster, holding the office of King’s Painter - an assured position in the royal household commanding a high income - was the equivalent of today’s production designer: overseeing all and presumably providing inspiration and direction. His is the only name appearing throughout the entire accounted period. Some, such as William of Sudbury, Gilbert of Conham, William of Westminster, William Wyt (also grinder and temperer) and Edmund of Marham, are described as *pictor* and equate to art directors. Gilbert of Conham appears to have replaced William of Sudbury as “Senior Art Director” after the first month. The remaining artists listed in the Remembrancer would be classed as today’s draughtsmen (an apposite title also for the Passional’s artist), all employed on an ad hoc basis in response to pressure of work, designing, drawing up, sometimes building models, as well as painting acres of Westminster palace, chapel and hall walls and furnishings. Their remit would have encompassed the pre-coronation “set-decoration” of the Abbey; sadly, there are no surviving accounts for this Abbey-work. The workshop, like today’s art departments, also employed trainee assistants, “for the grinding of colours and the doing of other necessities.” No fewer than forty-three painters were accounted during the six-months leading up to the coronation, from September, 1307-February, 1308, however twenty-six of those registered for only half-a-month’s work, presumably working on projects elsewhere, perhaps even in the adjacent Abbey - coming, going and sometimes returning. A steady core of five artists was paid twice a month for eight or more sessions; in December 1307, twenty-five painters were at work; by February, the number had dwindled to nine: the commission ended with the coronation at the end of that month. In medieval
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1354 Ibid., 25.
1355 “ad moland colores et ad alia necessaria facienda,” NA, Kew E101/468/21, fol.19r22.
Westminster, as in today’s film industry, it is the King’s Painter, Thomas of Westminster – the Production Designer equivalent - whose name is noted for posterity. There is nothing in the huge final product to identify which individual team member was responsible for which item, yet even the few surviving items of Westminster art demonstrate that more than one artist was at work. Each team member will have bent his talent to match the Master’s vision and style yet never totally loosing individuality. The artists would, however, carry that vision and style with them when working away from the workshop.

An important indicator of the acknowledged willingness of medieval artists to relocate, in order to gain employment, is preserved in the King’s Remembrancer. It lists at least nine possible East Anglian artists, identifiable by their surnames, working in the Westminster royal painters’ workshop in the “snap-shot” period between September, 1307 and February, 1308. They represent nearly a quarter of the workshop. Until recently, the blanket term “East Anglian” was readily applied to early-fourteenth-century English illuminated manuscripts. The migration of artists certainly complicates attempts at taxonomy for they would be absorbing and spreading influences as they went: painters’ workshops informing one another. Norfolk had the greatest concentration of parish churches in the country of which 659 survive: a fraction of the original number. The cathedrals and abbeys of Norwich, Ely, Bury St. Edmunds, and of course nearby Peterborough and St. Albans, as well as the many satellite monastic establishments, all had walls, altarpieces, and other accoutrements of liturgical ritual to decorate: plenty of scope for enterprising, peripatetic artists. The royal court of Westminster would be a strong attraction for artists and was only a three-days’ walk from Norwich. Hardly surprising, therefore, that features of style and iconography are shared between East Anglian and Westminster painting, a fact that is demonstrated by comparing the “Fenland group” Gough Psalter image of Christ bearing the Cross with the “London/Westminster” De Lisle

1356 De Hamel, A History, 105.
1357 NA, Kew E101/468/21, fols.19r-87r. I have identified five Norfolk painters painting from September, 1307 to February, 1308, - Adam of Gressenshall, William of Gressenshall, Edmund of Marham, John of Yarmouth, John of Norfolk; three from Suffolk – William of Sudbury, William of Stonham, John of Ipswich; and one from Cambridgeshire, Peter of Cottenham; (Ernest W. Tristram, English Medieval Wall Painting in the Fourteenth Century (London, 1955), 288-289, identified only three Norfolk painters in Westminster, 1307.)
Psalter, \textsuperscript{1361} [fig. 4.2]; note the similarly-distinctive treatment of hands of Christ and the attendant in the \textit{Trials of Christ} from the Gough and De Lisle psalters \textsuperscript{1362} [fig. 4.3]. \textsuperscript{1363}

Painters did not only circulate within their own countries but also ventured farther abroad. The surnames of three painters listed in the 1307 Westminster accounts indicate French and Spanish origins: Walter Normann (Normandy?), Adam de Santa Elena and Simon de Burdedux (Bordeaux?). \textsuperscript{1364} Surnames also led to the identification of foreign painters employed from 1245 on Henry III’s project to rebuild and decorate Westminster Abbey: \textsuperscript{1365} William of Florence, an Italian; John of St. Omer, a Frenchman; and Peter of Hispania, a Spaniard; the latter two mentioned in accounts of 1250-1251. \textsuperscript{1366} (Even the most famous of thirteenth-century English manuscript painters was, after all, named Matthew Paris [fig. 4.4], described by Paul Binski as, “an enthusiastic xenophobe”: \textsuperscript{1367} a character trait that is often the hallmark of a recent and determined immigrant.) There are also examples of Englishmen abroad. In Paris, the sculptor Guillaume de Nourriche (William of Norwich), and his compatriots, were working between 1297 and 1330; \textsuperscript{1368} in October, 1316, the painter Jean Angles or Langlois \textsuperscript{1369} was recorded working in the papal residence outside Avignon at Noves, possibly moving with a team of painters to Pamplona between 1321/22-1330. \textsuperscript{1370} One Thomas Daristot, described 1321-1322 as an “English painter”, decorated the great hall of another papal residence in Sorgues, 1316-17, and since Aristot is a small Pyrenean village, Binski suggests the English Magister Daristot may have settled there. \textsuperscript{1371} Might this have been between a hypothetical quitting of the bankrupt English art scene c.1308-1310 and papal employ? The papal court moved to Avignon in 1309, just as Westminster palace painting ceased (February, 1308) and all funds becoming exhausted (by 1310). \textsuperscript{1372} Significantly, Thomas of Daristot and Thomas of Westminster both share the title Magister – as head of the workshop. The latter is not recorded in the

\textsuperscript{1361} Bodl. MS Gough liturgy.8, fol.49v and London, British Library, De Lisle Psalter, MS Arundel 83.II, fol.125r respectively.
\textsuperscript{1362} Bodl. MS Gough liturgy.8, fol.37r and BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.125r, respectively.
\textsuperscript{1363} Sandler, A Survey, 1:24-25, links the first Brussels Peterborough Psalter artist with London/Westminster.
\textsuperscript{1364} NA, Kew E101/468/21, fols.24r30, 46r6, 58r40 respectively.
\textsuperscript{1365} Lethaby, Westminster Abbey and the King’s Craftsmen, 57; on the rebuilding of the abbey, see Binski, Westminster Abbey, 10-52.
\textsuperscript{1366} Lethaby, Westminster Abbey and the King’s Craftsmen, 33.
\textsuperscript{1367} Binski, Westminster Abbey, 54.
\textsuperscript{1369} NA, Kew E101/468/21, lists ten Johns, including two assistants.
\textsuperscript{1370} Paul Binski, Gothic Wonder: Art, Artifice and the Decorated Style, 1290-1350 (New Haven, 2014), 252.
\textsuperscript{1371} Described as “pictor Anglicus, de Anglia or Anglicus,” ibid.
\textsuperscript{1372} Ibid. 89, Binski highlights the influence of pan-European famine and resultant agrarian crisis, 1315-1322, on artists’ migration.
palace accounts after February, 1308. Where was Master Thomas of Westminster from 1316? Could he and Master Thomas of Daristot be one and the same? (Thomas of Westminster is known to have worked away from London, in Peterborough, c. 1300.)

The English master painter, Thomas, worked in Avignon and its environs into the 1330s, along with English sculptors, on the tomb of Pope John XXII. Just as he was attracted by prestigious papal court (Westminster commissions having ceased), might not the new court in Prague have been equally attractive to another entrepreneurial, Westminster painter?

The wedding of John and Eliška - the start a new, highly successful, though short-lived, dynastic line in Bohemia - took place in Speyer, September 1, 1310, just as dramatic events were unfolding in the court of Westminster. These events severely impacted upon the Westminster royal workshop as patronage for painting within the palace ceased: the absence of painters in the accounts between 1308 and 1311 stands testimony to this. Edward II’s extravagances led court and country towards financial ruin and by 1310, money had run out. The wardrobe account for the fourth year of his reign shows Edward II owing the Florentine Frescobaldi bank £3,829. The situation became so critical that by March 20, 1310, the Ordainers (seven prelates, eight earls and six barons, and others they might call upon) took charge in Westminster, and between September 29, 1310 until September 29, 1311, these Ordainers exerted their full authority, having rights of reform not only over the royal household but over the entire nation. This took place just twenty-eight days after the marriage of the new King and Queen of Bohemia in Speyer.

The Westminster financial crash may account for a wave of migrant English court artists responsible for English influences detected in continental art: for example, the now-lost, wall painting in the Chateau des Templiers in Nieuwpoort, Belgium, dated 1313, was described by Paul Clemen (October 31, 1866-July 8, 1947) as the work of an English
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similarly, the chancel wall paintings in Cologne Cathedral, after 1322 [fig. 4.5], have long been recognised for their English traits. With no prospects of further employment at Westminster, it would be expedient for experienced court artists to travel in search of new, royal, continental patronage. Where more inviting than the burgeoning Luxembourg court in Prague which was on the rise just as the Westminster royal court was crashing? Emily Howe recognises the Westminster workshop as part of, “a peripatetic, inter-media painting tradition”, and an experienced, free-lance, royal court artist was free to offer his credentials at another court. Westminster Abbey and the Convent of St. George also shared a Benedictine foundation, that pan-European medieval institution that extended across national borders and which might itself have secured entrée for a foreign artist in a foreign city.

Although John of Luxembourg and his Bohemian bride, Eliška, were married at the beginning of September, 1310, the young couple and their entourage did not return to Prague to claim the Czech throne until the end of November. In “very harsh cold, snow, frost and rime ice”, they were forced to encamp outside the walls of Prague for Henry of Carinthia, supported by Meissen troops, barred their entry. Eventually, they accessed the city by the “porta circa S. Franciscum”, close to the Clarisse Convent, where, according to the Zbraslav Chronicle, hordes of city-folk, “came, clad with weapons of war, hoes and axes and broke down the gate”. Welcomed by the populace, the new king and queen, supported by impressive troops, rode through the Prague streets shouting, “Peace, peace, peace.” Henry and his mercenaries took fright and retreated across the river to the citadel; Henry and Anne remained almost a week longer, until December 9, and then fled. February 4, the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin, 1311, John and Eliška were crowned in Prague’s Basilica of Sts.Vitus, Wenceslas and Adelbert, by the

1383 Ibid., 222.
1385 “zima velmi tuhá, sníh, mráz, jinovatka s ledem”; Kronika Zbraslavská, 390.
1386 Ibid.
1387 Ibid.
1388 “přišlo...odené válečnými zbraněmi, a motykami a sekerami rozbili bránu.” Kronika Zbraslavská, 390.
1389 “Mír, mír, mír!” ibid., 391.
1390 Ibid.; appendix I.
1392 The Zbraslav Chronicle makes no mention of Abbess Cunegund’s presence at the ceremony. Klára Benešovská points out that Charles IV’s coronation (September 2, 1347) first records the “obligatory presence” of the Abbess of St. George’s Convent, and suggests this refers to previous custom and that
Archbishop of Mainz, Peter of Aspelt (1240–d.June 5, 1320).1393 Eliška’s crowning must have represented the culmination of Cunegund’s hopes for her niece, the Premyslide dynasty and the Czech Nation. There was reason for optimism, although no room for complacency. With a Luxembourg on the throne, providing a direct association between the Kingdom of Bohemia and the Holy Roman Emperor,1394 the country was looking westward perhaps as never before. John of Luxembourg was merely fourteen years old,1395 Eliška eighteen, when they became joint rulers of the Czech nation. They needed to make their mark and establish a position of authority. Already by May, 1311, John had departed for Moravia,1396 on the first of the many sorties and campaigns that typified his reign.1397 When the king was away from the kingdom on campaign, Eliška was usually required to remain in Prague to oversee domestic politics, often with the support of Archbishop Peter of Aspelt as acting regent.1398 Bishop John IV of Dražice, who had presided at Cunegund’s service of consecration,1399 also fulfilled this role as a document, dated May 14, 1315, attests. With John so frequently absent, Eliška was probably also responsible for commissioning works of art,1400 perhaps guided by the art-afficionado Bishop John IV.

With a view to establishing a cultural status for the new Prague court, it would be prudent to employ a master painter from a western royal court to introduce a style of art already widely popular in the West and that might serve to portray the court as up-to-date, therefore raising the profile of the young royals.1401

Cunegund’s privileged position as senior royal would give her access to the court. She was also close to her niece Eliška, the new queen of Bohemia, who had been cared for, from the age of thirteen - a vulnerable princess in an uncertain world – by her aunt, Cunegund,
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1394 P.78; Bobková, “From an Inexperienced Youth,” 206, see fig.II.2.7.
1395 Much as Edward II had no doubt in mind with his coronation preparations, pp.170 and 190.
within the Convent of St. George, from 1305 until some time prior to Eliška’s 1310 marriage. According to the Prague canon and chronicler Beneš Krabice of Weitmile, when a princess, Eliška even established a small court within the convent. The warmth of this aunt/niece bond is supported by the presence of the six-months-pregnant Eliška at Cunegund’s death-bed in 1321. Cunegund’s close familial connection with the royal court and her own status undoubtedly gave her the power and influence, as well as the funds “from the royal estate, particularly her dowry”, to employ the best court artist to illustrate the ambitious and certainly somewhat costly Passional. The Czech nation was at an historical crossroads; the stage being set for the future Golden Age of John and Eliška’s son, Charles IV, King of Bohemia and Holy Roman Emperor. The Passional Master, with Cunegund’s patronage, appears to have played his part in introducing the Gothic style of painting and laying artistic foundations for the new age of the Luxembourgs in Bohemia.

