Imagining the Unimaginable:

The Iconography of the Trinity in England, c. 1000-1300

Volume 1: Text

Sophie Kelly

Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Medieval and Early Modern Studies

University of Kent

Total Word Count: 97, 314

March 2019

Abstract

This thesis explores the ways in which medieval artists visualised the Trinity. It seeks to understand how an 'unimaginable' and paradoxical idea – that God is one being and yet three, Father, Son and Holy Spirit – was depicted in visual form. The study focuses primarily on English visual culture from c. 1000-1300, where the two most common representations of the Trinity, the Seated Trinity and the *Gnadenstuhl*, developed. It offers new perspectives on the eleventh- and twelfth-century contexts in which these influential Trinitarian images appeared, tracing their transmission across many types of media, from manuscript illumination to wall paintings, stained glass, metalwork and sculpture in stone, ivory and wood. It shows how, at the turn of the thirteenth century, the Seated Trinity and the *Gnadenstuhl* evolved from images known and used in relatively limited circles to the two most common representations of the Trinity. This process is contextualised within the broader shifts in theology and debate during this period, where both Trinitarian ideas and images underwent momentous and radical changes.

This thesis also examines how the standardisation and proliferation of the iconography of the Seated Trinity and *Gnadenstuhl* over the course of the thirteenth century paved the way for new and exciting visualisations of the Trinitarian God. Whether adapting and manipulating conventional iconography, or crafting an image that departed radically from these more standardised forms, artists working in this period turned to increasingly inventive and unusual designs as a means of communicating something new about the triune nature of God. Both the invention of 'conventional' images of the Trinity and the re-invention of these standardised forms in the production of 'unusual' Trinitarian images demonstrate the remarkably imaginative, inventive and innovative nature of artistic and visual culture in this period.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude and thanks to several institutions and individuals for the support they have offered me over the course of this PhD. I am overwhelmingly grateful to my two superb supervisors, Dr Emily Guerry and Dr Alixe Bovey. I would never have been able to complete this thesis without your unyielding support and encouragement, your wisdom, your advice and, above all, your humour and kindness, especially in the final few months. I would also like to thank the wider MEMS community at the University of Kent for making the PhD a much more enjoyable and exciting process.

The completion of this thesis would not have been possible without the financial support of several institutions: with special thanks to the Arts and Humanities Research Council, the School of History at the University of Kent, the Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature (*Medium Aevum*), and the British Archaeological Association.

I am thankful for the help and support I received while working with various collections. In particular, I am grateful to those at St John's College Library Cambridge, the British Museum, the Victoria and Albert Museum, the British Library and Salisbury Cathedral, who made using and understanding their collections a much smoother process.

I am ever grateful for the support of my friends: to my Fleet friends, who endured countless trips around medieval churches and Cathedrals with patience, and who were my constants throughout this whole process. To Lloyd, Lizzie, Ellie and Charley in particular, who were always there when I needed them. To my old Canterbury friends, with whom I discovered the wonder and excitement of medieval art – to Rebecca, Gareth, Nicole, Emily and Emma, I will never forget all you have done for me. I am equally grateful to my new(er) Canterbury friends: to Stuart, Hugh, Julie, Peter, and Adam and to everyone in the Kent PGR community.

Above all, thank you to my family – to my parents, John and Judith, to my brothers, Jack and Thomas, and my sister-in-law Laura, for more than I can ever express. You have given me the world. This thesis is for you.

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of Ceri Palmer, née Howells, who never found out I was going to do a PhD, but would have been very excited that I did.

List of Figures

NB: All figures are contained in Volume II: Illustrations, bound separately.

Fig. 1.13
Detail: Handle (obverse)
Seal Matrix of Godwin, England, c. 1040 (London, British Museum number 1881, 0404.1)

Fig. 1.14
'Arm and sceptre' coin of Harthacnute, England, c. 1040 (Exeter, Royal Albert Memorial Museum and Art Gallery, museum no. 7/2003)

Fig. 1.15
St Albans Psalter, England (St Albans), c. 1030 (Hildesheim, Dombibliothek MS St. God. 1), p. 403

Fig. 2.1
Peter Dell the Elder, *Allegorie de Christlichen Heilsordnung*, 1548
Previously in Berlin, Kaiser-Friedrich-Museum
Photograph: reproduced in Berthold Kress, 'A Relief by Peter Dell (1548) After a Drawing by Paul Lautensack, and the Origins of the Term "Gnadenstuhl"', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 73 (2010), pp. 181-194 (p. 183)

Fig. 2.2
Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, Norfolk: Exterior

Fig. 2.3
Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill: Interior, looking east

Fig. 2.4
Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill: Interior, looking west

Fig. 2.5
Wall painting, chancel arch, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.6
Detail: *Gnadenstuhl* in triple mandorla
Wall painting, chancel arch, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.7
Detail: The elect
Wall painting, chancel arch, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.8
Detail: Falling figures
Wall painting, chancel arch, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.9
Detail: Saints in roundels
Wall painting, chancel arch, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.10
Detail: Saints and devils in roundels

Wall painting, chancel arch, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.11
Detail: Devils in roundels
Wall painting, chancel arch, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.12
Detail: Raising of the Dead
Wall painting, chancel arch (north), Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.13
Detail: Raising of the Dead (?)
Wall painting, chancel arch (south), Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.14
Detail: Raising of the Dead
Wall painting, chancel arch, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.15
Detail: Raising of the Dead
Wall painting, chancel arch, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.16
Detail: Raising of the Dead
Wall painting, chancel arch, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.17
Detail: Raising of the Dead
Wall painting, chancel arch, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.18
North wall, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill

