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New Fragments of an Alsatian Copy of Jordan of Quedlinburg’s
Sixty-Five Articles on the Passion

Jeffrey F. Hamburger

Jordan of Quedlinburg is hardly a household name, yet in his own day (ca. 1300–1380, or possibly 1370) and right up until the time of the Reformation, he was among both the most prolific and popular preachers and spiritual authors of the later Middle Ages. Like Luther, he was an Augustinian monk who had profound influence on subsequent generations. Along with Luther, he also spent a formative part of his career (1327–1333) at the Augustinian monastery in Erfurt, where he lectured at the university. During his studies, he also spent time at the universities of Bologna (1317–1319) and Paris (ca. 1319–1322). Active as an administrator as well as a teacher and preacher, he was perceived by his contemporaries as combining in ideal measure the balance of the active and the contemplative life to which his order aspired.

Despite Jordan’s popularity and the widespread dissemination of his writings, both in manuscript and in print, Houghton Library has heretofore had in its possession only a single representative of his works, an incunable of his Meditations on the Passion, printed by Jacob Wolff of Basel in 1492, with the title Textus Passionis Christ secundum quattuor Evangelistas (Houghton Inc 3236), better known as the Meditationes de vita et Passione Jesu Christi or as the Sixty-Five Articles on the Passion. Notes inside the cover indicate that right around the time of the Reformation the book belonged to

1 A significant portion of this article draws verbatim on my initial publication of the set of leaves from the same manuscript now in Colmar, Bibliothèque de la Ville, MS 1027; see Jeffrey F. Hamburger, "Enluminure et incunable: L''exemplaire alsacien des Soixante-cinq articles de Jourdain de Quedlinbourg," Revue de l'Art 145 (2004): 5–18. In light of the fact that this article was published in French and, more important, the unexpected discovery of an additional pair of leaves from the same manuscript, I have taken the liberty of reproducing here the relevant parts of my original analysis, with modest changes reflecting the difference in context and new discoveries.


2 There remains no modern edition of the work. For an extensive discussion of Jordan’s Passion piety and the moderate tone that distinguishes it from much of his contemporaries, see Eric L. Saak, High
one otherwise unidentifiable Bartholomew Hagen and that it later passed “pro libraria fratrū apud cenobiũ sct elizabeth in rūkada ciuitat[is] brixin[ae],” i.e., to the library of the Franciscan friars adjacent to the priory of St. Elisabeth, the house of the Poor Clares, in the city of Brixen in the South Tyrol (the province of Bolzano-Bozen in modern-day Italy), a house infamous for its resistance to the reform efforts led by cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, who served as bishop of Brixen from 1450 to 1464.³

This very work, however, which in the copy at Harvard is bound together with an exposition of the Canon of the Mass by Gabriel Biel (ca. 1420/1425–1495) and a treatise on simony by the Swabian humanist and historian, Johannes Nauclerus (ca. 1425–1510), provides an instructive point of comparison to and contrast with two fragments of an extensively illuminated copy of the very same work recently acquired by the Houghton Library (MS Lat 424). The fragments take the form of two leaves from a larger set that, having onto the art market in 2003, were acquired by the Bibliotheque de la Ville in Colmar (MS 1027) on the basis of their likely origin at the Dominican convent of Unterlinden in Colmar (Alsace).⁴ The illumination of this now enlarged set of fragments, as well as their distinctive script, links them in turn with the most elaborately decorated manuscript extant from the larger group of Alsatian manuscripts to which the copy of Jordan’s Meditationes belongs, a Dominican matutinale (the portion of a breviary intended for use at Matins) that, it so happens, also belongs to Houghton Library (MS Richardson 39) and that also most likely originated at the celebrated convent in Colmar.⁵ Placed in the company of the printed edition of Jordan’s Meditationes and


⁴ The leaves in Colmar, which have since been bound together, were acquired from Antiquariat Jörn Günther, at that time still in Hamburg. The leaves at Harvard were purchased from Les Enluminures, Paris, which acquired them from an unknown source. The leaves previously were sold at the Hôtel des Ventes, Geneva, at the Spring sale (2009), lot 354, without any indication of their prior provenance.

⁵ Before being bequeathed to Harvard in 1951, the manuscript passed through a number of private collections, before which it belonged, in the eighteenth century, to the Dominican monastery of Ebersheimmünster in Alsace. Consistent with this provenance, the calendar and litany of the Matutinale are unmistakably Dominican: Dominic’s name is doubled in the litany (a specifically Dominican feature) and the calendar singles out in red or blue Thomas Aquinas, Vincent Martyr, Peter Martyr and “Dominici patris nostri.” The prominence accorded St. Anne, mother of the Virgin, Catherine of Siena, and the 11,000 virgins indicates production for, if not necessarily in, a female house. See Roger S. Wieck, Roger S. Wieck, Late Medieval and Renaissance Illuminated Manuscripts, 1350–1525, in the Houghton Library (Cambridge, Mass.: Department of Printing and Graphic Arts, Harvard College Library, 1983), 90–91; and Les dominicaines d’Unterlinden, 2 vols. (Colmar and Paris: Musée d’Unterlinden/Somogny, 2000–2001), 2:cat. nos. 105, 151 and 153.
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Figure 1. Coronation of the Virgin, Jordan of Quedlinburg, *Meditationes de vita et Passione Jesu Christi*, Colmar, Unterlinden (?), ca. 1500. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University, Houghton Library, MS Lat 424, fol. 1r.
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Figure 2. Text page, Jordan of Quedlinburg, *Meditationes de vita et Passione Jesu Christi*, Colmar, Unterlinden (?), ca. 1500. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University, Houghton Library, MS Lat 424, fol. Iv.
the liturgical manuscript, the fragments present more than the proverbial sum of their parts: they become part of a larger picture of manuscript production by nuns for nuns in a famous monastic community and center of monastic reform in the second half of the fifteenth century. They furthermore offer fresh insight into the complex interaction of print and manuscript culture in the period following the revolution represented by the inventions of Gutenberg and his contemporaries.