It has been observed that aspects of the Passional Master’s art recall techniques found in wall painting, and that he was obviously also skilled in draughting decorative, architectural features: both traits compatible with having worked in Westminster palace and Abbey. Indeed, the manuscript provides evidence that the Passional Master excelled as a draughtsman, and like any experienced and accomplished master-artist he would be as capable of executing large scale works as he was of painting the small, Passional illuminations. Versatility was a key aspect of Westminster’s artistic practice.
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1402 Tomek, Dějepis, 1:458; Jaroslav Čechura, Královny a kněžny české (Prague, 1996), 88, states that a ten-year-old Eliška went to St. George’s Convent because of Wenceslas II remarriage to Elizabeth Richenza, May 26, 1303. Even if this were so, Eliška (b.January 20, 1292) would be eleven; the date given for her admission to the Convent of St. George is, however, 1305, when she was aged 13.  
1403 Kateřina Telnarová, “Anna královna česká - nejstarší dcera Václava II a její osudy,” in Mediaevalia Historica Bohemica 13/1 (2010): 77-110, at 88-89; Toussaint, 49 n. 21, mistakenly refers to Eliška as Emperor Charles IV’s future wife: she was his mother.  
1404 Writing in the second half of the fourteenth century, see Marie Blahová ed. Kroniky doby Karla IV (Prague, 1989), 182.  
1406 Tomek, Dějepis, 1:518.  
1407 “de bonis regalis prope dotis” Prague, Národní knihovna České republiky, MS XIII.A.2, fol.9v3. see pp.12-13 for the full quotation on Cunegund’s patronage.  
1408 P.51.  
1409 P.65.  
1410 E.g., John of St. Omer and a carpenter were commissioned by Henry III, 1249 to fashion a lectern for Westminster chapter house; presumably, the artist provided the design and painted decorative finishes, and the carpenter created the object, Lethaby, Westminster Abbey and the King’s Craftsmen, 33 and 57-58; similarly, the Coronation Chair, pp.178 and 180.  
Like modern-day, film art department draughtsmen, Westminster painters also worked in close association with craftsmen who realised their designs: carpenters, sculptors, goldsmiths, embroiderers etc. Binski comments on the important influence on Westminster art of the tomb of young Aveline de Forz, c.1295 [fig. 4.6] - wife of Edmund Crouchback (January 16, 1245-June 5, 1296) second son of Henry III - and that of Crouchback himself, 1296-1297 [fig. 4.7]. This is manifest in the sedilia, c.1307, standing on the other side of the sanctuary [fig. 4.8]. Painters certainly collaborated on the sedilia canopy as well as executing the dramatic figures contained within. Wardrobe accounts, 1300-1301, record Edward I’s painter, Master Walter of Durham, working with Adam the royal goldsmith to create what is now known as the Coronation Chair [fig. 4.9]. Binski also notes deep similarities between details on Westminster Abbey’s stone tomb of Edmund Crouchback and sedilia, and figurative elements of the Madonna Master section of the De Lisle Psalter [fig. 4.10]: “The type of link that could explain these precise similarities would be an imager capable of executing sculpted, painted and, more rarely, illuminated work.” I would argue that the paramount requirement of such an “imager” was, as in today’s film art departments, to produce top-quality designs.

Sandler also commented that the most satisfactory comparisons with the De Lisle Majesty Master’s style were to be drawn “not from the sphere of illuminated manuscripts, but from that of monumental art - wall and panel painting, sculpture, architectural decoration and ecclesiastical furnishings.” Comparison between the De Lisle Psalter Virgin and Child [fig. 4.10] and the early-fourteenth-century wall paintings in Little Wenham [fig. 4.11], illustrates that Westminster-linked artists, contemporaries of the Passional Master were,
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1412 Opus Anglicanum employs iconography found in manuscripts and it is accepted that embroideries were probably designed by these master painter/draughtsmen; see Clare Browne, Glyn Davies and Michael A. Michael, eds., English Medieval Embroidery – Opus Anglicanum (New Haven, 2016); Michael A. Michael, ed. The Age of Opus Anglicanum (London, 2016).
1413 Edmund’s body was returned to Westminster in 1300, Lethaby, “English Primitives,” 171.
1414 Binski, Westminster Abbey, 113.
1415 P. 189.
1416 Binski, Westminster Abbey, 117; 124.
1419 Binski, Westminster Abbey, 113-120.
1420 BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.131v.
1421 Binski, Westminster Abbey, 174. Binski compares French fourteenth-century imagiers “who could undertake work in several media for patrons of high station.”
1422 NA, Kew E101/468/21 testifies to the large number of craftsmen available in Westminster at that time. Lucy Freeman Sandler, The De Lisle Psalter in the British Library (London, 1999), 15-16; the “monumentality” of the De Lisle Psalter images is also noted in Sandler, A Survey, 2:43, Margaret Rickert, Painting in Britain in the Middle Ages (London, 1965), 147, and Binski, “Style and Date,” 67.
1423 Binski, “Style and Date,” 74.
like him, accomplished at draughting complicated designs and architectural structures. Westminster artists provided influence through and drew inspiration from the many artistic projects undertaken over a range of locations, including Little Wenham, extending as far as Canterbury, Peterborough and Lincoln Cathedrals; also the now-lost Palace buildings; the Eleanor Crosses [fig. 4.12] raised by Edward I to memorialise his chère reine; and, of course, Westminster palace and Abbey and its interior furnishings. Despite little surviving of the extensive Westminster painting projects undertaken during the critical period for my study - the first decade of the fourteenth century - vital evidence for my hypothesis is to be found in remaining Abbey fittings and other associated architectural/sculptural projects as well as in Westminster-related manuscripts. The Passional’s compositionally-important, decorative, architectural details are found on five pages: fols.1v, 17v, 18r, 20r and 22v. Expertly-draughted, these structures often frame images and add grandeur and, crucially, they display distinct features of English Decorated Style. The Passional’s architectural details are, therefore, the starting point for my analysis.

The Passional Master crowns the arch on the opening page of the manuscript (fol.1v) Dedication Illustration, with a dramatic display of heraldic arms. These compare with the carved and painted stone shields, which appear as if slung upon corbels, lining the arcade and filling each spandrel of Westminster Abbey’s monastic choir [fig. 4.13]. They fulfil an identical role as an overt display of symbols of dedication and allegiance. Dated c.1259-1272, the Abbey’s stone shields provide an artistic precedent for later Westminster work, including the shields around the bases of the Eleanor crosses, [fig. 4.14]. At the base of Edmund Crouchback’s tomb chest, shields above the figures of the attendant guardians [fig. 4.15] make an interesting, and strikingly similar, comparison with fol.1v of the Passional. Many artists in the Westminster workshop would have been involved in the painting of the Crouchback tomb structure and, as described by Binski, covering it with “a

\[1425\] There is evidence for the Passional Master’s involvement in other design projects and is the subject of on-going research. This, however is outside the remit of this thesis.

\[1426\] Brayley and Britton, The History of the Ancient Palace, 424; see Hastings, St. Stephen’s Chapel.


\[1428\] Trans. – beloved queen, altered to Charing, the final memorial cross.

\[1429\] See Binski, Westminster Abbey.


\[1431\] Binski, Westminster Abbey, 76-77.
staggering display of colour and glass inlays.”¹⁴³² Aveline’s tomb [fig. 4.6], the sedilia [fig. 4.8] and the Coronation chair [fig. 4.9] were all likewise worked on by the painters in gesso, gold, glass, enamels and paint.¹⁴³³ This would provide them with an intimate familiarity with these structures as well as a fertile training ground for the absorption of motifs.

It has been noted that Cunegund’s throne, with its gracefully-rising, ogival arch, is purely Gothic in form.¹⁴³⁴ The ogival arch is a distinctive feature in English Decorated architecture and, citing the Douce Apocalypse illustration of the Church of Thyatira [fig. 4.16],¹⁴³⁵ Binski notes the appearance of ogees in Anglo-Norman ahead of French art.¹⁴³⁶ The Marnhull Orphrey is but one surviving example of opus anglicanum¹⁴³⁷ employing repeated ogival arches very similar to those found in the Passional: their form on this embroidery closely compares with the arch on fol.1v [fig. 4.17]. Howard Colvin cites the Eleanor crosses as the earliest examples of ogee arches in English Decorated Style architecture: gently curved examples head the muliple niches displaying statues of the dead queen, presumably signifying her attainment of her Heavenly Abode [fig. 4.18].¹⁴³⁸ The Passional Master uses the ogee to signify a divine location in all the examples in the manuscript: on fol.1v, the arch that frames Cunegund may, therefore, be read on one level as presaging Cunegund’s desired final destination; the fol.18r niched tower, inhabited by angels, is topped by an ogival arch, as are the many, heavenly mansions pictured on fols.20r and 22r. The fol.1v image of Cunegund, the statues of Eleanor on the crosses, and the kings on the Westminster sedilia,¹⁴³⁹ are all forms of royal portraiture. They demonstrate that niches, roofed by gabled arches, were not the preserve of saints but also functioned as an expression of patronage and memoria. Such images became a part of the English, collective, artistic consciousness. Just as Cunegund, patron of the Passional, appears within her arched space so, at Lincoln Cathedrål – in the same manner as the patron sculptures of the Margrave of Meissen Ekkehard II and his wife Uta in Naumburg Cathedral [fig. 3.18] - Edward I and Queen Eleanor appear within a double niche on the

¹⁴³² Ibid., 117.
¹⁴³⁶ Binski, Gothic Wonder, 164.
¹⁴³⁷ See Browne, Davies and Michael, eds. English Medieval Embroidery.
¹⁴³⁸ Colvin, “The ‘Court Style’,” 135; see also pp.206-207.
¹⁴³⁹ Binski, Westminster Abbey, 124-126.
south exterior wall of the Angel choir which was constructed under their patronage between 1256-1280 [fig. 4.19].

On fols.17v, 20r and 22v of the Passional, once again twin niches form a double-bay, providing a setting for the Coronation of the Virgin. In this, the Passional closely parallels surviving, opus anglicanum cope designs [fig. 4.20]. The Coronation of the Virgin, heading the fol.20r Passional illustration of the heavenly mansion, is canopied by two, conjoined arches, supported by three slender pillars, creating a two-compartment arcade, each span similar to that on fol.1v. Fol.20r carries the only Passional illustration where the leaf-like crockets nod downwards rather than wafting towards the pinnacle. This makes it comparable with the canopied St. Faith in Westminster Abbey where the French-styled, tightly-budded crockets also nod downwards [fig. 4.21]. In both images, slender pillars, topped by capitals with divided foliage, support a trefoil-headed arch. These also feature in the Velletri parchment of c.1270-1280 [fig. 4.22], which may have been a design for opus anglicanum. Fol.22v’s Coronation of the Virgin plays out beneath a single, broad ogee arch, spanning two bays with a quatrefoil in the tympanum, recalling the triforium arches of Lincoln’s Angel Choir [fig. 4.23]. It also compares with the arcade directly above and at right angles to the wall paintings of the Incredulity of St. Thomas, and St. Christopher - which works of art will be shown to have a significant bearing on the assessment of the Passional Master’s work - in the south transept of the Westminster [fig. 4.24].

The gabled arches of fol.17v’s two-bay structure not only resemble the Westminster sedilia, as observed above, but also the three-bay Crouchback tomb [fig. 4.25]. On fol.17v, the twin-canopied ciborium shelters the Virgin and Christ; their throne is set upon the plate; the ancestor David is housed within the tomb-like dais. The steeply-inclined gables of both the Crouchback tomb and the fol.17v structure are trimmed with characteristic, neatly undulating crockets rising to ebullient, acanthus-like finials: the flanking pinnacles reaching the same height as the intervening gable. These same features appear in the decorative arcades running above the attendant guardians not only on

1440 Ibid., 70-74.
1442 Velletri, Museo Capitolare, Roll with Passion scenes.
1443 Morgan, A Survey, 2:147.
1444 Binski, Gothic Wonder, 84.
1445 Pp.196-199.
1446 P.183.
Crouchback’s tomb-chest but on that of Archbishop Pecham, by Michael of Canterbury, in Canterbury Cathedral: both make an arresting comparison with fol.17v [fig. 4.26].

On the Crouchback tomb, a lying trefoil is placed within the tympanum of each central gable, one facing the sanctuary, the other the north transept, each inhabited by differing reliefs depicting the deceased on horseback. The Passional Master located an image of a mounted St. George centrally and directly above Cunegund’s throne on fol.1v, making a notable comparison with the Crouchback equestrian memorial reliefs [fig. 4.27]. Recent studies on the polychromy at Westminster Abbey have revealed that the painted abdomen of the horse on the north tomb-relief was dappled in the same manner as the steed on fol.3v.\textsuperscript{1447}

When considering the painting of the Crouchback tomb, particular attention should be drawn to the mock-tracery on the arcade shafts. The lower section compares with the un-outlined, monochrome, fictive tracery flanking David’s “window” (fol.17v); the upper section matches that on the shafts of the fol.18r inhabited, heavenly tower [fig. 4.28]. Minute observation reveals the same decorative detail on the shafts of the Westminster sedilia, and on the inhabited towers of the \textit{Madonna and Child} of the De Lisle Psalter\textsuperscript{1448} [fig. 4.29]. Some decorative elements on the Crouchback tomb had already been employed by its likely creator, the royal mason Michael of Canterbury,\textsuperscript{1449} during the 1280s or 1290s on the prior’s throne in Canterbury Cathedral chapter house [fig. 4.30].\textsuperscript{1450} The pinnacle shafts of both these works are faced with blind-tracery beneath small, triangular gables topped by steep, crocketed and finialed “roofs” which, in the English manner and unlike their French counterparts, are not shingled.\textsuperscript{1451} These are all features found in Passional illustrations. The Canterbury throne arcade has tall, solid shafts, directly comparable to those on the Crouchback tomb and the sides of the tiered aedicules (fol.18r); the foliage corbels of the prior’s throne canopy hang in space at the foot of suspended pinnacle shafts in the same manner as illustrated on fols.17v and 18r. The combination of pinnacle and gable in this latter image bears especially close comparison with the prior’s throne [fig. 4.31]. Binski observed that, “The prior’s throne of Canterbury chapterhouse is linked explicitly to the back of the Westminster Chair in the detailing of the crocketed gable at its

\textsuperscript{1447} Howard and Sauerberg, “The Polychromy at Westminster Abbey,” 233.
\textsuperscript{1448} BL Arundel 83.II, fol.131v.
\textsuperscript{1449} Binski, \textit{Westminster Abbey}, 116.
\textsuperscript{1450} Binski, \textit{Gothic Wonder}, 143.
\textsuperscript{1451} P.66; these were replaced on the Crouchback tomb, 1835, Binski, \textit{Westminster Abbey}, 116.
summit, with a large oculus and pointed trefoils in the spandrels.” The Passional Master’s fol.17v image almost shares this “explicit link” with Westminster on each count, although the trefoil arch beneath intrudes into the triangle of the gable [fig. 4.32]. The upper tier of blind tracery on the back of the Coronation Chair also compares with that either side of King David’s fol.17v “window” [fig. 4.28].