Fig. 2.19
Detail: God creating Eve
Wall painting, north wall, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.20
South wall, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill

Fig. 2.21
Detail: Wheel of Fortune (?)
Wall painting, south wall, Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, early twelfth century

Fig. 2.22
Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill: Exterior, c. 1992

Fig. 2.23
Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill: chancel arch, c. 1992

Fig. 2.24
Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill: Exterior, c. 1996

Fig. 2.25
Fragment of wall painting, England (Winchester?), c. 900 (Winchester, Winchester City Museum)

Fig. 2.26
Athelstan Psalter, North-East Francia, 1st half of the 9th century (London, British Library, Cotton MS Galba A X VIII), f. 21r

Fig. 2.27
Wall painting, chancel arch, St Andrew's Church, Nether Wallop, Hampshire, c. 1000

Fig. 2.28
Wall painting, chancel arch, St John the Baptist Church, Clayton, Sussex, c. 1110

Fig. 2.29
Wall painting, chancel arch, Coombes Church, Coombes, Sussex, c. 1110

Fig. 2.30
Detail: *Majestas Domini*
Wall painting, chancel arch, Coombes Church, Coombes, Sussex, c. 1110

Fig. 2.31
Wall painting, chancel arch, St Botolph's Church, Hardham, Sussex, c. 1110

Fig. 2.32
St Mary's Church, Kempley, Gloucestershire: Interior, looking east

Fig. 2.33
Detail: St John
Wall painting, chancel arch, St Mary's Church, Kempley, Gloucestershire, c. 1130

Fig. 2.34
Detail: *Majestas Domini*
Wall painting, chancel ceiling, St Mary's Church, Kempley, Gloucestershire, c. 1130

Fig. 2.35
Detail: Apostles
Wall painting, chancel, south wall, St Mary's Church, Kempley, Gloucestershire, c. 1130

Fig. 2.36
Detail: Apostles
Wall painting, chancel, south wall, St Mary's Church, Kempley, Gloucestershire, c. 1130

Fig. 2.37
Parts of a wooden crucifix (The South Cerney Head), found in All Hallows Church, South Cerney, Gloucestershire, c. 1130 (London, British Museum, museum no. 1994,1008.1)

Fig. 2.38
Cambrai Missal, Cambrai, c. 1120 (Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipal, MS 234), f.1r

Fig. 2.39
Cambrai Missal, Cambrai, c. 1120 (Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipal, MS 234), f.1v

Fig. 2.40
Cambrai Missal, Cambrai, c. 1120 (Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipal, MS 234), f.2r

Fig. 2.41
Gellone Sacramentary, Meaux or Cambrai, c. 790 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS Latin 12048), f. 143v

Fig. 2.42
Sacramentary of Charles the Bald, West Francia, c. 869-870 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Latin 1141), f. 5r

Fig. 2.43
Sacramentary of Charles the Bald, West Francia, c. 869-870 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Latin 1141), ff. 5v-6r

Fig. 2.44
Sacramentary of Charles the Bald, West Francia, c. 869-870 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Latin 1141), f. 6v

Fig. 2.45
Fulda Sacramentary, Corvey, last third of the tenth century (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 10077), ff. 11v-12r

Fig. 2.46
Sacramentary of Bishop Ellenhard von Freising (?), Freising (?), shortly before 1056 (Bamberg, Staatliche Bibliothek, MS Lit. 2), ff. 9v-10r

Fig. 2.47
Sacramentary of Bishop Ellenhard von Freising (?), Freising (?), shortly before 1056 (Bamberg, Staatliche Bibliothek, MS Lit. 2), ff. 10v-11r

Fig. 2.48
'The Red Book of Darley', southern England (Winchester or Sherborne?), c. 1061 (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 422), pp. 52-53

Fig. 2.49
Detail: Aminadab panel
Anagogical window (N II), choir ambulatory, Church of Saint-Denis, Paris c. 1140-44

Fig. 2.50
Anagogical window (N II), choir ambulatory, Church of Saint-Denis, Paris c. 1140-44

Fig. 2.51
Hildesheim Portable Altar, made for the Cathedral of Hildesheim, c. 1160-80 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, Museum number 10-1873)

Fig. 3.1
Gilbert of Poitiers, Commentary on the Psalms, Southwest Germany, third quarter of the twelfth century (Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek ms aa51), f. 65

Fig. 3.1a
Detail: David and the Trinity

Gilbert of Poitiers, Commentary on the Psalms, Southwest Germany, third quarter of the twelfth century (Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek ms aa51), f. 65

Fig. 3.2
Trinitarian figures '*Contra Petrum Lombardum*'
Joachim of Fiore, *Liber Figurarum*, North Italy or South Germany (?), late thirteenth century (Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek MS A 121), f. 89r
Image from Marjorie Reeves and Beatrice Hirsch-Reich, *The Figurae of Joachim of Fiore* (Oxford, 1972), fig. 30.