Before exploring this wider context, however, we must first examine the fragments themselves and establish their connection to this larger group of manuscripts. Identical in their average dimensions (9 x 6 cm.) to the leaves now in Colmar, the pair acquired by the Houghton Library represent respectively the Coronation of the Virgin (MS Lat 424.1) and the standing St. Peter (MS Lat 424.2) (see figures 1 and 3). The reverse of the leaf of the Coronation bears fifteen lines of text (ruled in brown ink, full across, with double vertical and horizontal bounding lines), features that, together with its iconography, permit it to be placed precisely in the sequence of surviving subjects represented on the other leaves and in relation to the text that accompanied them (see figure 2). In contrast, the reverse of the leaf bearing St. Peter remains blank, which makes its context within the book something of a conundrum.

Both images evidently were executed by the same artist, whose distinctive style makes up in color and charm what it lacks in sheer skill. Although in some ways crude in execution, the miniatures are by no means impoverished in technique. Both make profuse use of burnished gold for frames, crowns, halos, and other elements, such as the stars in the background of the Coronation of the Virgin or the cross held above her by God the Father. God’s gesture lends the scene a liturgical air and that could perhaps further be construed as a reference to the rite of the consecration of virgins that would have been familiar to at least some of those nuns who had not entered the convent as widows.

Also used is a gold-like pigment (most likely orpiment, a naturally occurring yellow arsenic sulfide that produces a golden or brownish yellow). Close inspection of the pair of leaves finds this or a similar pigment in some profusion, masquerading as painted gold or employed to create patterns on top of burnished gold, for example, in the Coronation of the Virgin, on the halos and on Mary’s elaborate robe, and in the St. Peter, for parts of his robe, the stylized blossoms in the background, represented by five dots clustered around another dot at the center, as well as the filigree fronds that connect them and also flourish in the margins surrounding the vigorous green and red acanthus that winds its way around the gold bar border of the frame, as if on a trellis.

The artist’s palette further includes red, green, yellow, a bright celestial blue, employed for Peter’s cloak and the heavenly background of the Coronation, and white,

6 The Coronation of the Virgin is inscribed in pencil “G 15 603/12 C 1” in the lower left corner. The St. Peter is inscribed “50 [. . . ] 110.–” at the lower right, “6–” at the lower left, and “Hf” (?) at the center of the lower margin, all in pencil.
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used for the garments of the angels in the Coronation as well as for the intestinal-like squiggles that constitute a conventional indicator of clouds, but that in late medieval art (more often of the fourteenth than of the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century) further represented the visionary boundary between heaven and earth and that here serve to place the scene of coronation in a celestial setting.

Despite her varied palette, the artist makes little, if any attempt to suggest spatial depth, which would in any case be out of place in the paradisiacal setting occupied by the sacred figures in these two scenes. The ground that rises almost half way up the miniature, reaching to St. Peter's waist, looks more like a mille-fleurs tapestry or embroidery than it does a plot of turf receding into the background. Every tuft of grass, every flower, is carefully arranged so as to avoid any overlap. The break between the green ground and the virtually blank background in the upper half of the miniature is reinforced by the change of coloration in the acanthus of the frame. In the Coronation, the bench-like throne on which God the Father and Christ are seated, with the dove of the Holy Spirit descending between them, contains not even a hint of spatial recession, let alone perspective. The base, seat, and back become three superimposed bands, a horizontal element that is only further reinforced by the tufts of wavy, white clouds that ascend in neat rows above the figures' heads. Adding to the overall grid-like patterning of the page is its overall symmetry, which works its way upward according to an inverted triangle centered along the central axis. Moving up from the figure of the Virgin, who kneels at the bottom, the pattern extends through the pair of God the Father and Christ, arrayed to either side of her and flanked by a pair of angels whose hands are joined in prayer, before culminating in the second pair of praying angels whose outstretched wings break the confines of the frame and extend into the inner and outer margin. The fundamentally decorative treatment of all aspects of the compositions, which is closely related to and perhaps derives in part from practices established in embroidery, extends to the treatment of the figures' faces, which are virtually without expression other than the impression of paradisiacal bliss conveyed by their doll-like visages, bright red pursed lips, rosy cheeks, open eyes, and neatly arched eyebrows. Facial details such as eyes, nose, and lips, are delineated with a fine thin line of light brown ink.

The overall atmosphere of paradisiacal contentment extends to the closely related miniatures, initials and marginal decoration documented in other manuscripts from the group, of which the matutinale in Houghton's collection, MS Richardson 39, is the principal surviving representative. The decoration that accompanies the initial for psalm 97 ("Cantate domino canticum novum," fol. 54v) and that extends beyond three of the four margins into the intercolumnar space represents the paradigmatic representation of paradisiacal subject matter: heaven as an enclosed garden populated in this case by the Virgin and Child in the company of female saints, Catherine, Agnes, and Ursula, along with a consort of musical angels, all of whom can be seen as joining
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Figure 4. Virgin and Child with Saints Catherine, Agnes and Ursula (Psalm 97), Matutinale, Colmar, Unterlinden (?), ca. 1500. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University, Houghton Library, MS Richardson 39, fol. 54v. Bequest of William King Richardson, 1951.
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in the heavenly song celebrated by the psalm (see figure 4). This is the same subject matter that defines among the most famous of all Upper Rhenish panel paintings of the fifteenth century, the so-called Paradiesgärtenlein or Little Paradisiacal Garden, now in Frankfurt (Städelisches Kunstinstitut, Inv. No. HM54), dated ca. 1410–1420.7

Not that such images can be read as reflecting reality within a convent setting, a contrast clearly indicated by a pastoral letter from the Dominican Prior Provincial of Saxony, Hermann of Minden (d. ca. 1294). Hermann, writing ca. 1280 to the nuns of St. Lambert, denied them their “foolish” request that they might “eat on the grass next to the infirmary”.8

As daughters of the Light, you wish to flee the deepening shadows, and therefore seek permission to sit, eat, drink as you wish on the little meadow nearby that is enclosed by a wall. Oh, praiseworthy ingenuity and meritorious invention, which belie the accusation that they have too little resourcefulness. The mother of Zebedaeus, who was reproached because she didn’t understand what she asked, stands far beneath you. In the beginning even Jesus planted a garden of delights, in which he placed the people he had created, and we also read that he often met his beloved students there. The bridegroom in the Song of Songs climbs up into the sweet-smelling garden to pluck lilies. We should contemplate the lilies of the field no less earnestly, how they neither labor nor sew, yet are dressed in greater splendor than Solomon . . . But see! The indication is already at hand that all this, even when not forbidden, is not so beneficial. The first Adam disregarded the means of salvation and therefore was tempted in the Garden; the second Adam [Christ] was betrayed in a garden. Younger generations must also pay greater heed to the known danger . . . Who would protect you from the fiery ants, from the crawling spiders, from the biting fleas? Alheid von Strßburg would cry: “You’re getting your clothes dirty on the ground,” and the prioress would condemn your idleness with words and punishments (“verbis et verberibus”) . . . Stay in your crannies in the rocks and behind your walls like the turtledoves, who don’t know the bed of sin, and seek out dry ground rather than the green!