There are particularly striking comparisons to be made between the Passional fol.17v structure and the Westminster sedilia. The easterly section of the sedilia canopy, facing the sanctuary, preserves female joint sockets where tricuspid decorative finials were originally located. Tricuspid decorations painted on the panel behind, representing an echo or shadow of the arch, make this certain: the tips of the cusps within the arches on fol.17v end in identical finials [fig. 4.33]. The sedilia gables facing the south transept contain standing quatrefoils above trefoil arches. If the pinnacles and crockets were not missing from this aspect, the likeness with the fol.17v image would be exact and complete [fig. 4.34]. Sandler describes the sedilia panels as “framed in rich architecture exactly like that enclosing the seated Virgin in the [De Lisle] Psalter” [fig. 4.10]. Fig. 4-34, however, demonstrates that the Passional fol.17v architecture provides an even closer match to the sedilia than the De Lisle image. There is also a near-match between the crocketed gables of the angels’ tower in the De Lisle Psalter Madonna and Child, and that beneath which Christ shelters on fol.18r; the comparison extending to the shaft and pinnacle [fig. 4.35]. The Passional’s fol.18r architecture also shares a further, exact detail with the sedilia arches: on this occasion, on the side viewed from the sanctuary. It is a lanceolate trefoil, filling a cusp at the foot of the arch, and two small, flanking, sharp, subsidiary cusps [fig. 4.36]. If the sedilia still had its trefoil trim at the tip of the main cusp, the match would be perfect.

In contrast to fol.18r’s airy architecture, the image opposite of Christ releasing Joseph of Arimathea (fol.17v) illustrates a squat and sturdy building, adorned with battlements and arrow-slits, its stones delineated with double-lines. The Passional Master also crenelated the fiery furnace to which Adam and Eve are consigned (fol.5r), and from which they are rescued (fol.9r) [fig. 4.37]. Bony considered crenelated and embattled architecture to be a defining feature of English Court art: possibly reflecting the preoccupation with

---

1452 Ibid., 137.
1453 Sandler, A Survey, 2:44.
1454 BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.131v.
1455 Bony, English Decorated Style, 22.
Arthurian imagery. Crenelations also appear in the Westminster De lisle Psalter Harrowing of Hell. Towers with arrow-slits and battlements, their ashlar structure also delineated with double-lines, once also predominated the paintings on the walls of the Painted Chamber in Westminster Palace [fig. 4.38]. Miniature faux ashlar, like that on fol. 17v, is painted not only on the sedilia and at the base of the arcade columns of the Canterbury prior’s throne [fig. 4.39], but also on the Crouchback tomb where it still visible today from the north ambulatory, and which was described by Lethaby as, “painted white with red lines like toy masonry”.

In 1925, Lethaby recorded having seen “a precious remnant of the general decoration” in a window recess in Westminster Abbey: a portion of original, limed stonework, lined with red and decorated with roses. This “stones and roses” motif, the work of Adam the dealbator – whitewasher or plasterer - was executed in 1253. Decoration of this type survives in the chancel of St. Peter, Martley, Worcestershire. Roses have also been noted as a typical wall painter’s filler employed across England at the end of the thirteenth century, for example St. Mary’s Church, Chalgrove [fig. 4.40]. Henry III also requested that the Queen’s Chamber be “thoroughly whitened internally and painted with roses.” Similarly, as noted above, the Passional Master painted roses on a plain ground on fol.17v, scattered evenly around the figures of Christ and Joseph: the only decorative background in the entire Passional manuscript. This identical rose motif is employed to similar effect in the Gough Psalter Agony in the Garden [fig. 4.41]. Importantly, the background of the wall painting of St. Christopher, in the south transept of Westminster Abbey, was also described in 1937 by Ernest Tristram as “once diapered with rosettes, most of which have now disappeared.” Furthermore, there is a stone frieze of double roses on each of the voussoirs of the archivolt of the bay arches framing these wall paintings [fig. 4.42].
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1456 P. 100-101.  
1457 BL Arundel 83.II, fol.132v.  
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The rose-filled backgrounds executed by these Westminster-linked painters match that of fol.17v of the Passional.

The Westminster artists’ repertoire included the simulating of stone in paint, each artist apparently exhibiting an individual technique. The tombs of Edmund Crouchback was executed in carved freestone covered in gesso and then painted in a mottled green to simulate serpentine or some other green stone/marble. Similarly, the alcove recess of St. Faith’s image was painted red, flecked with a lighter shade to mimic porphyry: a red or blue/grey stone used in the Westminster Abbey Cosmati-work on the great pavements in the sanctuary; in the chapel of St. Edward on the Confessor’s shrine base; and on Henry III’s tomb. On fol.1v, the Passional Master created a porphyry-effect in both the red and blue shades [fig. 4.43], applying dots over a light wash to the dais, pillar shafts and faces of the pinnacles surrounding Cunegund’s throne. In the De Lisle Psalter, the Madonna Master created a marble-effect using a green wash overlaid with black curls and loops - resembling closely-packed prawns - on the manger and the tombs of Lazarus, Adam and Christ; the De Lisle Majesty Master favoured a wash covered with crescents in a darker tone of the same colour, representing the marble of thrones. The Passional Master’s own, distinctive recipe for fictive-marble was green, painted outlines, creating trilobular patterns of unpainted parchment demonstrated on fols.8v, 9r, 14r and 15r [fig. 4.44].

The base of Cunegund’s fol.1v throne, bearing a ribbon of six, standing quatrefoils, immediately recalls not only the base of St. Albans shrine but, more pertinently, that of the Westminster Coronation Chair [fig. 4.45]. At each anterior corner of the fol.1v throne, the Passional Master has included the unusual addition of extravagant, green foliage. Its unruly asymmetry adds a casual air to an otherwise formal composition [fig. 4.46]. Gia Toussaint describes this simply as “acanthus”. In a Westminster context, Andrew Russell remarked that “surmounting the Crouchback tombs, the leaf is more like a crinkled lettuce-leaf…the foliage is on the way to become what a recent writer has described as ‘mere shapeless cabbagery’.” Margaret Rickert categorised this leaf-form as being specifically English: “Serrated cabbage leaf (so-called). An East Anglian decorative motif probably
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1470 Binski, Westminster Abbey, 95-104.
1471 BL Arundel 83.II, fols.124r,124v,132r, (132v, somewhat worn),133r.
1472 Ibid., fols.134r,134v.
1473 Toussaint, 46, suggests that this is a reference to, “a lily among thorns”, Song of Songs 2.2.
1474 Andrew Russell, Westminster Abbey - The story of the church and monastery with some account of the life of the monks, a guide to the buildings and monuments and an explanation of their styles (London, 1934), 99.
derived from the acanthus…greatly elongated to form a graceful ribbon-like form with serrated edges.”

The sprouting leaves and the abundant acanthus of Cunegund’s throne and arch are unmistakably of this type, exhibiting remarkable kinship with the decorative, foliage at the tips of the ogees above and below the Majesty Master’s figure, Christ in Majesty, and above the Madonna Master’s Crucifixion in the De Lisle Psalter, [fig. 4.47].

Before further analysing a variety of traits which indicate a link between the Bohemian manuscript, the Westminster Abbey wall paintings, the De Lisle Psalter and other art work; and in order to draw useful and well-founded conclusions, it is necessary to spend time attempting to carefully refine some dating. Howe favours a surprisingly early date, c.1260-1270, for the Westminster south transept wall paintings [fig. 4.48], linking the figures with those of the Westminster Retable [fig. 4.49].

I find it hard to reconcile the bold, bulky forms of the wall painting with the delicate, refined images that people the retable. Binski, on the other hand, assesses that, together with the panel paintings on the back of the sedilia facing into the south transept [fig. 4.50], the wall paintings of Sts. Thomas and Christopher may have formed part of a larger early-fourteenth-century painting scheme.

I find this a more persuasive suggestion. Significantly, and, I would suggest, counter to her own proposed date, Howe reports that technical analysis, “of the south transept and St. Faith paintings has revealed a basic similarity of original materials and overall technique.”

An important starting point for this discussion must, therefore, be the dating of the St. Faith wall painting.

Westminster Abbey’s wall painting of St. Faith [fig. 4.51] is on the east wall of a monastic chapel dated to 1250, identified by Leslie Milner as having functioned as a combined vestry and sacristy. It leads off the south transept and is sandwiched between this and the chapter house vestibule. Binski dates the painting to c.1290-1310, more

---

1475 Rickert, *Painting in Britain*, 231.
1476 BL Arundel.83.II, fols.130r and 132r.
1479 Howe, “Painting and Patronage,” 12.
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1481 Ibid., 167.
recently restricting this window to c.1300. He states that there is no evidence for the wall painting having replaced an earlier painting scheme. He also suggests that the chapel remained unharmed by a devastating fire, recorded in the chronicle of St. Mary of Southwark, March 28, 1298, and which destroyed, amongst other monastic buildings, the monks’ dormitory. I would argue that, even if the structure of the chapel remained intact during the fire, it would inevitably have suffered from severe smoke damage since it was situated adjacent to the destroyed dormitory: the night gallery, linking the dormitory to the night stairs, ran directly along the end of the chapel. Smoke damage would have necessitated the scrubbing of the entire stone wall surface: even had there been previous wall decoration, any trace would have been removed. If this were so, today’s wall painting of St. Faith would, therefore, have a terminus post quem of 1298.

Binski points out a possible association between the St. Faith image and the fact that in October, 1303, Abbot Walter of Wenlock (in office December 31, 1283-d. December 25, 1307) and forty-eight of the Abbey brethren were committed to the Tower of London, having been implicated in a notorious and well-planned robbery of the Royal Treasury, situated within the monastery. Wenlock was released on bail. Binski writes: “Exotic as the theory appears, St. Faith’s capacity as an ingenious liberator of captives…might well have come to the minds of the monks, traumatized by their mass incarceration in the first decade of the fourteenth century.” A monk, illustrated in a barbed quatrefoil extending into the altar arch soffit to the left of the altar [fig. 4.51], appeals to the patron saint of prisoners, uttering an apologetic entreaty which is inscribed in a sharp diagonal extending from his kneeling figure: “Raise me, oh sweet virgin, whom grave sin burdens / render unto me Christ’s pleasure and blot out my iniquity.” Binski proposed that the penitent monk represented the community, or possibly a specific, unknown donor; I suggest it to be a portrayal of the disgraced Walter of Wenlock. As the presiding Abbot at the time of this outrageous scandal against the Crown, Wenlock had much to be ashamed of, and for which to be grateful, not least that he avoided being hanged – the fate of the merchant.
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Richard de Podelicote who confessed to his part in the robbery, with the possible attendant risk of, as tradition had it, having his skin stretched over the treasury door! I would add two further, salient points: firstly, not only is St. Faith the patron saint of prisoners, as Binski points out, but her feast falls on October 6, within the same month that saw the Westminster Benedictines’ incarceration in the Tower in 1303 and, no doubt, in fear for their lives. Secondly, ten or twelve of the monks were not released for two years, the order finally coming on Lady-day 1305, from Edward I who was giving thanks in the abbey for a victory over the Scots. It is, therefore, utterly plausible that the dedication and decoration of the monastic chapel to St. Faith formed part of a penance, an act of penitence and remorse to placate the offended king, directly related to this unhappy episode of the monastery’s history and perhaps to expedite bringing it to a close. This would offer a tighter date for the St. Faith wall painting of 1303-1305.

Emily Guerry follows Howe in dating the south transept wall paintings c.1269, however she states that iconography in the Incredulity of St. Thomas, where Christ places St. Thomas’ hand into the side wound, to be “deviating from conventional representations” for that period. The iconography is, however, standard for many early-fourteenth-century representations, for example those in the Brussels Peterborough and the Ramsey Psalters [fig. 4.52], strengthening the argument for the later dating suggested by Binski and which I support. The style of the south transept paintings, particularly in the depiction of fabric, concurs with an early-fourteenth-century dating. (Note for example that, apart from the longer under-tunic, the drape of St. Christopher’s mantle and the
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1503 P.186.
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seating posture of the Christ-child in the south transept wall painting compares with the
image of that subject, in reverse, in the Hours of Alice de Reydon,1505 from the circle of the
Westminster Queen Mary Psalter artist [fig. 4.53].1506 Stylistic variations between the
surviving Westminster-related paintings serve to demonstrate the working practice of the
workshop outlined above.1507 Half a dozen or more pictori, assisted by several others, all
listed in the King’s Remembrancer,1508 might be candidates for these paintings, and
however many other figural and decorative paintings, on walls and panels, and in
manuscripts that are lost to us today.1509

Edward II’s extravagant coronation, February, 1308, provides the obvious, circumstantial
motive for a rapidly-executed, extensive and showy, decorative scheme within the abbey.
Widescale work commenced in the palace immediately following Edward I’s death, July 7,
1307 and extended over the subsequent months until the coronation: the King’s
Remembrancer, which accounts for all this work prior to the coronation, dates from July 8,
1307.1510 The Abbey scheme will, almost certainly, have included the sedilia, erected
shortly after the translation of St. Sebert’s body to its present location beneath the structure,
1307,1511 in readiness for the coronation, presumably complementing the elaborate, raised
dais erected in the chancel for the occasion [fig. 4.50].1512 (Lucy Wrapson observes a
stylistic and technical association between the sedilia figures and the figure of St. Faith
[fig. 4.51]: this also supports my suggested date of 1303-1305 for the St. Faith
painting.)1513 Accepting all the south transept paintings as being part of these preparations
– the sedilia and wall paintings - we have a credible date of between July 8, 1307 and
February 8, 1308.

Howe notes that, unlike the St. Faith image, the white base layer of the south transept wall
paintings is confined beneath the painted figures alone;1514 the under-drawing is in bone

1505 Cambridge, University Library, MS Dd.4.17, Hours of Alice de Reydon, fol.4r.
1507 P.171-172.
1508 NA Kew E101/468/21.
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Flete was a Westminster monk between 1420-1465.)
1510 NA Kew E101/468/21.
1512 P.170.
1513 Lucy Wrapson, “The Materials and Techniques of the c.1307 Westminster Sedilia,” in Medieval
Painting in Northern Europe –Techniques, Analysis, Art History. Studies in Commemoration of the 70th
1514 Howe, “Painting and Patronage,” 12.
black rather than red, and there are no signs of the careful measurements employed in the St. Faith image.\textsuperscript{1515} What she describes as “an economy of approach...characteristic of the transept paintings,”\textsuperscript{1516} might represent the time-saving expedients required when executing a large-scale, decorative scheme to a strict deadline: Edward II’s coronation. Economy of time, but not economy of expenditure for, corresponding with the extravagances of Edward II’s preparations, expensive pigments were used to create lustrous colours.\textsuperscript{1517} Howe observes that the costly pigment \textit{lac} was used for the pink of Christ’s mantle (also used extensively in the St. Faith image), and that the red background of the \textit{Incredulity of St. Thomas} wall painting was liberally scattered with once-gilded fleur de lys.\textsuperscript{1518} These images were intended to catch the eye (including perhaps that of Eliška’s future father-in-law, Henry VII of Luxembourg, when he attended the coronation).\textsuperscript{1519} If these wall paintings were executed, as I suggest, 1307/1308, the implications may be profound for the art of the Passional.