Fig. 3.3
Psalter of Louis IX and Blanche of Castile, France (Paris), c. 1225-35 (Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenale MS 1186), f. 136v

Fig. 3.4
Psalter, England (Oxford), 1st quarter of the thirteenth century (London, British Library MS Arundel 157), f. 93r

Fig. 3.5
Glazier Psalter, England (London?), c. 1225 (New York, Morgan Library MS G 25), f. 121v

Fig. 3.6
Bible, France (Paris?), c. 1245-50 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 269), f. 207v

Fig. 3.7
Bible, England (Oxford?), c. 1265 (New York, Morgan Library MS G 42), f. 176r

Fig. 3.8
Peter Lombard, Glossa in Psalmos, France (Avignon?), c. 1210-30 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Latin 8874), f. 180r

Fig. 3.9
Peter Lombard, Commentary on the Psalms, France (Paris?), first half of the thirteenth century (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Latin 448), f. 218r

Fig. 3.10
Peter Lombard, Commentary on the Psalms, England (London?), 2nd or 3rd quarter of the thirteenth century (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Latin 448), f. 218r

Fig. 3.11
Bible of William of Devon, England, 3rd quarter of the thirteenth century (London, British Library MS Royal 1 D I), f. 252r

Fig. 3.12
Grosbois Psalter, Belgium (Liege), c. 1260 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 440), f. 106r

Fig. 3.13
Psalter, England, c. 1260 (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Laud. Lat. 114), f. 148r

Fig. 3.14
Evesham Psalter, England, after 1245-c. 1270 (London, British Library Additional MS 44874), f. 159r

Fig. 3.15
York Psalter, England, c. 1260 (London, British Library Additional MS 54179), f. 110r

Fig. 3.16
Oscott Psalter, England (Oxford?), c. 1260-70 (London, British Library Additional MS 50000), f. 168r

Fig. 3.17
Psalter, England (Winchester?), second half of the 13th century (New York, Morgan Library MS M 679), f. 281r

Fig. 3.18
Psalter, France, third quarter of the thirteenth century (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 50), f. 126r

Fig. 3.19
Psalter-Hours, Netherlands (Brabant), last quarter of the thirteenth century (London, British Library MS Harley 2930), f. 90v

Fig. 3.20
Bible, France (Paris?), last quarter of the 13th century (London, British Library MS Harley 616), f. 309v

Fig. 3.21
Psalter, Italy, c. 1276-1300 (Modena, Biblioteca Estense, MS Latin 844), f. 90r

Fig. 3.22
Psalter, England, c. 1280-1300 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 102), f. 117v

Fig. 3.23
Psalter, France (Artois), end of the 13th century (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 118), f. 127r

Fig. 3.24
Huth Psalter, England (Lincoln or York?), last quarter of the 14th century (London, British Library MS Additional 38116), f. 119v

Fig. 3.25
Psalter, Belgium, c. 1300 (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Auct. D. 4. 3), f. 149v

Fig. 3.26
Psalter, Belgium, c. 1300 (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 23), f. 229v

Fig. 3.27
Breviary of Renaud de Bar, France (Metz), c. 1302-5 (Verdun, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 107), f. 57r

Fig. 3.28
Breviary of Renaud or Marguerite de Bar, France (Metz), c. 1302-3 (London, British Library MS Yates Thompson 8), f. 61r

Fig. 3.29
Psalter, England (London or Canterbury), c. 1310-20 (New York, Morgan Library MS G 53), f. 102r

Fig. 3.30
Psalter, Belgium (Ghent), c. 1320-30 (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 6), f. 80r

Fig. 3.31

Howard Psalter and Hours, England, c. 1310-20 (London, British Library MS Arundel 83), f. 72r

Fig. 3.32
Queen Mary Psalter, England (London or East Anglia?), c. 1310-20 (London, British Library MS Royal 2 B VII), f. 233v

Fig. 3.33
The Chertsey Abbey Breviary, England, c. 1310-20 (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Lat. Liturg. D 42), f. 26r

Fig. 3.34
Stowe Breviary, England (Norwich), c. 1322-5 (London, British Library MS Stowe 12), f. 200v

Fig. 3.35
Barlow Psalter, England (Peterborough), c. 1321-41 (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Barlow 22), f. 132r

Fig. 3.36
Benedictine Choir Psalter, England (Christ Church, Canterbury), second quarter of the fourteenth century (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Auct. D. 2. 2), f. 133v

Fig. 3.37
Psalter, England (East Anglia), c. 1340 (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 131), f. 97r

Fig. 3.38
Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, S. France or N. Italy, late thirteenth century (Rome, Vatican Library, Vaticana, Reg. Lat. 534), f. 17v

Fig. 3.39
Miscellany, England, late thirteenth century (London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 522), f. 85r

Fig. 3.40
Cuerden Psalter, England (Oxford), c. 1270 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 756), f. 169r

Fig. 3.41
Egerton Psalter, England (East Anglia), c. 1270-90 (London, British Library MS Egerton 1066), f. 83r

Fig. 3.42
Psalter, Belgium (Liège), c. 1290-1305 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 155), f. 114v

Fig. 3.43
Prayer Book, Netherlands (Brussels), c. 1276-1296 (London, British Library MS Harley 2449), f. 79r

Fig. 3.44
Psalter-Hours, France (Amiens), c. 1280-1299 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 729), f. 253v

Fig. 3.45
Antiphoner, Netherlands, c. 1300 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. 8997C)

Fig. 3.46
Chertsey Abbey Breviary, England, first quarter of the 14th century (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Lat. Liturg. E. 39), f. 147v