Mixing some light learning and a few telling exempla drawn from scripture, Hermann, in keeping with his training as a preacher, offers a telling, if condescending, admonition

7 Bodo Brinkmann and Stephan Kemperdick, Deutsche Gemälde im Städel 1300–1500, Kataloge der Gemälde im Städelischen Kunstinstitut Frankfurt am Main 4 (Mainz: von Zabern, 2002), 93–120.
that reveals that even within the “paradise” of the cloister, nuns chafed under and contested the limits of enclosure.

Despite its fragmentary state, the prayer book now divided between Colmar and Cambridge commands attention on account of the density of its illustration. Each of the surviving leaves bears a full-page miniature on one of its two sides. With the exception of the leaf with a miniature of St. Peter at Harvard, which is blank on its reverse, all the leaves, moreover, bear text, written in the same spiky textura hand, overleaf from the image (see figure 2). Assuming that this structure, in which text and image receive equal weight, was typical of the entire manuscript in its undisturbed state, the original codex could be characterized, less as a prayer book with illustrations, than as a series of pictures to which prayers were appended. The book’s structure dictates that words give way to images and intense visualization of the Life of Christ and Virgin, in particular, of the Passion.

In the absence of other evidence, the only way in which to pin down the fragments’ place of origin is the style of the miniatures and the marginal ornament. Fortunately, the decoration is anything but generic in character. Similar decoration characterizes a sizable group of illuminated manuscripts, all from Alsace, and all with ties to communities of Dominican nuns. Of these, the earliest extant is a devotional book in Frankfurt (Stadt- und Universitätsbibliothek MS germ. oct. 28) containing prayers in both Latin and German. The compendium, which most likely comes from one of the many Dominican convents in Strasbourg, provides an approximate terminus post quem for the entire group. The inclusion of Catherine of Siena in the litany indicates that the manuscript was written after her canonization in 1461. A reference to the convent of St. Margaretha and St. Agnes in Strasbourg simply as “St. Margrethen” suggests a date prior to its rededication in 1475. Unterlinden is included among a list of monasteries to which its owner was bound in a prayer confraternity (fol. 129v–133r). 9


10 Among the numerous prayers for the dead and dying is one (fol. 129v) that instructs the devotee to fashion the Virgin’s protective mantle on behalf of a dying nun with 90,000 Ave Marias. The cult of the Virgin’s mantle had one of its centers in Strasbourg.

11 The register mentions the Dominican friars in Colmar (“Die vetter zů Colmar”) and the sisters of Unterlinden (“zů vnder linden”) after the Carthusians, but before the Dominican nuns in Basel (“an den steinen”), the Poor Clares in Freiburg i.Br., and a series of other Dominican convents in Strasbourg and elsewhere in Alsace.
Figure 5. Last Judgment, Colmar, Unterlinden (?), ca. 1500.
Colmar, Bibliothèque de la Ville, Ms. 1027, fol. 12v.
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Most of the remaining manuscripts in this group are related by content or provenance to the convent of Unterlinden in Colmar. Although uneven in quality, this relatively large group of manuscripts is fairly homogeneous in content and function, consisting exclusively of liturgical and para-liturgical books tailored to the needs of monastic piety. Among those most closely linked to Unterlinden are a so-called Book of Hours (Colmar, Bibliothèque de la Ville, MS 277)—in fact, an abbreviated liturgical psalter, prefaced by a Dominican calendar, and combined with a cursus of prayers in honor of the Virgin, the penitential psalms, Office of the Dead and litany—and two diurnales (Colmar, Bibliothèque de la Ville, MS 399 and Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Ms. St. Peter perg. 63), both dated to the late fifteenth or very early sixteenth century. Allowing for slight differences in quality and refinement of execution, these manuscripts offer parallels for virtually the full range of decorative forms found in the fragmentary prayer book. These include the pairs of S-curved vines that bifurcate from the center of the left and lower sides of the frames. Similar vines occur in the so-called Book of Hours, also in Colmar, where they spring directly from comparable points on the text block.

Further members of this tight-knit group of prayer books are yet another diurnale (Colmar, Bibliothèque de la Ville, MS 494), a so-called Breviary in Karlsruhe (Badische Landesbibliothek, MS K 3135)—in fact, closer in content and function to a diurnale—and the much larger, lavishly illuminated matutinale in Houghton Library. Despite its more refined quality of execution, the matutinale shares with the fragments a distinctive repertory of ornament. The doll-like figures with pert, schematic faces, pointed noses, and rosy cheeks that inhabit its miniatures and margins come from the same stock as those that populate the fragments. The same can be said of the architectural backgrounds in both books (compare, e.g., the backgrounds in the Denial of Peter and the Flagellation, fol. 3v and 5v, to that found in the initial for the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin on fol. 209r of the matutinale). In the fragments, the helical line-fillers, parti-colored initials, or their fleuronné decoration all resemble those in the


13 Whether the Matutinale at Harvard was produced in Colmar, let alone at Unterlinden, remains uncertain. Before being bequeathed to the University in 1951, the manuscript passed through a number of private collections, before which it belonged, in the eighteenth century, to the Dominican monastery of Ebersheimmünster in Alsace. Consistent with this provenance, the calendar and litany of the Matutinale are unmistakably Dominican: Dominic’s name is doubled in the litany (a specifically Dominican feature) and the calendar singles out in red or blue Thomas Aquinas, Vincent Martyr, Peter Martyr and “Dominici patris nostri.” The prominence accorded St. Anne, mother of the Virgin, Catherine of Siena, and the 11,000 virgins indicates production for, if not necessarily in, a female house. See Wieck, Late Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts, 90–91, and Les dominicaines d’Unterlinden, vol. 2, cat. nos. 105, 151, and 153.
Figure 6. Matutinale, Colmar, Unterlinden (?), ca. 1500. MS Richardson 39, fol. 70v (detail).
matutinale so closely that one can reasonably posit that both books were written and
decorated by the same scribe. The parti-colored scrolls with small blossoms that occur
twice among the fragments (Colmar, MS 1027, fol. 8r, and, still more prominently, in
the margins and background of the leaf with St. Peter, Houghton, MS Lat 424.2) also
adorn several folios in the matutinale (see figures 3 and 5). Among the fragments, the
presence of similar ornament surrounding the miniature of the Mocking of Christ
(Colmar, MS 1027, fol. 7v) and the presence of white highlights with a similar ductus
in the background of the same miniature suggests that scribe and illuminator might be
one and the same person (see figure 6).