From July 8, 1307-February 8, 1308, Westminster was full of artists as the King’s Remembrancer attests;\textsuperscript{1520} a rich centre for the development and sharing of artistic ideas, and for the strengthening of local stylistic and iconographic models and traits. Following my hypothesis, the sharing of this busy, artistic environment might account for otherwise inexplicable similarities between the Passional, the Abbey’s south-transept paintings, and works such as the De Lisle and Queen Mary Psalters,\textsuperscript{1521} as well as the passing resemblance, suggested by William Hassall, between the Passional illustrations and those of the Holkham Bible.\textsuperscript{1522} It has already been noted that Westminster artists were capable of transferring their skills from one medium to another,\textsuperscript{1523} and that traits of a wall painter’s practice are evident in the Passional illustrations.\textsuperscript{1524} If the Westminster Abbey south transept wall paintings were painted at this time they would pre-date the Passional first treatise by five years.

\textsuperscript{1515} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{1516} Ibid., 13.
\textsuperscript{1517} Ibid., 12.
\textsuperscript{1518} Ibid., 5.
\textsuperscript{1519} P.170.
\textsuperscript{1520} NA Kew, E101/468/21.
\textsuperscript{1521} Pp.59-60.
\textsuperscript{1522} London, British Library, Holkham Bible, Add. MS 47682; Hassall, \textit{The Holkham Bible}, 25; see pp.50 and 212-213.
\textsuperscript{1523} P.178.
\textsuperscript{1524} Pp.51 and 184.
Having addressed the dating of the wall paintings, attention must now be turned to dates ascribed to certain manuscripts. Even the brief comparison between examples from Peter of Poitiers’ Genealogy of Christ and the Queen Mary Psalter, and the Passional, demonstrates the resemblance not only in the “unmistakably English” technique of painting in washes, but also in style and iconography; the handling of tones in flesh and cloth; the fall of drapery as well as in figure-posture and physiognomy [fig. 4.54]. The Queen Mary Psalter is dated on stylistic grounds to c.1310-c.1320, Kathryn Smith arguing cogently for the Psalter being made for Isabella, wife of Edward II. The De Lisle Psalter’s date is perhaps more equivocal and potentially more important; it therefore requires closer consideration. To strengthen the contentions of my hypothesis, as with the south transept wall paintings, I consider it necessary to establish as tight a time-frame for the manuscript as possible. Indeed, as will be demonstrated below, the art of the Passional may even raise questions over the dating of the De Lisle Majesty Master’s illustrations.

The De Lisle Psalter’s image of the Resurrection [fig. 4.55] offers a crucially important detail that may guide towards dating the manuscript: a representation of the arms of Scotland where the colour of the embellishments has been subdued, replacing gules with sable (red with black). This not only suppresses the boldness of the emblem, indicating a night scene, but might also envisage the subjugation of the nation and express a contemporary, English perception of the Scots as evil. As will be discussed below, its inclusion may also reflect Robert De Lisle’s personal sense of injustice. As Binski writes, “Heraldry and the emblems of power were exceedingly efficient means of visually stressing that peculiar continuum between past and present, good and bad, in the thirteenth-century mind.” And in the early-fourteenth-century mind, it would seem. He observed that, in the Douce Apocalypse, the arms Gilbert de Clare feature on the pennants, alongside the traditional three-frog heraldry of Satan himself, in the illustration of Satan’s armies [fig. 4.56]. The Douce Apocalypse and De Lisle Psalter employ heraldry to

1525 London, British Library, Peter of Poitiers’ Genealogy of Christ, MS Royal 14.B.IX and Passional fol.4v (see p.202); MS Royal 2.B.VII, fol.3r and Passional fol.4r.
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1531 Binski, Westminster Abbey, 86.
1532 Bodl. MS Douce 180, p.87.
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name and shame. The Passional Master did just this when he identified the sleeping guards on fol.9r as agents for an expression of contemporary enmity by emblazoning their arms with “Jewish” embellishments and thus picking them out for vilification.\textsuperscript{1534} (The guards in the Passional \textit{Resurrection} on fol.9r - one sitting slumped with head-on-hand, the other out-stretched - are found to be mirror-images of the diminutive sleeping guards found in the \textit{Three Mariæ visiting the Tomb} on fol.9r of the Trinity College Psalter [fig. 4.57].\textsuperscript{1535} There is also much to compare between the \textit{Resurrection} images in the Passional and the Brussels Peterborough Psalter, including the angle of Christ’s flexed and abducted right hip [fig. 4.58].)\textsuperscript{1536}

When might feelings against the Scots have run high enough to warrant the incorporation of the altered arms of Scotland in a Westminster manuscript? Many bloody campaigns were fought by Edward I throughout the 1290’s culminating in the short-lived conquest of February 1304 when John Comyn, the sole-remaining guardian of Scotland, knelt before Edward I and swore allegiance: the following year William Wallace (c.1270-1305) was executed.\textsuperscript{1537} Edward I tasted brief victory over Scotland, but then, on February 10, 1306, before the altar of the Franciscan Church in Dumfries, Comyn was murdered by Robert the Bruce who was then crowned King Robert I of Scotland, March 25, 1306.\textsuperscript{1538} According to the fourteenth-century Scottish poet John Barbour, this sent Edward I “nearly out of his mind.”\textsuperscript{1539} Once again, Edward I set forth to “hammer” Scotland.\textsuperscript{1540} Robert the Bruce was defeated but fled after the Battles of Dalrigh and Methven in June 1306 only to return early in 1307; July 6 that year, Edward I died in Carlisle on his final foray against the Scots.\textsuperscript{1541} His son, Edward II, exhibited no appetite for war and only twice, totally ineffectually, raised arms against the Scots.\textsuperscript{1542}

Circumstantially, the year 1306 stands out as a possible date for the De Lisle Psalter’s production not only for the political reasons outlined above but also for the following
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\textsuperscript{1540} Edward I’s epithet “\textit{Scottorum malleus}” – hammer of the Scots: “hammer” in Hebrew is \textit{makabeh} and, in 1320, Edward I was described as “the most Maccabean king”, ibid., 377-378. Note: Westminster Painted Chamber was illustrated with scenes from Maccabees, 1 and 2, see Paul Binski, “The Painted Chamber.”\textsuperscript{1541} Morris, \textit{A Great and Terrible King}, 362.
\textsuperscript{1542} 1310-1311, when the Ordainers stepped in, he was beleaguered by Robert the Bruce but failed to engage him in battle, Dan Jones, \textit{The Plantagenets: The Kings who made England} (London, 2013), 370; the the English were comprehensively defeated by the Scots at the Battle of Bannockburn, June 23-24, 1314, ibid., 382-386.
arguments. November 1306 saw the conclusion of the long-projected marriage plans for the future Edward II and Isabella of France.\textsuperscript{1543} This achievement is possibly referenced by the top-quality background combination of the English lion with the fleur-de-lys of France of the De Lisle Crucifixion [fig. 4.59].\textsuperscript{1544} which replaces the decorative diaper patterns employed elsewhere throughout the Psalter. Perhaps even more significantly, 1306 saw the start of the rebuilding of Greyfriars, London, towards which Robert de Lisle donated several contributions, including an individual sum of £350.\textsuperscript{1545} In 1306, he was eighteen. This indicates precocious sympathies towards the Franciscan order that he fostered his entire life for c.1341 Robert de Lisle retired to Greyfriars, was ordained, died and was buried there January 4, 1344.\textsuperscript{1546} Clearly, the young man had a great deal of money at his disposal in 1306; might this also have enabled him to commission his Psalter from the then very active Westminster workshops? It should also be recalled that it was a Franciscan Church that Robert the Bruce desecrated when murdering Comyn. Did this dire act against the brotherhood he so admired provide De Lisle with a personal reason for anti-Scottish sentiment? The argument, therefore, is for the whole De Lisle Psalter manuscript to be dated c.1306: six years before the execution of the first treatise of the Passional.

One of the most extraordinary features of the Passional is the very close similarity between the fol.18r figure of Christ guiding souls to Heaven and the Christ-figure in the De Lisle Christ in Majesty, illustrated by the so-called Majesty Master [fig. 4.60].\textsuperscript{1547} Indeed, the two images are so alike as to suggest some shared knowledge: even the chosen colouration of Christ’s mantle - blue on the outside, green on the inside - is identical. It is also notable that the Christ in Majesty throne is similar to Cunegund’s on fol.1v. Sandler suggests a date c.1310 for the Madonna Master, and pre-1339 for the Majesty Master sections of the De Lisle manuscript.\textsuperscript{1548} She argues for a large time-gap in the middle of the De Lisle manuscript’s production based on her assessment that the Majesty Master’s painting style is “not conceivable before 1330”.\textsuperscript{1549} The Passional fol.18r image is confidently datable to 1314.\textsuperscript{1550} I suggest that the Majesty Master’s Christ is certainly not so different from the Passional image as to be inconceivable for another sixteen years. If less refined, all the Passional Master’s illustrations, 1312-1314, display the same exuberant, multiple, loose
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\textsuperscript{1550} Pp.28-32.
cloth-folds favoured by the Majesty Master. Added to this, the diapered grounds of both the Madonna and Majesty Master sections of the De Lisle Psalter, although traditional in format, employ common colours and designs, suggesting continuity and the probable use of the same workshop apprentices [fig. 4.61]. Although Sandler concluded, “the De Lisle Psalter was not originally intended as a collaboration,” it may represent just that. Collaborative manuscript illustration was an accepted working method of the period, acknowledged and discussed by Sandler in relation to the creation of the Brussels Peterborough Psalter. The De Lisle manuscript may have been divided to allow several artists to work on the manuscript concurrently, within a busy workshop, perhaps to ensure timely completion of the whole. The variation in styles resulting from this working method was probably of no consequence to patrons primarily desiring works of admirable quality, worthy of their spiritual and religious content. The hypothetical date of c.1306 for the commissioning of the De Lisle Psalter illuminations would position it just before the pre-coronation period of Westminster painting production. This brings it close to the suggested date for the surviving paintings within the Abbey’s sanctuary and south transept, with which all sections of the psalter share several features.

Sandler links the De Lisle Madonna Master’s style, exemplified by the Madonna and Child, with the figures of the kings on the front of the Westminster sedilia [fig. 4.62], stating that “the obvious conclusion to be drawn from these similarities is that both works were made in the same place, perhaps even by the same artist.” I suggest that there is also an apparent relationship between the disciples in the Majesty Master’s *Ascension*, fol.133v, and the heavy, flat-footed stance of Gabriel and the looping drapery and busy, tubular vertical folds of cloth in the remnants of the *Annunciation* on the back of the sedilia, dated c.1307 [fig. 4.63]. (It should be noted that St John the Evangelist, categorised as the Madonna Master’s work, on fol.132r of the De Lisle Psalter [fig. 4.59], also has similarly large, flat feet.) Binski observed that the Majesty Master is associated with stained glass produced around Paris and Rouen, 1320s and 1330s, for example in the choir ambulatory of Saint-Ouen in Rouen, executed between 1318 and 1339. If the De Lisle
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Psalter was a single production c.1306, it is not impossible that, extending my hypothesis, the Majesty Master might represent one of several artists travelling from Westminster to the continent following the cessation of English royal patronage recorded in the King’s Remembrancer between 1308-1311. The De Lisle Psalter therefore preceding the Majesty Master’s possible work in France. The Majesty Master may have moved to Rouen, just as I suggest the Passional Master may have moved to Prague. Unidentifiable to us in the surviving art, the artists named in the King’s Remembrancer as working on the coronation preparations and who may also have been involved in painting the south transept schemes, might include the names of the De Lisle Psalter artists and perhaps even the Passional Master: working together, collaborating, influenced by their surroundings and each other’s workmanship. Beyond the finely-drafted architectural features discussed above, the Passional shares many other features with Westminster-related works of art that will now be examined.

I refer to my previous comments on the English technique of applying tinted washes on a plain parchment ground which is immediately identifiable as the method employed by the Passional Master. Tinted images are a feature of the earlier, fashionable Westminster apocalypses that offer an appropriate starting point for comparison between the Passional and English art. The marginal positioning of Christ in the fol.15v Miracle on the Sea of Tiberias recalls the oft-repeated, on-looking figure of St. John the Divine in apocalypse illustrations, as an example from the Tanner Apocalypse serves to demonstrate [fig. 4.64]. (In the Passional image, simplified, cockle-shell boats bear the disciples on a cushion of stylised, schematic waves comparable to those in the Queen Mary Psalter [fig. 4.65].) A stylistic link has already been drawn between the on-looking St. John in the Douce Apocalypse and the Passional fol.4r image of God in the Creation of Eve [fig. 2.50]. Both images share the same, refined facial type and expression: note the shape of the head, the sloping eyebrows, pronounced downwards line of the mouth and moustache, and concave contour of the cheek swelling to a broad, rounded chin. Interestingly, Nigel Morgan described the Westminster Abbey, south transept wall paintings as exhibiting, “a
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more developed version of the Douce Apocalypse style with more relaxed sinuous poses.”

The two, south transept wall paintings in Westminster Abbey - the Incredulity of St. Thomas, and St. Christopher - have never previously been linked with the Passional illustrations and yet they provide essential evidence for the origins of the Passional’s art [fig. 4.48]. Comparative analysis of the treatment of figure and fabric, and facial-type, highlights details that might further secure my hypothesis. The Westminster wall paintings have deteriorated since their revelation in 1934; referring to Tristram’s copies, published in 1937, is therefore occasionally a helpful expedient [fig. 4.66].

The Passional Master’s art exhibits certain, idiosyncratic details specifically found in the art of Westminster. They are, therefore, of immense importance to my argument and play a vital role in establishing a link. The huge figure of the kneeling St. Thomas covers c.2m of the south wall of Westminster Abbey’s south transept, and the small depictions of Christ on the Mount of Olives, on fol.6r and 10r of the Passional, perhaps 8.5cm of their respective pages. Yet despite this vast size discrepancy, an irrefutable resemblance may be observed between these images [fig. 4.67]. Comparing the Westminster St. Thomas and the fol.6r Passional Christ, note the same shortened, right arm curving simply up to an open-palmed hand, and the right leg with bended knee positioned beneath the mantle; the front edge of this garment pleats in the self-same manner in both paintings and the cloth is broadly highlighted from hip to ankle; the right foot of both figures emerges from beneath the robes with the toes compressed. Particularly striking, is the similarity in the treatment of the heads [fig. 4.68]: the downward sloping eyebrows, gazing almond-shaped eyes with their whites revealed, drooping mouth and moustache, and the concave cheek and broad, round chin which has already been acknowledged as an inheritance from former Westminster masters [fig. 2.50]. The highlighted, wavy hair of both figures is plaited back over the shoulder at the neck exaggerating the backward extension of the neck and upward tilt of the face. There is also a notable resemblance between the head of Christ in the Incredulity of St. Thomas and, for example, Christ’s head on fol.18r [fig. 4.69]. The
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same flowing lines of hair running horizontally from the small forelock to fall down the neck in wide waves, the individual curls of the beard, the broad, triangular sweep of the neck up to the ear as the head is turned and tilted, may be observed. Both the broad bridge to the nose and the gaze are also comparable. It is not even beyond the realms of possibility that the Westminster and Passional figures are by the same hand.