Fig. 3.47
Missal, England (Cambridge?), c. 1320 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 107), f. 176r

Fig. 3.48
Book of Hours, France (St-Omer), c. 1320-1329 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 754), f. 22v

Fig. 3.49
Taymouth Hours, England (London?), 2nd quarter of the 14th century (London, British Library MS Yates Thompson 13), f. 33r

Fig. 3.50
Book of Hours, England, c. 1300 (Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery MS W 102), f. 6v

Fig. 3.51
Book of Hours made in England (Oxford?), c. 1325-1330 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 700), f. 89v

Fig. 3.52
Queen Mary Psalter, England, c. 1310-20 (London, British Library Royal MS 2 B VII), f. 299r

Fig. 3.53
Carrow Psalter, England (East Anglia), mid-thirteenth century (Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery MS W 34), f. 29r

Fig. 3.54
Cuerden Psalter, England (Oxford), c. 1270 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 756), f. 8v

Fig. 3.55
Single leaf from a Missal, Germany, thirteenth century (Hannover, Kestner Museum ms 3985)

Fig. 3.56
'La Sainte Abbaye', France, c. 1290 (London, British Library MS Yates Thompson 11), f. 29r

Fig. 3.57
Robert de Boron, *L'Estoire del Saint Graal*, France, c. 1270-90 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS Fr. 95), f. 1r

Fig. 3.58
Robert de Boron, *L'Estoire del Saint Graal*, France, second half of the thirteenth century (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS Fr. 749), f. 1r

Fig. 3.59
Roman de la Rose, France, c. 1340-50 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 185), f. 83r

Fig. 3.60
Roman de la Rose, France (Paris), c. 1340-50 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 48), f. 150r

Fig. 3.61
Roman de la Rose, France (Paris), c. 1350 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 324), f. 145r

Fig. 3.62
Roman de la Rose, France (Paris), fourth quarter of the fourteenth century (London, British Library Additional MS 42133), f. 145r

Fig. 3.63
Chalice and Paten, Belgium (Oignies), c. 1228-30 (Namur, Musée provincial des Arts anciens du Namurois –Trésor d'Oignies, inv. no. TO 03-04)

Fig. 3.64
Ivory pax, England or France, c. 1350-1400 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. 34-1867)

Fig. 3.65
Enamel copper pax, Limoges, c. 1350-1400 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. 1148-1864)

Fig. 3.66
Trinity brass, England, c. 1375-1400 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. M. 39-1946)

Fig. 3.67
Finger ring, England, fifteenth century (PAS WMID-439C61)

Fig. 3.68
Finger ring, England, 14th-15th century (PAS BERK-BCBDF5)

Fig. 3.69
Ring, England, c. 1400-1500 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. M.241-1962)

Fig. 3.70
Finger ring, England, early 15th century (London, British Museum, museum no. AF.900)

Fig. 3.71
Bronze seal matrix of Thomas Peverell, Bishop of Llandaff, Wales (?), 1398-1407 (London, British Museum, museum no. 1839,0921.4)

Fig. 3.72
Bronze seal matrix of Holy Trinity College, Stratford-Upon-Avon, England, late 14th century (London, British Museum, museum no. 1838,1232.20)

Fig. 3.73
Seal matrix of the Friars of the Holy Trinity, Hounslow, England, 15th century (London, British Museum, museum no. 1923,1207.1)

Fig. 3.74
Ivory diptych, Germany (Cologne), c. 1350 (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Cloisters Collection, no. 1970.324.8)

Fig. 3.75
Ivory leaf from a Diptych, England or France (?), 15th century (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, no. 17.190.265)

Fig. 3.76
Ivory panel, France, 14th century (London, The Courtauld Gallery, no. 0.1996.GP.2)

Fig. 3.77
Ivory diptych, France, 14th century (Hamburg, Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, inv. no. 1935.17)

Fig. 3.78
Ivory hair parter, England or France, 14th century (Paris, Musée du Louvre, no. OA 11221)

Fig. 3.79
Trinity Alabaster, England, 15th century (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. A.203-1946)

Fig. 3.80
Swansea Altarpiece, England, 1460-90 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. A.89:1-8, 10-15-1919)

Fig. 3.81
Robert Campin, Werl Altarpiece, Tournai, 1438 (Madrid, Museo del Prado)

Fig. 3.82
Wall painting, Chantry chapel of Edward le Despenser, Tewkesbury Abbey, c. 1375

Fig. 3.83
Wall painting, south choir aisle, Lichfield Cathedral, late fourteenth century

Fig. 3.84
Wall painting, north transept, All Saints Church, Boughton Aluph, Kent, fifteenth century

Fig. 4.1
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 9r

Fig. 4.2
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 9v

Fig. 4.3
Westminster Bestiary, England, c. 1270-1290 (London, Westminster Abbey Library, MS 22), f. 3r

Fig. 4.4
Bible moralisée, France (Paris), c. 1225 (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS 2554), f. 43v

Fig. 4.5
Secretum of Roger de Pont L'Évêque, c. 1154 (Durham, Durham University Library D/C 1.1 Archep. 4)

Fig. 4.6
Secretum of Roger de Pont L'Évêque, Society of Antiquaries of London, *Vetusta Monumenta, quae ad rerum britannicarum memoriam conseruandam*, 7 vols. (London, 1747-1906), vol. I (1747), plate LIX