The matutinale’s border decoration closely resemble those found in a smaller
Dominican diurnale in Cambridge, England (Fitzwilliam Museum, McClean MS 64),
in many respects a sister manuscript to the diurnale, Colmar, Bibliothèque de la
Ville, MS 494.14 As in that manuscript, the borders consist of dense, sinuous and
spiralling vines inhabited by rabbits, birds, and mythical creatures. Many of the vines
are contained within trellis-like gold bars that run along the outer edge of the text or
of the border. The ornamental embroidery, sewn in saw-tooth strips along either the
lower or outer margin in red, blue, yellow, and green silk, serves to attach separate
strips of parchment and is of exceptional refinement. Identical embroidery occurs in
the diurnale from Unterlinden (Colmar, Bibliothèque de la Ville, MS 399) and can
probably be attributed to the same hand.15 The embroidery serves to bind together
scraps of parchment together so as not to waste any of the precious material. Assuming
that the embroidery is nuns’ work, both manuscripts probably originated within the
convent. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, it seems likely, if not certain,
that the fragmentary prayer book originated in the same or a similar context.

Turning from the illustrations to the words on the leaf bearing the Coronation
of the Virgin, the text on its reverse side (regardless of which side originally formed
the recto or verso) provides a decisive clue as to both the text it illustrated and its
placement within it. The text begins in fragmentary fashion (“ . . . \ Hec enim nos in
illa sacra tua quae nos docuisti . . . ”) before continuing with short sections introduced
by the rubrics, Ante cenam. Hic reficeris cum discipulis and Post cenam. Hic memor
esto gloriose et individue trinitatis, which refer to the meal of the mass. Comparison
with Leeu's printed edition of the Meditations establishes that these words did not
accompany one of the Sixty Five Articles per se, which carried through the narrative of
the Passion only as far as the Deposition. Instead, they accompanied the last in a series

14 See Montague Rhodes James, A Descriptive Catalogue of the McClean Collection of Manuscripts
in the Fitzwilliam Museum (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), 130–133. Another diurnale
quite closely related to this group, Freiburg, Adelhausenstift Inv.Nr. A 1220, was recently published in
Verborgene Pracht: Mittelalterliche Buchkunst aus acht Jahrhunderten in Freiburger Sammlungen, ed. Detlef
Zinke (Lindenberg: Fink, 2002), 68–69.

Figure 7. Mocking of Christ, Colmar, Unterlinden (?), ca. 1500. Colmar, Bibliothèque de la Ville, Ms. 1027, fol. 5v.
of supplementary prayers that permitted the continuation of the narrative beyond the Passion so as to include images of the Man of Sorrows (prefacing prayers to Christ, to be said on Friday), the Harrowing of Hell (prefacing prayers to Christ, to be said on Saturday, and indulgenced prayers for the Hours of the Sorrows of the Virgin), the Resurrection (prefacing prayers to Christ and the Virgin, to be said on Sunday), and, in conclusion, the Trinity. The image of the Trinity, rather than introducing a new section, concludes the final segment, which appropriately opens with a prayer invoking the Trinity, whose incipit reads, “Oramus igitur clementissimum patrem per te unigenitum eius pro nobis hominem factum crucifixum et glorificatum: ut de thesauris suis immittat in nos spiritu gratie septiformis. . . .” This is the prayer of which the conclusion, prefacing an image of the Trinity, appears on one side of the leaf at Harvard with a miniature, not of the Trinity per se, but rather the Trinity crowning the Virgin. An iconographic type whose origins can be traced to France at the beginning of the fifteenth century, the image as it appears in the manuscript can be considered an improvement in so far as it refers, as do the accompanying prayers, not only to the Trinity, but also to the Virgin Mary. In fact, the last words on the folio, “Hic memor esto gloriose et individue trinitatis,” are the last words of the entire section, providing the perfect segue to the concluding image of the Trinity crowning the Virgin overleaf. Even without the aid of the source, the formatting of the last line, which leaves the last third empty, would have suggested that it concluded a section, or at least a subsection, of the text.

Comparison with the source indicates that the text preceded the image and hence occupies the recto. Consistent with all the other images illustrating the Meditationes in the manuscript otherwise preserved in Colmar, the image fell on a verso. The manuscript appears to have maintained a consistent format throughout, with images—whether they opened or closed sections of the text—appearing on versos, and the intervening text abbreviated so as to appear on rectos or, depending on how long they might have been, a series of rectos and versos, but always concluding on a recto, very often, as in Leeu’s edition, with large gaps between different subsections of text so as to ensure the uniformity of the layout. As in the case of the other miniatures, however, the text was copied faithfully, but the images were not. Whereas the artist has adopted the motif of the two pairs of flanking angels, one standing and one kneeling, the figure of God at the center wearing the triple tiara associated with the papacy has been replaced by that of the kneeling Virgin with the Trinity above.

The consistent structure of the manuscript, in which all the extant miniatures of Jordan's *Meditations* occupied versos, can perhaps shed some light on the original placement and function of the anomalous leaf of St. Peter, which poses a problem in that it does not fit into the series of scenes from the life of Christ constituted by all the remaining leaves. Nor does it match any portion of Jordan's text. In theory, one might suggest that it prefaced the tenth article, which was devoted to the Denial of Peter, but as one of the leaves in Colmar (Colmar, MS 1027, fol. 3v) depicts that very subject, that possibility, unlikely to begin with, can easily be excluded. The blank on the verso suggests several possibilities: first, rather unlikely, that the miniature was originally a verso that prefaced the start of the cycle (but why, one is then forced to ask); second, that the miniature was originally a recto that concluded the cycle (unlikely in that all the other extant miniatures can be shown to have occupied versos); or third, most likely, that it illustrated an independent text that, together with the *Meditations*, formed part of a miscellany, just as in some printed editions of Jordan's *Meditations*. Even in this case, however, one has to ask why there is no text on the reverse of the leaf, presumably a recto, if the structure of the manuscript was consistent all the way through. Perhaps we are dealing with part of a prefatory cycle that originally included images of all the apostles or a larger set of saints.