Jan Gelasius Dobner offered the first recorded, somewhat depreciating, value-judgement on the Passional illustrations as “not inelegant, their colours lively to this day, decorated in gold.” He considered the manuscript of sufficient artistic and cultural significance to the Czech Nation to warrant its inclusion in his historical work. His description of the colours as “lively” applies today for, more than two hundred years after his appraisal, the colours remain vibrant and the paintings well-preserved. The Passional Master employs a bright, warm pink pigment throughout the manuscript which parallels the liberal use of lac in Westminster, exemplified by Christ’s mantle in the south-transept Incredulity of St. Thomas wall painting. Comparison may also be made between the now-defaced Annunciation panel in Westminster Abbey’s south transept and the same subject of fol.5v [fig. 4.70]. Mary’s right hand and the downward-flowing banner bearing Gabriel’s salutation are similar. Both the Westminster and Passional Master employ the same rich pink/red for the angel’s tunic and for Mary’s cloak, hanging in full, highlighted loops and folds. There is also a striking resemblance between the Passional fol.5v Annunciation and that depicted at the base of the Tree of Virtues in the De Lisle Psalter. The handling of the feet is very different, but the character of the piece, the disposition of Gabriel’s and Mary’s hands, and the colours of the curly-headed angels’ robes are comparable in both images [fig. 4.71].

I have observed that Westminster-related paintings frequently include a peculiarly specific, form of broad, tubular, rectangular pleat at the hem of garments. This is an evidentially important feature. Tristram’s 1937 copy of the south transept wall paintings, records this fold on the lower edge of St. Thomas’ mantle [fig. 4.72]: it is hardly discernible on the original due to deterioration of the paint surface. This is a recurring detail in the Majesty Master section of the De lisle Psalter (the hem of Mary’s robe in the scene of Pentecost provides an example); the same fold appears in Queen Mary Psalter, for example God’s
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tunic on fol.2r; and it is repeatedly present in the Passional, for example, the hem of the villain as he kneels on fol.3v and on the lower image fol.7v [fig. 4.73]. Indeed, the Passional Master includes this characteristic, tubular hem-fold in no less than twenty-one of the Passional illustrations: sometimes several times within one image. Other detail-comparisons to be made between the wall paintings and the Passional illustrations include the hand of Christ grasping the cross-topped staff in the Incredulity of St. Thomas wall painting which is similar to that of Cunegund holding her crosier on fol.1v [fig. 4.74]. Comparison may also be made between Christ’s left foot in the wall painting and on fol.18r [fig. 4.75]. Both examples exhibit characteristically slim, long toes, and a three-quarter view of the dorsum of the foot on an extended ankle, also found in the Thornham Parva Retable and the depiction of Christ’s left foot in the De Lisle Psalter Christ in Majesty [fig. 4.76].

Looking more closely at the robes of the huge figure of St. Christopher (which has already been held up against the same image in the Hours of Alice de Reydon [fig. 4.53]), it is found to compare with several Passional examples, where the lie of the mantle is almost identical. (Due to deterioration of the image, once again Tristram’s copy provides a helpful resource.) Examples include Christ’s mantle on fol.14v, and even more particularly St. John the Evangelist’s on the same page [fig. 4.77]. The fabric hangs in folds, running to a point over the bent, right arm; then smoothly loops across the front of the body creating a semi-circle with a fold of cloth within; beneath this, a column of pleated cloth hangs down in a pronounced triangle ending just above the hemline in another point.

The Christ-child’s pose in the St. Christopher wall painting also appears to provide highly specific evidence for a link between Westminster and the Passional Master’s art. This is seen when examined beside the Passional’s fol.17r figure of St. John the Evangelist [fig. 4.78]. This precise posture appears particularly favoured in the art of Westminster, making an appearance in the sculptures on the artistically-influential tombs of Aveline de Forz, and Edmund Crouchback. H.A. Tummers describes how, “The angels… are sitting on their buttocks…with bent knees and one leg crossing the other and the sole of the foot showing towards the spectator.” This pose is also replicated in ten of the eighteen illustrated
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pages ascribed to the Madonna Master in the De Lisle Psalter [fig. 4.79].\textsuperscript{1584} It appears three times in the Passional: St. John the Evangelist, at Pentecost (fol.17r); the Jew drawing lots (fol.8r), and the figure of the sleeping St. James, in the lower fol.6r illustration (where Christ so closely resembles St. Thomas of the south transept wall painting). Tristram wrote of the wall paintings in 1937: “It is clear that they are the productions of a somewhat lesser master, working with slight mannerisms personal to himself, but evidently influenced by what had been done before him.”\textsuperscript{1585} The many, mutual “slight mannerisms” that are also to be found in the Passional represent a demonstrable association between Westminster and the manuscript created in Prague.

There are further points of artistic convergence to be explored in Westminster manuscripts: the De Lisle and Queen Mary Psalters, and others. General stylistic and iconographic similarities, obvious to the viewer, will not be dwelt on as I shall concentrate on those details that offer further support and evidence for my hypothesis. The first evidence, however, for the Passional Master employing an identifiable “Westminster” draughting style, comes from a different and somewhat unusual quarter: sketched, votive figures, dated to the early 1290s,\textsuperscript{1586} etched into the underside of Henry III’s effigy-plate. A study of draperies, to the left of the group of female devotees, closely compares with the Passional Master’s handling, for example, God’s robes (fol.4r) [fig. 4.80]. The posture and flowing gowns of the etched females make an interesting match with both the gathering of nuns on fol.1v and the fol.3v sponsa [fig. 4.81]; note, the fol.3v sponsus has already been identified as a stock image.\textsuperscript{1587} It appears that the Passional Master developed a range of images closely modelled on and sharing iconography with English prototypes. This will be clearly demonstrated below.

There is a close parallel between the Passional fol.4r Creation of Eve and an illustration in an early-fourteenth-century English manuscript-roll of Peter of Poitiers’ Genealogy of Christ [fig. 4.82].\textsuperscript{1588} In both images, Adam strikes a classical pose, resting his head almost nonchalantly on his left hand; the foreshortening of the right arm is particularly well-observed in the Passional example. The Queen Mary Psalter’s handling of the same subject

\textsuperscript{1584} BL MS Arundel 83.II, fols.124r,125r,125v,126v,127v,128v,129v,131v,132v,133v (fol.127v in [fig. 4.79]).
\textsuperscript{1585} Tristram, “A Recent Discovery,” 230.
\textsuperscript{1586} Binski, Westminster Abbey, 170.
\textsuperscript{1587} P.100.
\textsuperscript{1588} London, British Library, Peter of Poitiers’ Genealogy of Christ, MS Add 14819, roll; note, this is not the roll of the same name, BL Royal 14.B.IX, roll, referred to on pp.190-191 and 200.
not only employs similar shading in sepia washes, \textsuperscript{1589} but also a comparable pose with Adam’s legs crossed above the ankles. \textsuperscript{1590} As in the Passional fol.4r image, he reclines on a rising hillock created by soft, daubs of washed colour; the artist employs similar iconography to that used in the Ramsey Psalter [fig. 4.83]. \textsuperscript{1591} Unusually, possibly occasioned by the constraints of space, the Passional Eve’s head emerges from Adam’s rib. Of particular note is the already-observed, extraordinary likeness - almost exact mirror-images from below the waist \textsuperscript{1592} - between the figures of Adam and Eve on the fol.4v illustration of the *Temptation of Adam and Eve* and in a Peter of Poitiers’ Genealogy of Christ from the last quarter of the thirteenth century [fig. 4.84]. \textsuperscript{1593} (Several images are mirror-images of their comparators, as noted in the illustrative figures, suggesting that, at some point, models were traced.) Also, of interest here [fig. 4.84] is the similarity in colour-choice. These images are so alike - note in particular the line of the legs and feet - that the English example might even be considered an earlier work by the same artist [fig. 4.54]. This comparison, at the very least, provides a crucial example of the Passional Master draughting his images after an English model and incorporating them into his repertoire.

Before leaving this particular comparison, a commonality should be noted between the segmented bodies of both female serpents and the tree-trunks with their stylised fruit and foliage, and cut-off branches. Schematic, imaginative tree-depictions appear a feature of English Decorative Style, also represented by the De Lisle Psalter *Tree of Vices*; \textsuperscript{1594} a similar, ornamental tree also appears in the contemporary Genealogical Chronicle of the English Kings [fig. 4.85]. \textsuperscript{1595} Another English tree-type - small and stunted with densely-packed leaves - is represented in the now-lost wall painting of *The Story of Abimelech* from the Painted Chamber of the Palace of Westminster. Counterparts to this tree-type are found on fols.6r and 10r of the Passional [fig. 4.86]. There are six Passional examples with trefoil, heart-shaped and oak leaves (fols.3r, 4r, 5r, 5v, 6r, 10r), three of which are depicted on representations of the Mount of Olives (fols.3r, 6r, 10r). Branches are sawn from the tree in the image of the *Creation of Eve* on fol.4r, as, for example, in the image of the *First

\textsuperscript{1589} P. 52.
\textsuperscript{1590} BL MS Royal 2.B.VII, fol.3r.
\textsuperscript{1591} PML M.302, fol.1r.
\textsuperscript{1592} First presented in a paper: “Cunegund - ‘Bartered Bride’ and ‘Bride of Christ’”, in the section *The Construction of the Other in Medieval Europe*, at the 11th Congress of Czech Historians, Olomouc, October 2017.
\textsuperscript{1593} BL Royal 14.B.IX, roll; pp.190-191.
\textsuperscript{1594} BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.128v.
\textsuperscript{1595} London, British Library, Genealogical Chronicle of the English Kings, MS Royal 14.B.vi, roll.
Seal, in the Douce Apocalypse [fig. 4.87].\textsuperscript{1596} The Passional’s expelled Adam and Eve (fol.5r), modestly hold oak branches the leaves of which compare with those in the Douce Apocalypse image of the Great Whore [fig. 4.88].\textsuperscript{1597}

There are further startling examples linking the Passional Master’s drawings with English equivalents and suggesting common model-sources. The female figures on the right in the scene of Christ appearing to Mary his Mother compare directly with the Queen Mary Psalter’s Virgin Saints [fig. 4.89];\textsuperscript{1598} these Virgin Saints also resemble the Passional illustration of Widows, in the fol.22v Heavenly Mansions of the Blessed - two of the female figures are again almost identical [fig. 4.90]. It should also be noted that the Passional Widows are positioned beneath a run of arches, resembling the sanctuary-facing Westminster sedilia panels and those framing scenes in the Brussels Peterborough Psalter [fig. 4.91].\textsuperscript{1599} There are also likenesses to be found in male figures: the Apostles and Disciples in the Queen Mary Psalter and the Passional Prophets and Apostles, from the fol.22v Heavenly Mansions of the Divine, are nearly identical [fig. 4.92].\textsuperscript{1600} In the depiction of angels, the diminutive, winged soul, floating in the direction indicated by Christ’s pointing finger, resembles the mandorla-supporting angel of the Assumption of the Virgin image in a contemporary Religious Miscellany from the Westminster, Queen Mary Psalter Master’s circle.\textsuperscript{1601} this similarity is seen again in the Passional’s fol.20r tumbling virtues [fig. 4.93]. The Grieving Virgin, on fol.11r, her head bowed by grief, rests her left cheek tenderly upon the back of her left hand, as if recalling her physical contact with Christ’s arm at the Deposition (fol.8v). Her pose is identical to the similarly-veiled Virgin in the Gough Psalter’s Crucifixion [fig. 4.94].\textsuperscript{1602} The equally poignant fol.16v image of the Christ embracing his Mother reminded Jan Květ of the Brussels Peterborough Psalter’s depiction of Mary greeting Elizabeth,\textsuperscript{1603} where even the colour and lie of clothing is comparable: a comparison that may be extended to include the same subject in the De Lisle Psalter [fig. 4.95].\textsuperscript{1604} In both the Passional and De Lisle examples, the artists have depicted a supporting hand on each shoulder as one figure urgently steps forwards.\textsuperscript{1605} The

\textsuperscript{1596} Eg. Bodl. MS Douce 180, p.13.
\textsuperscript{1597} Eg. Ibid., p.72; Oak leaves signified “majesty and immortality”, Eileen Roberts, The Wall Paintings of St. Albans Abbey (St. Albans, 1993), 29.
\textsuperscript{1598} BL MS Royal 2.B.VII, fol.309r.
\textsuperscript{1599} BR MS 9961-62, fol.24r.
\textsuperscript{1600} BL MS Royal 2.B.VII, fol.306r.
\textsuperscript{1601} Ibid., p.72; Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce MS 79, fol.3r.
\textsuperscript{1602} Bodl. MS Gough liturgy.8, fol.61r.
\textsuperscript{1603} Květ, Iluminované rukopisy, 243.
\textsuperscript{1604} BR MS 9961-62, fol.10r; BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.129v.
\textsuperscript{1605} In the De lisle image, the white hands blend with the veil but are visible on close scrutiny.
Passional Master has drawn the figures closer together in a sensuously intimate pose designed to elicit an emotional response from the observer and, no doubt, fulfilling Cunegund’s expectations from such an image.