Fig. 4.7
Bible of William of Hales, England, Salisbury, 1254 (London, British Library MS Royal 1 B XII), f. 193v

Fig. 4.8
Detail: Three-faced head initial
Bible of William of Hales, England, Salisbury, 1254 (London, British Library MS Royal 1 B XII), f. 193v

Fig. 4.9
Wilton Psalter, England (Salisbury?), c. 1250 (London, Royal College of Physicians MS 409), f. 6v

Fig. 4.10
Martyrology for the Abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, Paris, c. 1219-1220 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Lat 12833), f. 27r

Fig. 4.11
Psalter for the Clunaic Abbey of Reading, Oxford, c. 1250 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 103), f. 4r

Fig. 4.12
Cuerden Psalter, Oxford, c. 1270 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 756), f. 1r

Fig. 4.13
Peterborough Psalter and Bestiary, Peterborough, c. 1315 (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 53), f. 1r

Fig. 4.14
Book of Hours, England (Oxford?), c. 1325-1330 (New York, Morgan MS M 700), f. 5r

Fig. 4.15
Three-faced label stop, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.16
Spandrel scene xxx, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.17
Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral: interior, looking east

Fig. 4.18
East wall, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral

Fig. 4.19
Plan of Salisbury Cathedral chapter house
'Plan D' in Pamela Blum, 'The Salisbury Chapter-house and its Old Testament Cycle: An Archaeological and Iconographical Study', unpublished PhD dissertation (Yale University, 1978)

Fig. 4.20
Label-stop beneath spandrel scene vi, north-west wall, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.21
Label-stop beneath spandrel scene ix, north-west wall, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.22

Label-stop beneath spandrel scene xv, north-west wall, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.23
Label-stop beneath spandrel scene xvii, north-west wall, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.24
John Carter, 'Vol. XV: Cos. Surrey, Southampton, Wilts., Sussex; and Salisbury Cathedral', 1802 (London, BL Additional MS 29939), p. 74

Fig. 4.25
John Carter, 'Vol. XV: Cos. Surrey, Southampton, Wilts., Sussex; and Salisbury Cathedral', 1802 (London, BL Additional MS 29939), p. 75

Fig. 4.26
Plaster cast head, Salisbury Cathedral (made), 1855-6 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, Museum number A.1916–587

Fig. 4.28
'Lot's Wife Turned to Salt', spandrel scene xxiv, north-east wall, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.29
'Isaac Instructing Esau', spandrel scene xxvii, east wall, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.30
'Isaac Blessing Jacob', spandrel scene xxviii, east wall, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.31
Archangel Gabriel, Chapter House, Westminster Abbey (ex-situ), c. 1253

Fig. 4.32
Angel harping, Triforium of Angel Choir, Lincoln Cathedral, c. 1270-80

Fig. 4.33
Detail: Feeding of the Five Thousand
Left panel, Westminster Retable, Westminster, c. 1260-70 (London, Westminster Abbey)

Fig. 4.34
Detail: Abel
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26) f. 5v

Fig. 4.35
Detail: Christ
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26) f. 7r

Fig. 4.36
Detail: Abraham
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26) f. 9r

Fig. 4.37
Detail: Moses

The Tree of Jesse Cope, 1310-25, England (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. 175-1889)

Fig. 4.38
Detail: St Peter and St James
The Syon Cope, 1310-20, England (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. 83-1864)

Fig. 4.39
Detail: The Funeral of the Virgin
The Syon Cope, 1310-20, England (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. 83-1864)

Fig. 4.40
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 24r

Fig. 4.41
Lambeth Apocalypse, England (Westminster?), c. 1260-70 (London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 209), f. 48r

Fig. 4.42
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 11r

Fig. 4.43
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 16r

Fig. 4.44
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 16r

Fig. 4.45
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 6r

Fig. 4.46
Leiden St Louis's Psalter, England (York?) c. 1190 (Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit MS Lat. 76 A), f. 12v

Fig. 4.47
Painted medallion (N3), north wall, Saint-Chapelle, Paris, c. 1248 (Photograph: Emily Guerry)

Fig. 4.48
Watercolour of Painted medallion (N3), north wall, Saint-Chapelle, Paris, 1870
Saint-Cyr, Mediathèque de l'architecture et du Patrimoine, Relevé de Louis-Charles-Auguste Steinheil no. 6655.03. Watercolour 'état actuel' of Paris, Sainte Chapelle, mural N3, 1870

Fig. 4.48
Painted medallion, Saint-Chapelle, north wall, c. 1248

Fig. 4.49
Lost jugate cameo, Westminster Retable, Westminster, c. 1260-70
Photograph: Warburg Institute, reproduced in George Henderson, 'The Style and Function of the Cameos on the Frame of the Westminster Retable', *The Antiquaries Journal*, 91 (2011), pp. 145-62, fig. 1

Fig. 4.50

'The Fall', spandrel scene ix, north-west wall, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.51
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 4r

Fig. 4.52
'The Conviction of Cain', spandrel scene xv, north wall, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.53
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 6v

Fig. 4.54
'Noah and the ark', spandrel scene xvi, north wall, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.55
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 7r

Fig. 4.56
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 7v

Fig. 4.57
'Noah enters the ark', spandrel scene xvii, north wall, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.58
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 8r

Fig. 4.59
Douce Apocalypse, England (Westminster?), c. 1265-70 (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 180), p. 24