Returning to the text, the rubrics, *Ante cenam* and *Post cenam*, although brief, provide vital information on the function of the book. The meal to which they refer is, of course, that of the mass, indicating that the meditations from which these lines are taken were, for lack of a better term, paraliturgical in nature, i.e., they were designed to be carried out in the context of the celebration of the liturgy of the mass. Given that this particular manuscript was made by nuns and almost certainly also for nuns, its having been written in (fairly simple) Latin serves as a welcome reminder that, despite the significance of German vernacular texts in the spiritual culture of Dominican nuns along the Upper Rhine in the later Middle Ages, Latin continued to be essential, not only for liturgical performance, but also for other activities such as prayer and meditation. In fact, the convent of Unterlinden was a center for the translation of texts from Latin into German, led by its mid-fifteenth-century prioress, Elisabeth Geith, who among other texts, translated the convent's celebrated early fourteenth-century chronicle, the *Vitae sororum*, written by Katharina von Gueberschwiir.17

Given the wide dissemination of the Sixty-Five Articles, it should come as no surprise that they frequently found their way into print, with nine editions prior to the end of the fifteenth century.18 Of these, that by Wolff owned by Harvard was hardly

---


the first. Five, including the earliest, published in Antwerp on February 10, 1485, were produced by Gerard Leeu in three different formats (16º, 8º, and 4º), three in Latin, and one in Dutch (dated January 5, 1487). In light of the almost complete absence of illustrations in the prior manuscript tradition, a striking feature of these editions is the prominence of their illustrations. Prayer books in Latin and the vernacular were a staple for fifteenth-century printers, but rarely were they extensively illustrated; seven woodcuts for the seven liturgical divisions was a common formula.

Leeu, however, employed fifty-eight different blocks to provide a total of seventy-five illustrations (seventy-eight in the Dutch edition) for the sixty-five articles and other divisions of the text. Of these blocks, thirty-four were newly cut to illustrate Jordan's work, whereas the remainder were reused from publications previously printed in Gouda. In this respect, Leeu's handling of Jordan's work was hardly exceptional; Leeu's Rosarium (Hain 13968), for which Leeu employed some of the same blocks and which was sometimes


The woodcuts are described briefly in Martinus Joseph Antonius Schretlen, *Dutch and Flemish Woodcuts of the Fifteenth Century* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1925; reprinted New York 1969), 36, who says merely of the artist, “He is a bad draughtsman without the least sense of perspective; his groups are clumsy in composition and they stick as it were to the background . . . His other woodcuts do not deserve any special attention, yet we are not justified in ignoring his work when reviewing the woodcutters of the 15th century, on account of the enormous amount he produced.” William Martin Conway, *The Woodcutters of the Netherlands in the Fifteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1884), 52–54, 224–225, 227–228, and 330–334, identifies two hands in the woodcuts employed by Jordanus for his various editions, the “Second Gouda Woodcutter” and the "First Antwerp Woodcutter," but is even less kind, saying of the latter (p. 54), “The subjects left to him were almost all ghastly, and he treats them in a most painful manner, insisting only upon horrible details, and enforcing the brutalities of those who inflicted suffering, and the heroism of the sufferer. He is the first, and one of the worst, of a set of men who cannot be called artists.” For a more dispassionate appraisal, see Clazina Helena Cornelia Maria Kok: “De Houtsneden in de Incunabelen van de Lage Landen, 1475–1500. Inventarisatie en bibliografische analyse” (Diss., Universiteit van Amsterdam), 1994, 236–239. Johannes Beer, “Die Illustration des Lebens Jesu in den deutschen Frühdrucken (c.1460–1500),” *Archiv für Schreib- und Buchwesen: Sonderheft* 3 (1929): 67–68, briefly describes the woodcut illustrations in the German edition published by Mentzer in Magdeburg in 1491.

For the precise breakdown, see Kok, “Houtsneden,” 244.
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bound together with the Articles, contains fifty-five woodcuts, one for each of its rosary prayers. The incorporation of extensive series of illustrations, some of which were borrowed from other imprints, was a notable, even salient, characteristic of Leeu's products and no doubt accounted in no small measure for their success.

Comparison with Leeu's editions indicates that the prayer book divided between Cambridge and Colmar was copied directly from a printed exemplar (see figure 8). This practice would not have represented an isolated instance among the books that survive from Unterlinden's library, nor, for that matter, among manuscripts of the period more generally, in which incunabula often provided models for scribes. In some cases, printed books put into circulation texts that would not otherwise be available or lent them a new authority. In the case of liturgical books, printed editions were very often associated with reform efforts. At Unterlinden, a legend of St. Ulrich of Augsburg, one of several included in a collection of saints' lives from the convent (Colmar, Bibliothèque de la Ville, MS 717 I), contains elements most likely derived directly from an edition of the legend of St. Ulrich of Augsburg printed in 1516. As a result, a manuscript previously dated to the second quarter of the fifteenth century, must be placed well into the subsequent century. Given that the fragmentary prayer

23 See Kok, “Houtsneden,” 244, and Wilhemina C. M. Wüstefeld, Middeleeuwse Boeken van Het Catharinencvent (Zwolle: Waanders, 1993), 116, cat. no. 78, which reproduces a copy of the edition of 1488 bound together with an illustrated set of Rosary devotions printed in Antwerp in 1489.
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book depends on one of Leeu's editions, it too acquires an approximate *terminus post quem*, in this instance, no earlier than 1485, a date consistent with the evidence of style.