The Passional Master’s handling of the Crucifixion is central to further discussion of figure and posture. In French images, Christ’s arms are often raised high, his hands nailed vertically to the cross, his loin cloth wrapped tightly around his thighs and sometimes knotted to one side, and his legs arranged so that the heel of his right foot juts out to his left [fig. 4.96]. The Passional has two images of the Crucifixion: the still-living Christ is pictured on fol.8r, and on fol.8v the dead weight of his body sags on outstretched arms. These two illustrations employ the same iconography as the De Lisle Psalter Crucifixion [fig. 4.97]. Both masters display the same looping of the loincloth with dangling, loose ends; both of their images of Christ exhibit a similar anatomical structure with the concave dip of his limp body; the out-stretched arms are pinned wide, defining the arm pit and exposing the swell and curve of his arm muscles; and the hands curl around the nails. These images also exhibit exactly the same disposition of the legs: running parallel to one another, the left knee prominently exposed, and the left foot twisted and inverted, trapped and pressed beneath the right. The Thornham Parva Retable Crucifixion shares this same leg posture. Here, Christ is crowned with thorns, as in the Passional images [fig. 4.98]. (The Thornham Parva Retable figure of St. John the Evangelist, swathed in his convoluted mantle, may also be compared with the fol.8r Evangelist.) The crucified Christ in the Queen Mary Psalter is also very similar to the Passional examples and, significantly, as on fol.8r, includes the drawing of lots at the foot of the cross [fig. 4.99]. It was noted that the rubric title of the fol.8r Crucifixion takes the from of a conversation between the Virgin and Christ: it is interesting to note that the Westminster Queen Mary Psalter also includes dialogue in its titles. The Queen Mary Psalter is also notable for depicting Christ in a full-length, blue robe (representing the seamless robe) in the depiction of Christ carrying the Cross, rather than depicting him near-naked as, for example on the Marnhull
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1606 P.65.
1607 Eg., Tournai, Bibliothèque de la Ville, Missal of Tournai, MS 12(9), fol.76r; Paris, Bibliothèque national de France, Missal of Saint-Denis, MS lat.1107, fol.209v.
1608 BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.132r.
1609 In the Thornham Parva Retable Crucifixion, Christ’s hands and loincloth, however, follow the French convention.
1610 BL MS Royal 2.B.VII, fol.256v.
1612 Stanton, Queen Mary Psalter, 30.
Orphrey. Christ is similarly depicted in his blue robe on fol.7v of the Passional: the page facing the first image of *Crucifixion* [fig. 4.100].\textsuperscript{1613}

Some further attention must be paid to the Passional Master’s handling of draperies, bearing in mind the remarkable affiliation between the treatment of cloth on the figure of the fol.18r Christ and the De Lisle Majesty Master’s *Christ in Majesty* [fig. 4.60] to which I have already alluded.\textsuperscript{1614} Comparisons are also to be made with the Madonna Master’s work. Christ’s voluminous loincloth, depicted on fols.8r and 8v, demonstrates the Passional Master’s enthusiasm for repetitive, fine folds also seen in the Madonna Master’s De Lisle *Crucifixion* [fig. 4.97]. In the scenes of the Flagellation, the respective masters both kilt Christ’s loincloth into many, highlighted (and impossible) folds, appearing the more extravagant in contrast to Christ’s naked torso [fig. 4.101]. The attendant beaters have similarly disposed leg positions: note also, the attendants thrashing with the same over-head action. Both masters also apply the same tilt to Christ’s head.\textsuperscript{1615} Further similarities may be noted in other English manuscript Flagellation images, for example that in a late-thirteenth-century Canticles, Hymns and Passion of Christ in St. John’s College Cambridge, and in the Brussels Peterborough Psalter [fig. 4.102].\textsuperscript{1616}

The De Lisle Psalter, and other contemporary English works, share two, further and very particular details with the Passional: the first is the depiction of a distinctive, loose, forward-hanging pleat at the neck of the tunic, and the second takes the form of a short, triangular, column of fabric, folded into pleats and often flipped over the shoulder or arm, hanging down to end in a neat dagger-point. I have found no previous reference highlighting these distinctive artistic details despite their prevalence in Westminster-associated works of art. Several examples of the neck-pleat are found in the De Lisle Psalter, for example in the scene of *Christ before Pilate*;\textsuperscript{1617} it also features in La Estoire de Seint Aedward le Rei and other works including the Gough Psalter. These examples may all be compared with the same detail on the seamless tunic on fol.3r of the Passional [fig. 4.103].\textsuperscript{1618} The Passional has no less than thirteen examples of this detail (fols.3v, 4r, 6v, 7v, 9r x3, 15v x5, 20r). Five examples are demonstrated on fol.15v alone [fig. 4.104]. Christ’s mantle on fol.18r displays the second, similarly identifying device of a triangle of

\textsuperscript{1613} Ibid., fol.253r; p.121.
\textsuperscript{1614} Pp.193-195; fol.10r and BL. MS Arundel 83.II, fol.130r.
\textsuperscript{1615} Passional fol.7r and BL. MS Arundel 83.II, fol.125r.
\textsuperscript{1616} Cambridge, St. John’s College, Canticles, Hymns and Passion of Christ, MS 262(K.21), fol.51r and BR MS 9961-62, fol.48r.
\textsuperscript{1617} BL. MS Arundel 83.II, fol.125r.
\textsuperscript{1618} UL Cam. MS Ee.3.59, fol.25v and Bodl. MS Gough liturgy.8, fol.23r, respectively.
pleated, draped cloth. This example bears a particularly remarkable resemblance to an image of Moses in the Queen Mary Psalter [fig. 4.105].\textsuperscript{1619} Many Westminster-related sources demonstrate this artistic trait, with examples not only in manuscripts such as the Douce Apocalypse,\textsuperscript{1620} but also within Westminster Abbey itself, including the cloth falling over the knee of the sculpted angel at the head of Aveline’s effigy, and over the arm of the old king in the Westminster sedilia panel, viewed from the sanctuary [fig. 4.106].

The mantle end over the shoulder of the Passional Christ on the Mount of Olives (fol.10r) compares well with that of Gabriel in the De Lisle Psalter Annunciation\textsuperscript{1621} - note how similar the painting of the mantles is in these examples - and in a near-contemporary Office of the Dead and an Hours of the Virgin [fig. 4.107].\textsuperscript{1622} Excellent comparisons may also be made between the triangular white cloths draped over the edge of the Virgin’s tomb in the Passional fol.17r Dormition illustration, and the De Lisle Psalter Nativity and Three Maries visiting the Tomb [fig. 4.108].\textsuperscript{1623}

In the over-whelming majority of the Passional illustrations, the artist portrays females wearing white veils, with one end swept across the front of the neck and over the shoulder, as in the Coronation of the Virgin on fol.20r.\textsuperscript{1624} This detail is shared with works created by the circle of the Queen Mary Psalter Master, as in examples of the same subject from the Psalter of Hugh of Stukeley and the Hours of Alice de Reydon [fig. 4.109].\textsuperscript{1625} In the Coronation of the Virgin at the top of fol.22v, the Passional Master dresses the Virgin’s head with a white veil which falls straight down to her shoulders.\textsuperscript{1626} This is one of several similarities that will be noted between this image and an English Coronation of the Virgin from the end of the thirteenth century, now in the Fitzwilliam Museum.\textsuperscript{1627} The De Lisle Madonna Master also portrays this form of headdress [fig. 4.110].\textsuperscript{1628}

There are many stylistic and iconographic correspondences between the above examples of images of the Coronation of the Virgin. This was a subject particularly popular in England:

\textsuperscript{1619} BL MS Royal 2.B.VII, fol.24r.
\textsuperscript{1620} Bodl. MS Douce 180, p.5.
\textsuperscript{1621} Ibid., fol.129r.
\textsuperscript{1622} Cambridge, University Library, Offices of the Dead and Hours of the Virgin, MS Dd.8.2, fol.27v.
\textsuperscript{1623} BL MS Arundel 83.II, fols.124r and 133r.
\textsuperscript{1624} Pp.57-58.
\textsuperscript{1625} Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Psalter of Hugh of Stukeley, MS 53, fol.11v and UL Cam. MS Dd.4.17, fol.9v, respectively.
\textsuperscript{1627} Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, MS 370, fol.1v.
\textsuperscript{1628} E.g., BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.124r.
in manuscripts, on walls of churches,\textsuperscript{1629} and on works of opus anglicanum.\textsuperscript{1630} There are three Coronation of the Virgin images in the Passional (fols.17v, 20r, 22v) excluding the fol.3v Crowning of the Bride which borrows from the iconography. On fols.17v and fol.20r, Christ is depicted in the act of crowning: standard imagery found, for example, in the Hours of Alice de Reydon and the Psalter of Hugh of Stukeley [fig. 4.111].\textsuperscript{1631} The disposition of Mary’s robes, on fol.20r, is particularly similar to the former example; Christ’s robes, to the latter. In these Passional examples, Christ holds a sceptre in his left hand: a symbol of kingship and dominion possibly added at Cunegund’s behest and perhaps symbolic of ultimate union with the King of Kings. The fols.17v and 22v examples recall not only the double-bay structures of the Pienza and Toledo copes but also those in the Brussels Peterborough Psalter [fig. 4.112].\textsuperscript{1632} The Pienza cope illustrates Christ in the act of crowning, as on fol.17v; the Toledo cope and the image on fol.22v both show Christ raising his hand in benediction over the already-crowned Virgin: a gesture symbolic of salvation completed. The same iconography is also employed in the Ramsey Psalter,\textsuperscript{1633} where both figures are seated upon a single-cushioned throne beneath an over-riding, ogee arch decorated with remarkably similar, leafy crockets [fig. 4.113], and in the Toledo cope and Fitzwilliam illustration referred to above [fig. 4.114].\textsuperscript{1634} In the latter, as in the Passional fols.1v and 20r, they sit on a plaid cushion. All these examples show Mary gesturing with hands apart suggesting an interactive relationship with Christ. Note how closely the figures, on the Toledo cope in particular, compare with those on fol.22v - the Virgin’s veil, the lie and colour of her mantle, Christ’s pose and the hang of his robes. Several Passional images, including Cunegund on fol.1v, depict mantle-folds falling over both knees: fols.1r, 3r, 5r, 6r, (8r), 17r, 17v, 20r, 22r. The uppermost folds almost appear to create their own layer of drapery: the image of God in the Queen Mary Psalter characteristically exemplifies this [fig. 4.115].\textsuperscript{1635} In the De Lisle Majesty Master’s Coronation of the Virgin,\textsuperscript{1636} the folds of cloth over the Virgin’s left leg similarly create three lines down from the knee, as in Cunegund’s fol.1v portrait: both depict a triangular toe of a black slipper peeping from below the gown [fig. 4.116].

\textsuperscript{1629} Rosewell, 322, cites ten surviving wall painting examples.
\textsuperscript{1631} UL Cam. MS Dd.4.17, fol.9v and CC Corpus Christi MS 53, fol.11v, respectively.
\textsuperscript{1632} BR MS 9961-62, fol.13r; p.183
\textsuperscript{1633} PML M.302, fol.4r.
\textsuperscript{1634} FM Cam. MS 370, fol.1v; p.206.
\textsuperscript{1635} BL MS Royal 2.B.VII, fol.2v.
\textsuperscript{1636} BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.134v
The wavy treatment of the Virgin’s hair in both the Fitzwilliam and, more specifically, the Ramsey Psalters’ *Coronation of the Virgin* may be compared to that of the Passional sponsa and Eve on fols.3v and 4v respectively [fig. 4.117]. The almond eyes and small, smiling mouth of the Fitzwilliam Virgin and Passional Eve are also particularly comparable. The Passional Master’s Eve is conspicuously close in style to William Torel’s exceptional, gilt-bronze Queen Eleanor tomb-effigy, installed in Westminster Abbey in 1292 [fig. 4.118]. Eleanor’s hair is stylised in even waves that swell to their broadest point at ear-level then ripple away over her shoulders, exactly as in the depiction of Eve on fol.4v. Torel provided the nation’s artists with the principal model of female beauty. Despite some idealisation, this, and a similar effigy for Henry III’s adjacent tomb, certainly capture a degree of portraiture, possessing physiognomic nuances that suggest Torel was not merely following a generic format, although he appears to have striven to bestow upon his queen a beatific, Madonna-like expression. He would, presumably, have had reference to her embalmed body. It is likely that royal funerary practices were the same for earlier Plantagenets as for Edward III. Ian Mortimer reports how the king’s body was “embalmed ‘with balsam and other perfumes and oil to stop it from putrifying’…His death-mask was made so that his true likeness…would be preserved for eternity. This was fixed to a wooden effigy carried at his funeral, dressed in his clothes and shown off, and was later used as a model for his gilt-bronze monumental tomb.” Binski believes the “cire perdue” method was employed for Torel’s tomb effigies. This required a wax figurine from which to work; model-making is similarly required of film draughtsmen today. Alexander of Abingdon was paid in 1293 for three wax models of Queen Eleanor, to be cast by William of Suffolk, for her tomb in Lincoln and her heart burial in Blackfriars. Her image was replicated again and again on the many Eleanor crosses. These multiple, complimentary images of the queen created, probably consciously, a template for an artistic vision of sanctified loveliness not only pleasing to the king, but that subsequently informed the female image in art. Note the oval face with its broad forehead framed by even waves of hair, the smoothly arching eyebrows rising from a long, straight
nose, the small, sweet mouth set above a wide, deep chin, and the resultant calm, restful expression. These are recognisable features found not only in the De Lisle Madonna, but also in the Passional fol.1v nuns, Eve on fol.4v, and the Virgin Mary on fol.6r [fig. 4.119]. Indeed, those female figures in the Passional not expressing high emotion, but at peace, all conform to these criteria. (There is also some correlation between head shape and facial features of the nuns on fol.1v and those sketched in a manuscript in Christ’s College, Cambridge, considered by Michael Michael to relate to the De Lisle Psalter [fig. 4.120].) Just as the model of Eleanor’s hair appears replicated on the fol.4v Eve, so her companion, Adam, portrays “ideal,” courtly youth with tidy, styled, wavy hair and curled dorlott, as sported by the young king painted on the sanctuary-side of the Westminster sedilia, and on a contemporary gravestone found on the site of the Bank of England [fig. 4.121].

It has been observed that several Passional figures are depicted wearing contemporary, courtly dress. The soldier on fol.6v wears a shallow, medieval helmet over a mail coif, finding his match on an opus anglicanum altar-front. In both these examples, the mail mittens are pulled down over the hands as the soldiers engage in brutal acts. The brass of Sir William de Setvans, demonstrates how these were worn when a soldier stood down [fig. 4.122]. Christ’s short, work-a-day, pilgrim tunic on fol.15r has already been noted as typical of the period and, like St. John the Evangelist in Westminster Abbey’s much-revered miracle-legend illustrated in La Estoire de Seint Aedward le Rei, Christ is thus fully disguised. In La Estoire de Seint Aedward le Rei, however, St. John, whose pilgrim hat is pushed back over his shoulders, wears “biblical dress” (ie. robes and bare feet). Road to Emmaus images often depict Christ wearing the broad-brimmed Pilgrim hat, specifically designed to throw off rain, but, like St. John, in “biblical dress” as in the Brussels Peterborough Psalter [fig. 4.123].