Fig. 4.60
Douce Apocalypse, England (Westminster?), c. 1265-70 (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 180), p. 26

Fig. 4.61
'Abraham and the three angels', spandrel scene xxi, north-east wall, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.62
'Abraham offers food to the three angels', spandrel scene xxii, north-east wall, Chapter House, Salisbury Cathedral, c. 1260-70

Fig. 4.63
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 18r

Fig. 4.64
Murthly Hours, England, c. 1260-80 (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland MS 21000), f. 15v

Fig. 4.65
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 18v

Fig. 4.66
Murthly Hours, England, c. 1260-80 (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland MS 21000), f. 17v

Fig. 4.67
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 19r

Fig. 4.68
Murthly Hours, England, c. 1260-80 (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland MS 21000), f. 18v

Fig. 4.69
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 20v

Fig. 4.70
Murthly Hours, England, c. 1260-80 (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland MS 21000), f. 20v

Fig. 4.71
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 21r

Fig. 4.72
Murthly Hours, England, c. 1260-80 (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland MS 21000), f. 21r

Fig. 4.73
St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), f. 21v

Fig. 4.74
Murthly Hours, England, c. 1260-80 (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland MS 21000), f. 22v

Fig. 4.75
Murthly Hours, England, c. 1260-80 (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland MS 21000) , f. 1r

Fig. 4.76
Murthly Hours, England, c. 1260-80 (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland MS 21000) , f. 2r

Fig. 5.1
Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 54r

Fig. 5.2
Detail: Trinity in the Tree
Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 54r

Fig. 5.3
Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 61r

Fig. 5.4
Detail: *Gnadenstuhl*

Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 61r

Fig. 5.5
Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 3v

Fig. 5.6
Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 8r

Fig. 5.7
Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 17r

Fig. 5.8
Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 38v

Fig. 5.9
Guillaume Le Clerc writing, Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 1r

Fig. 5.10
Lambeth Apocalypse, England (London?), c. 1260-67 (London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 209), f. 12r

Fig. 5.11
Lambeth Apocalypse, England (London?), c. 1260-67 (London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 209), f. 13r

Fig. 5.12
Lambeth Apocalypse, England (London?), c. 1260-67 (London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 209), f. iiv

Fig. 5.13
Lambeth Apocalypse, England (London?), c. 1260-67 (London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 209), f. 48r

Fig. 5.14
Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 50r

Fig. 5.15
Detail: Possible donor image
Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 50r

Fig. 5.16
Detail: The Stoning of Stephen
Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 53v

Fig. 5.17
Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 61v

Fig. 5.18
Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 62r

Fig. 5.19
Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969), f. 26r

Fig. 5.20
Gulbenkian Apocalypse, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Lisbon, Museu Calouste Gulbenkian MS L. A. 139), f. 7r

Fig. 5.21
Abingdon Apocalypse, England (London?), c. 1270-5 (London, British Library MS Additional 42555), f. 11r

Abbreviations

PL	*Patrologia Latina*, ed. by J. P. Migne, 221 vols (Paris, 1844-1855)
PG	*Patrologia Graeca*, ed. by J. P. Migne, 161 vols (Paris, 1857-1866)
BL	British Library
BM	British Museum
PAS	Portable Antiquities Scheme

Conventions

All Biblical quotations in this thesis are taken from the Douay-Rheims translation of the Vulgate, accessed from Douay-Rheims Bible Online.[1] This online edition is taken from the 1899 edition of the Douay-Rheims Bible, edited by James Gibbons and translated by Richard Challoner.[2] The dates for individuals' birth and death are taken from the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.[3] All websites used were accessed on 16th August 2018.

[1] <www.drbo.org>.
[2] *The Holy Bible: Douay-Rheims Version*, ed. James Gibbons, trans. Richard Challoner (Baltimore, 1899).
[3] <www.oxforddnb.com>.

Introduction

'*Among all these things that I have said about that supreme Trinity… I dare not claim any one of them is worthy of this unimaginable mystery, but must rather confess that his knowledge is too wonderful for me and has been too mighty and I have not been capable of it.*'

Augustine of Hippo, *De Trinitate*[4]

With this reflection on the 'unimaginable' qualities of the Trinity, Augustine of Hippo (354-430) closes his theological masterpiece, *De Trinitate*. He had spent around twenty years composing the treatise on the triune nature of God, which was probably complete by the end of the 420s.[5] Augustine's final reflections exemplify a struggle in Christian thought that was to continue throughout the course of Middle Ages and beyond: how should – and could – Christians imagine a God that was one divine being and yet simultaneously three – Father, Son and Holy Spirit. For Augustine, and for many other theologians, enquiry into the intricacies of this paradoxical doctrine could only go so far; the Trinity would always ultimately be a mystery. However, despite the frequently expounded idea that the Trinitarian nature of God was 'unimaginable', medieval artists continually sought to 'imagine' the Trinity in remarkably diverse ways. Indeed, the need to capture the paradoxical three-in-one aspect of God drove artists to create some of the most unusual and extraordinary images of the Middle Ages. The centrality of Trinitarian doctrine to Christian faith also provided fertile ground not only for the development of several distinct iconographic representations of the Trinity, but also their use across a variety of media and contexts. The dynamic and oftentimes obscure landscape of medieval Trinitarian iconography speaks to the overwhelming importance of images as ways to understand and express concepts that are fundamental to belief and yet seemingly 'unimaginable'.