The prayer book's fragmentary state precludes comprehensive comparison of its contents with its putative printed exemplar. What survives, however, matches it perfectly, at least as far as the text is concerned. The prayer book follows Leeu in drastically abridging the full text of Jordan's *Meditationes*. In Jordan's original, the text is divided into unequal parts corresponding to the canonical hours ("*habens partes septem iuxta horas septem canonicas cum theorematibus et articulus passionis atque doctrinis per homine saluberrimus*"). Each of the canonical hours is divided in turn into a series of articles enumerating events of the Passion in chronological order. Individual articles are prefaced by a *theorema*—the section that corresponds to the prayers in Leeu's editions and the Colmar collection—followed by the article proper, which could more accurately be described as a meditation buttressed by a series of short quotations from various authorities, mostly Church Fathers. To each article Jordan appends what he calls a "documentum," which often takes the form of a commentary. Each section closes with a "conformation," in which the Augustinian Hermit summarizes the moral of the preceding discussion and gives instructions on how it should be performed, taking special care to point out the benefits specific to meditation on each particular part of the Passion.

Leeu's edition, and, along with it, the prayer book in Colmar, of which the Houghton leaves are a part, reduces the complexity of Jordan's original to such an extent as to transform it entirely. Where Jordan is fulsome and digressive, Leeu is succinct, even pithy. Not only is the text shortened and simplified, it is also radically rearranged, changing the sequence of sections that structures Jordan's original. The articles embedded within Jordan's text are transformed into rubrics announcing subsequent episodes in the Passion. None of the patristic authorities remain, although in a few instances, a vestigial trace survives in the form of a brief excerpt from Scripture. In most cases, however, even this is reduced to the name of the Evangelist to whose Gospel the account originally referred. Following the article, and inverting Jordan's

---

27 I base my discussion on comparison of the text with that in the edition printed in Basel by Jacob Wolff in 1492, Hain 9443*, Houghton Library, Harvard University, Inc 3236.

28 For this and analogous instances of structuring Passion devotions according to the liturgical Hours, see Josef Stadlhuber, "Das Laienstudengebet vom Leiden Christi in seinem mittelalterlichen Fortleben," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 72 (1950): 282–325; and Petra Seegets, *Passionstheologie und Passionsfrömmigkeit im ausgehenden Mittelalter: Der Nürnberger Franziskaner Stephan Fridolin (gest. 1498) zwischen Kloster und Stadt* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 73.
original sequence, the “theorema” then serves as the prayer proper. The “documentum” and “conformatio” are omitted entirely.

In Jordan’s full text, longer, more discursive sections, including Latin devotional verses, divide the various sections. Each of these is prefaced by rubrics reading either ad prandium and post prandium or, more often, ante cemam and post cemam, as in our fragments. Whether the manuscript now divided between Harvard and Colmar conformed to the printed editions in including Jordan’s preface can no longer be determined. The preface is nonetheless germane in suggesting something of the prayer book’s original function. It lists the twelve fruits of meditation on Christ’s sufferings, noting, with Albertus Magnus, that continual meditation on the Passion is worth more than fasting, flagellation, or even the daily reading of the psalter: “Continua meditatio passionis christi plus valet homini quam si per annum integrum ieienaret in pane et aqua, vel si quotidie flagellis cederetur usque ad effusionem sanguinis, vel si etiam quotidie legeret unum psalterium integrum.” The value of interior meditation over corporeal exercises is a common note in monastic devotional texts. Given, however, that the psalter formed the backbone of the monastic rite, Jordan’s implication that his text possesses greater “virtue” than Scripture comes as something of a surprise. A similar literary self-consciousness is suggested by the rubric introducing the Latin verses attributed to Bernard of Clairvaux that close the preface, in which, Jordan notes, the Cistercian father speaks in persona christi. Jordan’s text constitutes an invitation to the reader to imagine him or herself in the same role. The amendments and elisions that characterize Leeu’s adaptation of the Meditationes reduce a commentary on the Passion that doubled as a devotional handbook to a streamlined set of prayers and meditations. Ludolph of Saxony’s Vita Christi, in which brief prayers followed fulsome commentaries on virtually every episode in the life of the savior, was curtailed and reshaped in similar ways. The shortened text is geared to the requirements of devotion in a monastic context. The addition of illustrations is entirely consistent with this change in purpose.

The motivations for Leeu’s abridgment seem clear enough. By cutting the text, Leeu enabled the pair of text and image accompanying each article to share an opening,
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thereby enhancing the importance of the pictures. The prayer book gives its illustrations a similar prominence, which suggests that it was not just the text, but rather the innovative Gestalt of Leeu’s edition that prompted its production. Having accepted the authority of Leeu’s text, however, the manuscript ignored that of his illustrations. None of the surviving miniatures bears any relationship to its iconographic counterpart in any of his printed editions. There is also no relationship to the woodcut illustrations in the editions published by Moritz Brandis in Mageburg in the 1490s. The layout of the prayer book also departs from Leeu’s exemplar. Whereas Leeu varied the amount of text below each image (including two to three lines of the rubric and, if necessary, part of the following prayer), the producer of the prayer book segregated text from image more strictly, placing each on separate folios.

The real originality of Leeu’s edition, however, lay less in his abridgment of the text than in his decision to illustrate it so profusely. In fact, the abridgment can be read as having been governed by the desire for images that would help structure the edition and make it more akin to illustrated prayer books of the period, in which serial imagery of the Passion had become increasingly important. To measure the significance of Leeu’s edition and, with it, the copy divided between Cambridge and Colmar, one has only to examine the extent of illumination in the prior manuscript tradition. Known in well over a hundred manuscripts, the Articles circulated in Dutch and German as well as in Latin. Of these manuscripts, however, only one, dated 1518, a German-language copy at Schloß Harburg (Fürstlich Oettingen-Wallerstein’sche Sammlungen, Oettingische Bibliothek, Cod. III.2.8º39), with drawings signed by Master I.E., lavishes a single illustration on each of the articles. A devotional miscellany in Berlin (Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz MS germ. oct. 37, fol. 29r–78v), also dated 1458, from the Dominican convent of St. Nikolaus in Undis, Strasbourg, prefaced each

31 In this respect, the prayer book differs from some other manuscripts that employed Leeu’s products as models, for example, the Dutch Book of Hours in the Huntington Library (HM 1140), dated to the last quarter of the fifteenth century, which, as noted by Hindman, 121, employs Leeu’s Rosarium, its woodcut illustrations included, as the model for its own rosary cycle. For a full description of the manuscript, see Consuelo W. Dutschke, with the assistance of Richard H. Rouse et al., Guide to Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Huntington Library, 2 vols. (San Marino: The Library, 1989), 1:454–458. For the slight variations among Leeu’s editions of Jordan’s Meditationes, some of which used substitute blocks, see Kok.