The Passional Master incorporated Czech court fashion into his illustrations, however I propose that he imported certain mannered hand-postures that characteristically belonged
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1645 E.g., BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.131v.
1646 Male physiognomy has been discussed above, pp.83, 118, 197-199, 121.
1647 Cambridge, Christ’s College, MS 1, Peter Lombard’s ‘On the Sentences’, sketches.
1649 P.82.
1651 UL Cam. MS Ee.3.59, fol.30r.
1652 P.149.
1653 P.54.
1654 BR MS 9961-62, fol.73v.
to the court of Westminster, and that may be seen as an identifying hallmark in many paintings associated with the English royal court. The affected, somewhat effeminate, hand-gestures would almost certainly have been adopted, as in the use of white gloves, to distinguish the elite: those so cultivated as not to be required to use, or soil, their hands. As part of court manners and etiquette, this affectation would no doubt have been further cultivated by that lover of luxury and frivolity, Edward II, and his famously foppish companions. Artists appear to have transferred these postures into their art, originally to convey the characteristics of divinity, sanctity and nobility. Note the exaggerated finger positions and the limp wrist of the sedilia young king, and St. Edmund on the Thornham Parva Retable [fig. 4.124]. Such hand-postures already featured in the Westminster Retable but by the time they are introduced into the De Lisle Psalter images, they had taken on a distinctive, taut, spidery character seen in many related works of art, and were even applied to less worthy figures [fig. 4.125]. It is just such a hand-posture that the Passional Master depicts in the spreading, stiffly-held fingers of the announcing Gabriel grasping the lily sceptre, on fol.5v of the Passional: almost identical to the tormented Christ’s hand holding the reed sceptre in the De Lisle Psalter [fig. 4.126]. Similarly, the Passional Master’s depiction of God’s fingers raised in blessing on fol.5r, those of Gabriel on fol.5v, and the pointing finger of Christ on fol.18r, all find their match in the gesture of Gabriel in the De Lisle Psalter, the hand of St. John the Baptist on the Thornham Parva Retable, and the old king on the Westminster sedilia [fig. 4.127].

A useful stylistic and iconographic comparison may be made between the Nativity on fol.5r of the Passional, and the same subject in the De Lisle Psalter, the Hours of Alice de Reydon and the contemporary Religious Miscellany [fig. 4.128]. The examples in the Hours and the Miscellany present a comparably absorbed, Phrygian-capped Joseph, T-shaped stick in hand, watching the Virgin whose white veil, as in the Passional, wraps across her neck. The Miscellany, like the Passional, sets the scene against a plain parchment background. Interestingly, the De Lisle and Passional images (both potentially under Franciscan influence and therefore possibly referencing the Meditations’ account
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1655 Eg., the kings on the Westminster sedilia panels; the three kings, BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.124r; in mystery plays God wore white gloves to symbolize his divinity, Roberts, The Wall Paintings, 29; bishops also wore white gloves, Durand, Rationale, 185.
1657 BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.125r.
1658 Ibid., fol.129r.
1659 UL Cam. MS Dd.4.17, fol.6r and Bodl. MS Douce MS 79, fol.2v.
1660 P.58.
referred to above)\textsuperscript{1661} depict the beasts arranging the hay in the crib with their mouths beneath a similar, gilded star.\textsuperscript{1662} Although reversed, the De Lisle and Passional donkeys are outstandingly alike. The composition of fol.15r’s \textit{Supper at Emmaus} also compares with that in the De Lisle Psalter,\textsuperscript{1663} both images presenting Christ in the act of breaking bread: half a loaf in each hand. (The fish in the De Lisle image have their counterpart on the grill in the Passional fol.15v [fig. 4.129].) In the Passional image, however, Christ turns to his neighbour, informally interacting with him, rather than challenging the viewer of the manuscript with a direct gaze. At the Passional’s homelier feast, the central position is occupied not by a chalice, as in the De Lisle Psalter, but by a bowl of food.\textsuperscript{1664}

The image of the \textit{Supplicant Nun} on fol.7v, already observed as having employed noli me tangere iconography, is similar to the image of that subject in, for example, the Ramsey Psalter.\textsuperscript{1665} There is, however, an even closer iconographic match between the Gough Psalter’s \textit{Incredulity of St. Thomas},\textsuperscript{1666} and the Passional fol.7v image [fig. 4.130]: both depict Christ, with an uplifted, outstretched arm, displaying his side wound. In a curiously reciprocal iconographic twist, it may be observed that the Passional Master transposes Christ’s bent-arm pose, used in the De Lisle Psalter \textit{Noli me tangere}, into the Passional’s fol.15v \textit{Incredulity of St. Thomas} [fig. 4.131].\textsuperscript{1667}

Other Passional scenes introduce further, unusual and arresting comparisons. The oppressed fol.3v sponsa, being pressed into her flaming tower, may be examined alongside a late-thirteenth-century panel depiction of \textit{Synagogue} removed from York Minster chapter house [fig. 4.132]. As with the south transept wall paintings, there is a vast discrepancy in dimensions: the York \textit{Synagogue} measures 2.83m, the Passional sponsa a mere c.4.5cm. Both females are subjugated, cowed and blindfolded, with tumbling, \textit{fleuron} crowns;\textsuperscript{1668} in both images, their heads are bowed and quartered turned, a blindfold tied over wavy hair that ripples down neck and shoulder as in other already identified English examples.\textsuperscript{1669} Binski judged that the York \textit{Synagogue} “cannot be matched closely in monumental

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1661} P.111.
\item \textsuperscript{1662} BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.124r.
\item \textsuperscript{1663} Ibid, fol.133v.
\item \textsuperscript{1664} P.150.
\item \textsuperscript{1665} PML MS M.302, fol.3v.
\item \textsuperscript{1666} Bodl. MS Gough liturgy.8, fol.109r.
\item \textsuperscript{1667} BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.133v.
\item \textsuperscript{1668} P.97.
\item \textsuperscript{1669} Pp.205-206.
\end{itemize}
English work of the period.” Nevertheless, the artist employs one of the now-familiar, curiously-affected hand poses discussed above, as the fingers of Synagogue’s left hand spread in a characteristically spidery fan. Had the York artist worked in Westminster, or was he emulating the art of the court? The subsequent fol.3v scene of Christ the Lover-knight on his charging mount, makes an interesting comparison with a similarly subtly-tinted illustration by the previous generation of London artists, Christ the True and Faithful Rider in the Tanner Apocalypse [fig. 4.133]. The horse in the Passional swishes its tail with added vigour, but otherwise the dappled steeds with their knightly riders are strikingly similar.

Toussaint looked to English marginal manuscript painting when considering the image of Betrothal in the fol.3v parable sequence, perceptively comparing it with a vignette in the Ormesby Psalter [fig. 4.134]. The figures curve towards one-another as a large ring is proffered; the noblemen in both images have fashionably slit robes. It is interesting to note that ring-imagery also had a specific association with Westminster. In the legend of St. Edward, he presents a ring to St. John the Evangelist who is disguised as a pilgrim. This all-important gesture was held to symbolise St. Edward’s sanctity, and was consequently often repeated in Westminster Abbey’s decoration. It was also illustrated in La Estoire de Seint Aedward le Rei [fig. 4.123]. Two representations survive in Westminster Abbey’s south transept, already highlighted as a location for the possible absorption of artistic influences. The first is on the westerly, south transept sedilia panels - the damaged figure of St. Edward offering the ring has survived the vagaries of passing centuries, saved by his royal status, but the saintly figure of St. John has been obliterated: a victim of protestant iconoclasm; the second is stationed directly above the south transept wall paintings - two large, mid-thirteenth-century, sculpted figures of the saints play out the drama, leaning from the jambs between the three window arches and pressing into the space of the transept beyond as they reach across an impossible void to give and receive a ring [fig. 4.135].

---

1671 Pp.207-208.
1672 Bodl. MS Tanner 184, Tanner Apocalypse, p.67.
1673 Toussaint, 93 n. 48, offers these as examples of Christ conquering evil with a lance, but draws no stylistic analogy.
1674 Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Douce 366, Ormesby Psalter, fol.131r; Toussaint, 91.
1675 Binski, Westminster Abbey, 55, notes that Aelred of Rievaulx’s Vita sancti Edvardi introduced this legend. Cunegund included Aelred’s writings in the earliest gifted volume, 1301, MS XIII.E.14c.
1676 UL Cam. MS Ee.3.59, fol.26r; (also ibid., fol.30r, in statuettes by St. Edward’s shrine.)
1677 Pp.190 and 195.
1678 See Binski, Westminster Abbey, 74.
Among the Passion Instruments displayed on fol.10r, discussed above,\(^{1679}\) is the arresting image of the *Veronica*.\(^{1680}\) Morgan highlights the Veronica’s particular popularity in second-half-of-the-thirteenth-century English art, including two versions produced by Matthew Paris in his *Chronica Majora*.\(^{1681}\) Especially noteworthy, however, is the remarkable similarity between the Passional image and the opus Anglicanum version on the Bologna cope [fig. 4.136]. Beyond the image of the Veronica, however, the Passional reveals a fascinating possible link with Westminster Abbey and its treasured collection of holy relics that were displayed at the Shrine of St. Edward the Confessor - each carrying indulgences that could be bestowed upon the viewer.\(^{1682}\) Any medieval artist working in Westminster Abbey would be aware of these.\(^{1683}\) Remarkably, fols.3r and 10r illustrate ten of the Abbey relics listed by John Flete his chronicle,\(^{1684}\) and again by John Dart in 1730.\(^{1685}\) These include (underlining has been added to clarify) the “great part of holy cross inclosed in a certain one, particularly beautify’d and distinguish’d;…great part of one of the *Nails* of our Saviour’s Cross; part of his undivided Garment; of the *Spunge*, *Launce*, and *Scourge*, with which he was tortur’d;…*cloth* that bound his Head;…*soil or rocks* of the Mountains of Golgotha and Calvary.”\(^{1686}\) In addition, Westminster Abbey possessed, “rust of our *Saviour’s knife*”,\(^{1687}\) which may be presumed to be the circumcision knife, and which is illustrated on both Passional *Andachtsbilder*; and *blood* from Christ’s side wound, a dominant feature of fol.10r’s image.\(^{1688}\) The Passional fol.17r *Ascension* distinguishes itself by illustrating Christ’s *footprints* on the ground. Dart describes Westminster as possessing: “another famous Relick, viz. the Marble-Stone whereon our Saviour stood at his Ascension, and which bare the marks of his Footsteps.”\(^{1689}\) Binski describes the, “well-developed English tradition of imaging the Ascension itself,”\(^{1690}\) exemplified by Matthew Paris’ illustration in the *Chronica Majora of passus Christi* [fig. 4.137].\(^{1691}\) The footprints

---

\(^{1679}\) Pp.136-145 and 149-150.

\(^{1680}\) Pp.142-143.


\(^{1683}\) Guerry, in Binski and Guerry, “Seats, Relics,” 191, mentions the specific relationship between south transept wall paintings and two of the Abbey relics.

\(^{1684}\) Flete, *Flete’s History*, 68-71.


\(^{1686}\) Ibid., 37.

\(^{1687}\) Ibid., 36.


\(^{1691}\) Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Historia Anglorum, Chronica Maiora, part 2, MS 01611, fol.146r.
- the eleventh Westminster “relic” illustrated by the Passional Master - are explicit on fol.17r and may be a salient feature in light of Westminster Abbey’s possible crucial influence on the Passional artist.\textsuperscript{1692} Were Matthew Paris and the Passional Master both referencing this famous Westminster imprint?

The Gough and Brussels Peterborough Psalters, in keeping with the Passional fol.17r image, illustrate a rising mound beneath Christ’s disappearing feet in the illustration of the Ascension [fig. 4.138].\textsuperscript{1693} In the Passional fol.17r Ascension, Mary and St. John the Evangelist are positioned in the foreground: in the Pentecost below, Mary is central to the composition, gazing serenely and prayerfully out of the picture as the disciples almost huddle around her. The Passional Master employs well-established iconography, as can be demonstrated by comparison with the English, early-thirteenth-century Trinity College Psalter [fig. 4.139]. In this image of Pentecost, as in the Passional, the splayed, descending dove dives vertically above the Virgin’s head; Mary is seated with the disciples on either side, also seated, again just as in the Passional. It has been noted that, as in medieval, English parish churches, there are two major programmes of Passional illustrations: Christ’s Passion accompanying the first treatise, and post-ressurrection Marian images illustrating the second.\textsuperscript{1694} Roger Rosewell noted that the subject of the Dormition was frequently included in English wall painting schemes;\textsuperscript{1695} David Park also observes that is was particularly popular in early-fourteenth-century England.\textsuperscript{1696} It may be of some consequence, therefore, that the Passional Master depicts the Dormition in the lower scene on fol.17r. English manuscript examples include those in the Ramsey and Barlow Psalters,\textsuperscript{1697} however the Passional example most resembles that found in the Queen Mary Psalter [fig. 4.140].\textsuperscript{1698} The scene of Circumcision, judged by Sandler to be “a rare theme for a Gothic narrative cycle,”\textsuperscript{1699} is found not only on fol.6r of the Passional but also in the De Lisle Psalter [fig. 4.141].\textsuperscript{1700} Both images depict the Christ-child adopting an identical twisting pose; note also, the similarity between the figures of Joseph, with their matching

\textsuperscript{1692} Lethaby, Westminster Abbey and the King’s Craftsmen, 5, refers to a visitors’ report of 1466, appropriately by Bohemians, remarking upon Christ’s footprint-relic.

\textsuperscript{1693} Bodl. MS Gough liturgy.8, fol.61r and BR MS 9961-62, fol.91v, respectively.

\textsuperscript{1694} P.63.

\textsuperscript{1695} Rosewell, 61.

\textsuperscript{1696} Ibid., 22; David Park, “Form and Content,” in Dominican Painting in East Anglia: the Thornham Parva Retable and the Musée de Cluny Frontal, eds. Christopher Norton, David Park and Paul Binski (Woodbridge, 1987), 33-56, at 53.

\textsuperscript{1697} PML M.302, fol.4r; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Barlow Psalter, MS Barlow 22, fol.14v.

\textsuperscript{1698} BL MS Royal 2.B.VII, fol.297v.


\textsuperscript{1700} BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.124r.
Phrygian caps.\textsuperscript{1701} As already mentioned, unlike the De Lisle image, the Passional’s setting is intimate and domestic with Joseph performing the operation.\textsuperscript{1702} This is a feature of two later English illustrations of the Circumcision, in the Luttrell Psalter and Holkham Bible [fig. 4.142] which, although employing different iconography, demonstrate an English proclivity for depicting this subject.\textsuperscript{1703}

It has also escaped note that another rarely depicted subject, \textit{Christ releasing Joseph of Arimathea}, is found in both the Passional (fol.17v) and the Queen Mary Psalter [fig. 4.143].\textsuperscript{1704} The kiss, illustrated in the Passional image, represents a masculine greeting also captured in opus anglicanum on the Riggisberg panels of the life of Thomas à Becket. It complements Christ and Mary’s embrace on fol.16v, and closes the second treatise with a kiss of peace and blessing and, importantly, of release [fig. 4.144]. The masters of both the Queen Mary Psalter and the Passional illustrate the wrist-grasping action as Christ leads Joseph of Arimathea from incarceration [fig. 4.143]. This guiding gesture occurs repeatedly in English art: commonly in images of the \textit{Incredulity of St. Thomas}, as in Westminster Abbey’s south transept wall painting,\textsuperscript{1705} and in other illustrations, including the \textit{Harrowing of Hell}. Both the Passional Master and the De Lisle Madonna Master employ the wrist-grasp in their renderings of this subject [fig. 4.145].\textsuperscript{1706} Comparison of these images shows the emerging figures of Man to exhibit a particularly remarkable affinity with one another. The fol.17v wrist-grasp is mirrored on the facing page (fol.18r) as Christ guides souls towards Heaven.