This thesis explores the multifaceted ways in which medieval artists wrestled with the idea of a triune God. It traces the transmission of Trinitarian iconography across many types of media, from manuscript illumination to wall paintings, stained glass, metalwork and sculpture in stone, ivory and wood. The discussion that follows focuses primarily on English visual culture from the beginning of the eleventh until the end of the thirteenth century, wherein the two most

[4] Augustine, *De Trinitate*, XV, 27.50: 'Verum inter haec quae multa jam dixit et nihil illius summae Trinitatis ineffabilitate dignum me dixesse audeo profiteri, sed confiteri potius mirificatum scientiam ejus ex me invaluisse, nec posse me ad illam… ubi te esse sentis, ubi jaces, ubi stas.' ed. J. P. Migne, PL (Paris, 1841), vol. 42, col. 1096, trans. Edmund Hill, *The Works of Saint Augustine: The Trinity* (New York, 1991), p. 441

[5] For a summary of the scholarship on Augustine's completion of De Trinitate see Luigi Giola, *The Theological Epistemology of Augustine's De Trinitate* (Oxford, 2008), pp. 1-2, n. 4.

common iconographic types employed as representations of the Trinity, the 'Seated Trinity' and the *Gnadenstuhl*, developed alongside some of the most unusual and peculiar Trinitarian images, such as the three-headed Trinity. The emergences of these conventional and unconventional Trinitarian iconographies are then contextualised with reference to the broader artistic and theological landscape of Western Europe, c. 1000-1300. In exploring how artists in this period confronted the paradox of the Trinity, this thesis simultaneously addresses wider questions of invention, imagination and innovation in medieval art. It shows how, in striving to 'imagine' the 'unimagineable', artists turned to innovative and remarkable designs to represent the idea of the 'three-in-one'.

Constructing the Trinity

By the time Augustine was writing *De Trinitate*, the Trinity had become central to Christian worship and belief. The path that led to its adoption as church doctrine was however a turbulent one, determined by struggles between church authorities and those perceived as holding 'heretical' Trinitarian beliefs. After a period of ambiguity regarding the orthodox definition of the Trinitarian nature of God in the early church, tensions over 'heretical' teaching reached a height in the fourth century, leading to the promulgation of a series of statements on Trinitarian belief drafted over the course of several ecumenical councils. Proclamations issued at the First Council of Nicea in 325 and the Council of Constantinople in 381 were adopted, on the whole, across both Eastern and Western churches.[6]

The turbulent nature of Trinitarian orthodoxy in the early church was due in part to the ambiguous references to the Trinity in the Bible. God's triune nature is never fully elucidated in either the Old or New Testaments, leaving theologians with only a handful of episodes and verses on which to draw.[7] One of the most significant of these is the story of Creation. In the Genesis text, God, having created the animals, describes his next and most poignant creation with words that would define Trinitarian belief: "'Let us make man in our own image and likeness'".[8] God's reference to himself in the plural was seen as evidence that, even at the very beginning of time, the deity had been formed of more than one being. This passage became particularly significant during the time of the Arian heresy in the early

[6] See below, pp. 31-34.
[7] For a discussion of the evidence for (and absence of) the Trinity in the Bible see Arthur Wainwright, *The Trinity in the New Testament* (London, 1967); G. T. Montague, *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition* (New York, 1976); Donald H. Juel, 'The Trinity and the New Testament', *Theology Today*, vol. 54, no. 3 (Oct., 1997), pp. 312-324.
[8] Genesis 1:26: 'Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostrum'.

fourth century, where Arius and his followers supposedly claimed that God the Father had created Christ at a finite point in time.[9]

The idea of a 'plural' God was supported by interpretations of other Old Testament episodes that were seen to prefigure Christ's incarnation, and thus God's plurality, in the New Testament. Most notable among these was the Visitation of Abraham, also in the book of Genesis.[10] This passage describes the arrival of three men (*tres viri*) in the Vale of Mambre, where Abraham had made a camp. They greet Abraham, who offers them food, and the three men then go on to prophesy that Sarah and Abraham will give birth to a child. The seemingly miraculous appearance of these three men, and their ability to prophesy about the future, raised the possibility for later commentators that the three men were not just messengers of God but God himself, revealed in the three persons of the Father, Son and Spirit.[11] The Psalms, particularly Psalm 2 and Psalm 109, which describe the Lord having a Son, were also drawn on as evidence of the plurality of God's nature and his relationship to Christ.[12] The story of the Visitation of Abraham, and the depiction of these three visitors as a large, seated 'three-headed' Trinity in a series of thirteenth-century illuminations is discussed at more length in chapter four.[13] The influence and artistic legacy of Psalm 109 is discussed in relation to the development of the Seated Trinity in chapter one.[14]

As with these Old Testament passages, the New Testament does not contain a sustained or explicit description of the Trinity. The key event in which all three persons of the Godhead are described as being physically together for the first time is the Baptism of Christ, a moment recorded by three of the Gospel authors.[15] At the moment Christ comes back out of the water, each of the synoptic accounts describe the heavens opening above him, the Spirit of God descending in the form of a dove, and the Father's voice declaring: '"This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased"'.[16] This highly significant moment in the