32 My thanks to Daniel De Simone of the Rosenwald Collection, Library of Congress, Washington DC, for confirming this on the basis of the copy in that collection.

33 See Robrecht Lievens, Jordanus van Quedlinburg in de Nederlanden: Een onderzoek van de handschriften (Ghent: Secretarie der Academie, 1958); and Johanna Maria Willeumier-Schalij, “De LXV artikelen van de passie van Jordanus van Quedlingburg in middelnederlandse handschriften,” Ons geestelijke Erf 53 (1979): 15–35.

34 See Regina Cermann, Katalog der deutschsprachigen illustrierten Handschriften des Mittelalters (Stoffgruppe 43. Gebetbücher), vol. 5 (Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009–), no. 43.1.71.
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of the liturgical divisions of the Articles with a full-page print (most likely woodcuts, all of which, however, have been removed). Against the foil provided by these illustrated manuscripts, not to mention the vast number lacking illustrations of any kind, the fragments in Cambridge and Colmar stand out as anomalous on account of their extensive, if not complete, cycle of images.

The manuscript’s original foliation, if any, does not survive. The rubrics, therefore, together with what appear to be the logical sequence dictated by their subject matter, provide the only way to reconstruct their original sequence based on internal evidence. No matter how scattered, the leaves permit some conclusions about the overall composition of the series of illustrations. The rubric on the first extant leaf (in Colmar, MS 1027 now numbered fol. 1) identifies itself as the second in a series (secundus articulus est sanguinei sudoris in terram defluxi; a paraphrase of Luke 22:44, “et factus est sudor eius sicut guttae sanguinis decurrentis in terram”). The verso, however, depicts a subsequent moment in the narrative of the Passion, Judas receiving the thirty pieces of silver from the priests in the Temple, which corresponds to the rubric on fol. 2r (Tertius articulus est christi vendicio). The rubric on fol. 1r clearly refers to another miniature, now missing, of the Agony in the Garden, which, together with the prayer, would have constituted a “diptych” in which text and image faced one another across the opening. The first text-image pair, now lost, addressed either the Last Supper or a previous episode of Christ’s prayer in the Garden at Gethsemane, which, in keeping with the combined accounts from the Gospels, was sometimes divided into as many as three separate moments.

Despite its apparent regularity, the prayer book’s structure was not entirely consistent. In at least one instance, it can be shown that a miniature followed rather than preceded the text it illustrated, with text on the recto and, as usual, the accompanying image on the verso. The numbering of the rubrics indicates unambiguously that the

35 For this manuscript, kindly brought to my attention by Regina Cermann, see Hermann Degering, Kurzes Verzeichnis der germanischen Handschriften der Preussischen Staatsbibliothek, 3 vols., reprint edition (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1970), vol. 3, Die Handschriften in Oktavformat und Register zu Band I–III, 15–16. The remaining woodcut is a “Neujahrswunsch” that prefaces the opening set of Pater noster devotions, which were written in 1458 by a separate hand; see Ulrich Rehm, Bebilderte Vaterunser Erklärungen des Mittelalters, Saecvla Spiritalia 28 (Baden-Baden: Koerner, 1994), 173–174. The missing illustrations were pasted in on fols. 28r, 35v, 44v, 49v, 61v, a leaf between the current 72v and 73r, 74v, 76v, and 78r. My thanks to Kurt Heydeck for checking the manuscript for me. Peter Schmidt, 2003, 329–330, argues that the date of 1478 found on fol. 2r, which Degering applied to the entire manuscript, is an erroneous transcription of the date 1458 in the colophon on fol. 1r.


37 This arrangement characterizes at least one set of printed prayers to the Passion, sometimes referred to as the Galitzin Passion (now in the Rosenwald Collection in the Library of Congress, Washington
current fol. 6 (numbered 31) must have followed fol. 5 (numbered 30). The rubric on fol. 6r announces the Flagellation (Trigesimus primus articulus est cristi flagellatio), which appears on fol. 6v. As a result, however, the prayer for the Flagellation (“O Dominie ihesu christe qui ad statuam ligari et flagellis cedi uoluisti,” etc.) is paired across an opening with the Mocking of Christ (fol. 5v).

Additional irregularities leave open the question whether this variability in text-image relationships, if not in layout, was deliberate or accidental. At least one miniature, the Raising of the Cross (fol. 11v), is clearly out of sequence. The Raising of the Cross follows an extended sequence of Crucifixion scenes, all of which it logically should precede. Both the numbering and the content of the rubric on its recto, however, indicate that this folio followed all the others. Reading christi a patre suo derelictio, it refers to a moment that customarily closes the Crucifixion narrative. In similar fashion, the miniature of Christ offered the sop (fol. 8v)—an event that, consistent with the Gospels (Matthew 27:48 and Mark 15:36), concludes any detailed account of Christ’s agonies—follows the prayer (fol. 8r, numbered fifty) that details the nailing of his right foot to the Cross (“articulus est christi pedis dextri transfossio”). Whether introduced by the scribe or carried over from the model, these irregularities suggest that the prayer book is at best a somewhat garbled copy of a more orderly original.

Leeu’s editions of Jordan’s Meditationes appear to have been unprecedented in providing each and every article with an illustration. Given the current condition of the prayer book divided between Cambridge and Colmar, there is no way of knowing exactly how many miniatures it originally contained. Yet even assuming additional instances of paired prayers, the manuscript probably had as many as fifty illustrations, perhaps even more. As such, it represents among the most extensively illustrated copies of the Meditationes to have survived in any language.38 The paucity of manuscript copies
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with ample illustration could be attributed in part to the nature of the text, which, at least in theory, demands sixty-five separate scenes from the Passion. Even by the standards of the late Middle Ages, this number would have represented a considerable challenge. Jordan indicates at least an indirect awareness of the unusual length and complexity of his work when, in the preface he confesses that the prolixity of his meditations cannot be traversed in the course of a single day: “Quoniam unus dies ad tantum amplissimum materie campum percurreret non sufficit hoc devotissimum passionis christi exercitium in septem dies est distributum, ut prolixitate repulsa que tedium generat quisque dies novam atque novam legenti devotionem afferat.”