The niched tower in the Passional fol.18r image is inhabited by musician-angels. Just as the Passional Master observed contemporary Czech court apparel, which he duly illustrated, he appears to have also taken note of Czech musical instruments for his angels to play in their heavenly tower. I suggest this in response to Karel Stejskal’s statement: “that the author of the Passional illustrations is Beneš, and not an artist brought in from abroad, is easy to demonstrate by a single iconographical particularity…four angels are pictured playing stringed instruments. The second of them, however, is not playing a hurdy-gurdy as is usual in foreign illustrations…but on a so-called ‘Czech wing’, ‘ala

\textsuperscript{1701} Schiller, \textit{Iconography}, 1:89, demonstrates that this pose is a reinterpretation of that used in much earlier Presentation in the Temple iconography.
\textsuperscript{1702} P.114.
\textsuperscript{1703} London, British Library, Luttrell Psalter, Add. MS 42130, fol.89r and London, British Library, Holkham Bible, MS Add. 47682, fol.13v, respectively.
\textsuperscript{1704} BL MS Royal 2.B.VII, fol.280v.
\textsuperscript{1705} Guerry, in Binski, and Guerry, “Seats, Relics,” 190;194.
\textsuperscript{1706} Passional fol.9r and BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.132v.
boemica’, an instrument only played in the Czech Lands. “From the top, the illustrated, Passional instruments are the harp, ala boemica, fiddle and gittern. Only the ala boemica is unusual but is a form of psaltery: psalteries are commonly illustrated in English manuscripts, including an example in the Queen Mary Psalter where, in a similar composition of music-performing angels inhabiting a tower, the middle angel is depicted playing this instrument. This image makes an important comparison with fol.18r of the Passional [fig. 4.146]. Another example of an inhabited tower may be found on Archbishop Pecham’s tomb, where the surmounting arch also compares closely with that on fol.18r. Tiered aedicules - populated by female saints, and angels (as in the Passional and Queen Mary’s Psalter) - similarly flank the Madonna and Child in the De Lisle Psalter illumination [fig. 4.147]. All these populated towers, may have been inspired by Wells Cathedral’s magnificent early-thirteenth-century façade [fig. 4.148].

The Passional fol.18v aedicules anticipate the cubicles in the Heavenly Mansions (fols.20r and 22v). English artists appear accustomed to compartmentalising the painted page as will have been noted in the later Arma Christi illustration from Omne bonum [fig. 3.16]; an earlier example is in the Trinity College London Psalter. Indeed, English examples contemporary with the Passional are many, including the De Lisle Psalter. The compartments on the pages of the Brussels Peterborough Psalter incorporate elaborate, single-, double-, or triple-headed arches as in the Passional illustrations of the heavenly mansions [fig. 4.149]. The triple-arched bays on fol.20r and 22v form a grid of boxes housing the nine ranks of heavenly mansions. Significantly, the Heavenly Mansions of the Divine are represented in both the Passional, on fol.20r, and in the Queen Mary Psalter. In the psalter, however, each of the nine boxes has but one representative within its space [fig. 4.150]. As in the fols.20r and 22v Heavenly Mansions, a representation of the Coronation of the Virgin also surmounts a series of boxed scenes in the Ramsey and Barlow Psalters. These illustrations chart the journey of the Virgin’s soul to Heaven [fig. 4.151]. A precedent for this compositional structure lies in an arched, three-bayed,

---


1708 BL Royal 2.B.VII, fol.168v.

1709 BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.131v.

1710 BL MS Arundel 83.II, fol.131v.

1711 E.g., CC MS B.11.4, Psalter, fol.8v and BL MS Arundel 83.II, fols.124v and 133r, respectively.

1712 BR MS 9961-62, fol.24r.

1713 BL MS Royal 2.B.VII, fol.304r.

1714 PML M.302, fol.4r and Bodl. MS Barlow 22, fol.13v, respectively.
two-tiered image in the Bible of William of Devon. This image also culminates in a Coronation of the Virgin [fig. 4.152].

And, with the depiction on fol.22v of the *Heavenly Mansions of the Blessed*, the illustrations of the Passional of Abbess Cunegund come to an end.

In creating this manuscript for Abbess Cunegund, Colda, Beneš and, most importantly, the Passional Master were creating not only a codex of devotional and penitential exercises but also a tool to serve as a perpetual *memoria* for Cunegund’s soul. Colda’s dedication speech ends on fol.2v, “May the name of the person at whose will the work is created be commended to eternal memory,” and the final words of the third treatise, also by Colda, read, “May the nobility of your graciousness prevail, world without end. Amen.”

The Passional is an example of enduring patronage, stimulating recollection that Cunegund would have believed to assist her towards her everlasting place in Heaven. The Passional remains a most highly-valued legacy, no longer for its spiritual or devotional content, nor yet to honour the remarkable woman who commissioned its making, but most particularly for its expressive and emotive illustrations. It is hoped that this study has contributed towards a deeper understanding of these, and of the master painter who fashioned them over 700 years ago.

An attempt has been made to identify features of the art of the Passional that resonate with English examples of the period, laying down the case for the Master who created the illuminations having been trained in England and closely associated with the Westminster painting workshop. The aim has been to supply enough secure evidence to establish a reliable heritage for the Passional’s art. This being said, it should also be strongly reinforced that the work remains unquestionably Czech for it was executed in Prague, specifically fulfils the requirements of its local patron and occupies a justifiably crucial place in the development of Czech art. Just as the Czech, Wenceslas Hollar (July 13, 1607-March 25, 1677), is declared to be one of the outstanding English artists of the seventeenth century so, I would argue, the English, Passional Master might claim his rightful place as the most important Czech artist of the early fourteenth century.

1716 London, British Library, MS Royal 1.D.1, Bible of William of Devon, fol.4v.
1717 “nomen illius ad cuius instant//tiam opus cadit eternae me/morie commendatur,” fol.2va28-fol.2vb2.
CONCLUSION

This study of the art of the so-called Passional of Abbess Cunegund has drawn me to recommend a new proposition; one based on careful scrutiny and the comparative analysis set out above: that the master draughtsman and painter, the Passional Master, was an artist trained in England and working in the royal Westminster workshop at the time of Edward II’s ascension to the throne, 1307/1308. Artists in the Westminster painters’ workshops at this time were undertaking a multitude of projects within the palace and Abbey, in preparation for the coronation, and working on manuscripts such as the Queen Mary Psalter, the De Lisle Psalter and others, as well as on designs for opus anglicanum. It will have been a community of talented painters, working together and influencing one another. We know from the King’s Remembrancer, however, that no painters were employed in Westminster palace after February, 1308; and that by 1310, court and country were in financial ruin. Recognising the peripatetic tendencies of medieval artists, I suggest that the Passional Master may have travelled to the nascent Luxembourg court in Prague, in search of secure and lucrative employment, having been forced to quit the bankrupt Westminster court, c.1310-11. Coupled with his obvious skill, the fact that the Passional Master was given a commission by the most senior royal female, the queen’s aunt, implies that by 1312 he had become the preeminent Bohemian Court Artist.

My thesis not only opens up several avenues for further study but also offers an important new perspective on the relationship between English and Czech art. Further research might include a wider exploration into artistic influences crossing national boundaries as a result of the movement of artists from court to court. There is also much to consider relating to the Passional Master himself and his possible influence over, and involvement in, later projects within the Bohemian Kingdom, particularly as a draughtsman, in light of the known flexibility of Westminster artistic practices. This would justify further investigation into a possible link between Passional Master and the flourishing of Gothic art under the following generation of artists of the Imperial Court of Charles IV in Prague.

The Passional Master’s illuminations express the emotional content of the text they illustrate, raising the work onto another level. The artist appears to have had a previously unappreciated, close working relationship with his patron, Cunegund, specifically shaping some images to reflect her Franciscan/Clarisse upbringing and her personal, spiritual concerns. He created illustrations that not only fulfilled the meditative and spiritually didactic requirements of Colda’s text but that also suited a female audience by inclusion of
elements of the chivalrous world of Arthurian Legend, and the Gospel of Nicodemus with its Grail associations. By placing the manuscript in the context of the society within which it was created, and being sensitive not only to the full implications of Cunegund’s own personal circumstances but also to the spiritual and religious attitudes of the period in which this manuscript was produced, it is hoped that deeper insight has been gained into the manuscript and its illuminations. These illustrations have been found to be remarkable for, amongst other things, the inclusion of much “female” subject matter, including emotive images of love, motherhood (extraordinarily, including parturition), embracing and suffering, redemption and salvation; and for the depiction of several unusual scenes where women are at the centre of the action; even for reflecting a degree of “anti-male/pro-female” innuendo within certain of the rubric titles (which I suggest were of Cunegund’s own composition). Amongst other outcomes of the research that attended this study, a raison d’etre has been offered for the unusual inclusion of the fol.17r image of Joseph of Arimathea with reference to volumes gifted by Cunegund to her convent. Some even more surprising aspects of the manuscript have been uncovered, including the hole in Christ’s chest, on fol.10r, and the revelatory (in many senses of the word) inscribed title at the foot of that page which had been considered illegible since the eighteenth century.

Most significant is the discovery of the remarkable number of points of artistic convergence - shared details of style and iconography - between the art of the Passional, produced within proximity of the Premyslide court and palace in Prague, and that practised in and around the Plantagenet court, palace and abbey of Westminster in London. Evidence for this is seen in elements of the Passional’s architectural structures, found to be identical with, for example, the Westminster sedilia; in the likeness between the Passional’s Christ on the Mount of Olives and Westminster Abbey’s St. Thomas in the south transept wall painting; in the striking similarities found between the Passional fol.18r Christ and the De Lisle Psalter Christ in Majesty; in the presence in the Passional of small Westminster-related details, such as mannered hand gestures, the use of the particular pose with the leg tucked up, the tunic neck-pleat and tubular hem-fold. This is to name but a few examples. Evidence has, therefore, been provided for answering the long-standing conundrum of the origin of the artist’s style: a conundrum which arose from the isolation of the Passional’s developed, and quite specific, Gothic style within the canon of surviving contemporary, Czech manuscripts. It is hoped that this comprehensive, detailed and analytical study, will serve to enhance the understanding and therefore the value of this remarkable, and apparently international, manuscript: Abbess Cunegund’s florilegium – a medieval masterpiece.
APPENDIX I: Map of Prague.

KEY:

A Basilica and Convent of St. George (Benedictine, c.970)
B Basilica of Sts. Vitus, Wenceslas and Adalbert (original rotunda, 974)
C Royal Palace
D Jelení příkop (Deers’ Ditch)
E Strahov Monastery (Premonstratensian, 1140)
F Church of St. Thomas and Friary (Augustinian, 1285)
G Bishop John IV of Dražice’s Palace
H Church of Our Lady beneath the Chain (Hospitaller Church)
I Judith Tower (after 1158)
J Judith Bridge (after 1158, prior to Charles’ Bridge, 1357)
K Franciscan Friary (1233), Convent of Clarisses (1234), Church of St. Salvator (1261)
L House at the Stone Bell (1310-1315)
M Ungelt (12th century)
N Jewish Quarter
O Church of St. Clement and Dominican Friary (1232)
P Church of St Anne and Dominican Convent (1313)
Q Church of St. Giles (refounded before 1318)
R Old Town, Bridge Tower
APPENDIX IIa: Early Premyslide Lords, (abbreviated).

Bořivoj (c.852/3-888/9, ruled c.867-888/9), the first Premyslide Lord and first Christian ruler of the Czechs m. Ludmila of Pšov (c.860-15th September, 928) = St. Ludmila.

I

Vratislav I (c.888-13th February, 921, ruled 915-921), founded St. George’s Basilica.

I

Wenceslas (c.907-28th September, (929)935, ruled c.925-(929)935), killed by brother Boleslav.

I

Boleslav II (c.932-7th February, 999, ruled 967/972-999) and sister Mlada (c.930/935-9th April, 994).

...... [For intervening period see Benešovská. ed. 2011, “Book of Appendixes”]......

Vratislav II (d.14th January 1092, ruled 1061-1085, King of Bohemia 1085-1092).

I

Břetislav II (ruled 1092-1100), sister =Ludmila (d. after 1100) nun in St. George’s convent

.... [For intervening period see Benešovská. ed. 2011, “Book of Appendixes”]......

CONTINUED OVERLEAF:
Appendix IIc: Árpád Family Tree (abbreviated)

Béla III (d. 1196)

Constance of Hungary (d. 1240)
   m. [Przemysł] Otakar I (d. 1230)

   St. Agnes (d. 1282)
   Wenceslas I (d. 1253)

   Blessed Anna, Duchess of Silesia (d. 1265)

   [Przemysł] Otakar II (d. 1278)

Andrew II (d. 1235)
   m. Gertrude (sister of St Hedwig of Silesia (d. 1243))

   Béla IV (d. 1270)

   Anna of Hungary (1226-?)

   Blessed Helen (d. 1270)

   Margaret (d. 1271)

   St Kinga (d. 1292)

Cunegund of Hungary (d. 1285)

CUNEGUND (d. 1321)

KEY:
Red = Poor Clare
Blue = Dominican
Green = canonised
† = founded Clarisse Convent, but did not take Holy Orders
Appendix IIb: Plantagenet Family Tree (abbreviated)

John (r. 1199-1216) m.
(1) Isabel of Gloucester;
(2) Isabella of Angoulême

Henry III
(r. 1216-1272) m.
Eleanor of Provence
(d. 1291)

Richard, Earl of Cornwall, Rex
Romanorum
(d. 1272)

Joan (d. 1238) m.
Alexander II,
King of Scots

Isabel (d. 1238) m.
Frederick, Holy
Roman Emperor

Eleanor (d. 1275) m.
Simon de Montfort

Edward I
(r. 1272-1307) m.
Eleanor of Castile
(d. 1290)

Margaret (d. 1275) m.
Alexander III,
King of Scots

Beatrice (d. 1275) m.
John, Duke of Brittany

Edmund “Crouchback”,
Earl of Lancaster
(d. 1296)

Katherine (d. 1257)

Eleven other children

Alphonso (d. 1284)

Edward II
(r. 1307-1327) m.
Isabella of France
(d. 1358)

Edward III
(r. 1327-1377)

Three other children
APPENDIX III: Assembly of Codex

PART I - The Parable of the Invincible Knight
PART II - The Lament of the Virgin
PART III - The Heavenly Abodes
PART IV - 'Sermon of Pope Leo on the Lord's Passion'
PART V - The Lament of Mary Magdalene

a - h - leaf signatures
i - ij - quire marks
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