Although not entirely without precedent, Leeu innovated in providing each and every article with an image. Other fifteenth-century illustrated manuscript copies of the Articles are less systematic, incorporating parts of Jordan’s cycle piecemeal into cycles that vary in content. For example, a Liber precum from Regensburg, now in Toronto (Art Gallery of Ontario), dated 1452, intersperses twelve miniatures of Passion scenes among a cento of psalms, Gospel sequences, prayers by Anselm of Canterbury and Nicholas of Clamanges and fifty-four Articles from Jordan. The miscellany in Berlin (Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, MS germ. oct. 37) has been stripped of its illustrations, but one can point to at least one other manuscript that illustrated the Articles with an ad hoc assemblage of prints. Like the prayer book in Colmar, the miscellany in question, which combined the Articles in Latin with other prayers, survives only as a set of thirty-nine closely cropped engravings by various hands, among them impressions from a Life of Christ attributed to the Master of St. Erasimus (Darmstadt, Hessische Landesmuseum, Graphische Sammlung, Inv. No. Gr. 348–413). Too little of this prayer book survives to determine just how much of
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Jordan's cycle it originally included. A few points of comparison, however, suggest that it bore some relationship with a *Liber precum* in St. Petersburg (National Library of Russia, MS Lat. O.v.I, 206), illuminated in Cologne ca. 1487–1488. Of Jordan's sixty-five articles, the St. Petersburg *Liber precum* includes only forty-three and then often only in part or in paraphrase.

In light of the prayer book's dependence on Leeu's edition for both its text and its structure, if not its images, it is reasonable to inquire whether the illustrations were copied from other printed materials, whether woodcuts or engravings. Whether in the form of engravings or woodcuts, printed Passion cycles of the fifteenth-century were intended primarily for inclusion in prayer books or other devotional compendia. Many series could hardly have been produced with any other purpose in mind, although they were often used to many different ends. The convent of Unterlinden, where the Colmar compendium most likely originated, provides numerous examples of woodcuts and engravings either tipped, pasted, or sewn in on separate, smaller

an abstract was published in *Das Münster*: Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst und Kunstwissenschaft 44 (1991): 60–61. My thanks to James H. Marrow for sharing with me his notes on the fragments in Darmstadt.

41 James H. Marrow and Margarita Logutova, *Liber precum* (Graz: ADEV A, 2003), where the relationship of the prayer book to the fragments in Darmstadt is discussed in greater detail.
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pieces of parchment or paper to illustrate a wide variety of devotional texts. In light of the prayer book’s disregard for the woodcuts that Leeu’s printed editions would have made readily available, it is tempting to conclude that the manuscript’s compiler employed single-leaf woodcuts or engravings as models for its miniatures. No extant print, however, offers a clear-cut point of comparison. For not one of the miniatures can a precise pictorial source be identified. If in some cases, for example, the Crucifixion and the Last Judgment, one can observe vague similarities to other images, the likeness is readily attributable to the schematic, largely conventional character of the iconography (see figure 8). Of course, were the series still complete, a different picture might emerge. One need not, however, assume that miniatures derive from of a vast cycle of engravings or woodcuts of which no other trace remains. So large a cycle may itself have been a composite, made up of borrowings from numerous sources. Given that no extant series of woodcuts or engravings of the Passion matches the scope of the manuscript’s program of illustration, prudence dictates considerable caution in drawing conclusions about any possible models. Assuming that the compiler and copyist matched images to texts as best they could based on the materials available to them, the few inconsistencies that mar the prayer book would have been a natural, even inevitable, by-product of the process. Far from involving a series of misunderstandings of an idealized original, the prayer book from Colmar could then instead be interpreted as an innovative attempt to illustrate a text that, to judge from the extent evidence, only rarely had been provided with a pictorial accompaniment.

In contrast to other illustrated printed books of the fifteenth century, which were based on manuscript models, the copy of Jordan of Quedlinburg’s Meditationes in Cambridge and Colmar is not rooted in a tradition of manuscripts, some illustrated, others not, extending back until the time of the text’s composition in the mid-fourteenth century. There is no evidence to suggest that Jordan of Quedlinburg’s expansive set of Passion meditations was illustrated with an extensive series of images as early as ca. 1400, let alone in his lifetime. To the contrary: given the extant evidence, it seems far more likely that the Meditationes, which always would have represented an invitation


46 The mixing of prints from several cycles was not uncommon; see, e.g., the prints pasted into the Huth Hours (London, British Museum, Dept. of Prints, 158*.h.1), discussed by James H. Marrow, “A Book of Hours from the Circle of the Master of the Berlin Passion: Notes on the Relationship between Fifteenth-Century Manuscript Illumination and Printmaking in the Rhenish Lowlands,” Art Bulletin 60 (1978): 590–613.
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to visualization, were first matched systematically with miniatures or drawings once the technology of printing made possible the production of such extensive series on a large scale or, as in the case of Gerard Leeu’s editions, in large numbers as well. The text derives from Leeu’s innovative edition, in which the demands imposed by a full set of illustrations dictated the abridgment of the text. For whatever reason, the scribe and illuminator ignored Leeu’s woodcut illustrations, but were comparably ambitious when it came to outfitting Jordan’s popular work with a largely unprecedented series of miniatures. If the illustrations derive from one or more series of engravings, then this aspect of the manuscript could also be regarded as a “spin-off” of printing. Printing, far from translating a tradition of illumination into another medium, created the conditions that first made it possible to illustrate Jordan’s popular devotional text, be it with prints or with miniatures. At least in this instance, printing did not serve as a reproductive medium. Instead, both to Leeu and the copyist of the prayer book in Colmar, it suggested new ways of combining text and image, in short, new ways of seeing.47

The prayer book from Colmar brings to light the complexity of cross-fertilization between manuscript illumination and various printed media in the second half of the fifteenth century. It also underscores the necessity of viewing illumination and incunabula, which all too often are studied separately, as parts of one larger field, the history of the illustrated book. Despite its fragmentary condition, the manuscript provides tangible evidence of the kind of pictorial materials employed in Passion devotions in one of the leading centers of Dominican reform in fifteenth-century Germany. Written and illuminated at a Dominican convent in Alsace, most likely at Unterlinden itself, the prayer book attests both to the literary and artistic culture of the community and the extent to which it was embedded in a web of relationships extending far beyond its walls. Itself a collection of fragments, the manuscript represents but one part of a much larger mosaic, the pieces of which have only just begun to be assembled.
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