[9] The Nicene Creed, issued in response to the Arian heresy, closes with a statement against the idea that Christ was created after the Father. See below, pp. 31-32.
[10] Genesis 18:2: 'And when he [Abraham] had lifted up his eyes, there appeared to him three men standing near him: and as soon as he saw them he ran to meet them from the door of his tent, and adored down to the ground.' (*Cumque elevasset oculos, apparuerunt ei tres viri stantes prope eum: quos cum vidisset, cucurrit in occursum eorum de ostio tabernaculi, et adoravit in terram.*)
[11] On the typological pairing of the narrative of Abraham and the three angels with the Trinity see M. R. James, 'Pictor in Carmine', *Archaeologia* 94 (1951), pp. 141-66; on the interpretation of the three men as angels see G. Bunge, *The Rublev Trinity* (New York, 2007), p. 46. This is discussed further in chapter four, pp. 151-4.
[12] This is discussed in chapter one, pp. 24-31.
[13] See pp. 184-216.
[14] See pp. 46-81.
[15] Matthew 3:13-17; Mark 1:9-11; Luke 3:21-23.
[16] Matthew 3:17: 'Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi complacui'. Mark and Luke record only slight variations in the Father's statement.

Gospel narrative was to have an enduring impact on the representation of the Holy Spirit, which would, with relatively few exceptions, be depicted in the form of a dove in medieval Christian art.[17] The relationship between baptism and the Trinity is a theme that continues throughout the New Testament. In one of Christ's final instructions to his disciples, he commands them to: "'teach ye all nations; baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost'".[18] By aligning these exegetical inferences, the three persons of the Trinity thus became central to understanding Christ's gospel message and the mission of the early Christian church. However, the exact nature of the relationship between the three persons, and how this can be reconciled with the Old Testament view that God is 'one', is never fully addressed. Similar blessings mentioning the three persons of the Trinity are also recorded in the Epistles, but again receive no formal explanation.[19]

Another major passage that directly addresses the tension between God's 'one-ness' and the New Testament's claim that he was also formed of three persons, occurs in the Gospel of John when Christ claims that he is 'one' with the Father.[20] John describes an altercation between Christ and Jewish teachers of the Law, in which Christ, describing his works on earth, states that they have been given to him to enact by the Father because "'I and the Father are one'".[21] Later, he elaborates: "'… though you will not believe me, believe the works: that you might know and believe the Father is in me and I in the Father.'"[22] In claiming 'one-ness' with the Father, Christ, for the first time in the Gospel narrative, asserts his identity not only as a representative of God on earth, but God himself. This passage becomes critical in discussions on the relationship between the Father and Son, and the impact of this relationship on Trinitarian doctrine. This passage also gains particular currency in the late thirteenth century in relation to heightened tensions between Christians and Jews, and leads to the development of a highly unusual adaption of an image of a *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity. The specific consequences of John 10:30 in the development of medieval Trinitarian iconography are explored at length in chapter five. [23]

---

[17] For the representation of the Holy Spirit as a dove see Gertrude Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, vol. II, trans. J. Seligman (London, 1972), pp. 122-4.

[18] Matthew 28:19: 'euntes ergo docete omnes gentes: baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.'

[19] 1 Peter 1:2: 'According to the foreknowledge of God the Father, unto the sanctification of the Holy Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ: Grace unto you and peace be multiplied' (*secundum praescientiam Dei Patris, in sanctificationem Spiritus, in obedientiam, et aspersionem sanguinis Jesu Christi. Gratia vobis, et pax multiplicetur*); 2 Corinthians 13:13: 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the charity of God, and the communication of the Holy Ghost be with you all. Amen' (*Gratia Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et caritas Dei, et communicatio Sancti Spiritus sit cum omnibus vobis. Amen.*).

[20] John 10.

[21] John 10:30: 'Ego et Pater unum sumus.'

[22] John 10:38: 'Si autem facio: etsi mihi non vultis credere, operibus credite, ut cognoscatis, et credatis quia Pater in me est, et ego in Patre.'

[23] See below, pp. 241-250.

The aforementioned New Testament passages still left a precise definition of the Trinity open and undefined. It is therefore unsurprising that the early Church seems also to have had no singular established Trinitarian doctrine.[24] Though first-century Christians certainly seem to have worshipped Christ as God, they simultaneously declared a monotheism that accorded with descriptions of God in the Old Testament.[25] Concern is predominantly with the divine nature of Christ, which gradually evolves to also encompass the nature of the Trinity.[26]

Second- and third-century theologians, such as Origen (c. 184 – c. 253) and Tertullian (c. 155 – c. 240) sought to explain the Trinity using the New Testament as a point of departure. Origen insisted on the 'incorporeal' nature of all three persons of the Trinity, arguing God's only corporeal form was in the person of Christ during his time on earth. He stated:

> God therefore must not be thought to be any kind of body, nor to exist in a body, but to be a simple intellectual existence, admitting in himself of no addition whatever, so that he cannot be believed to have in himself a more or a less, but is *Unity*, or, if I may so say, *Oneness* throughout.[27]

Despite an insistence on the unity of the Trinity, Origen's writing is often termed 'subordinationist', as it introduced hierarchies to explain the relationship between the Father, Son and Spirit.[28] In Origen's view, the Father holds the most power, the Son, being second to the Father, holds slightly less, and the Spirit is inferior in power to both:

> The God and Father, who holds the universe together, is superior to every being that exists, for he imparts to each one from his own existence that which each one is; the Son, being less than the Father, is superior to rational creatures alone (for he is second to the Father);

---

[24] For Trinitarian belief in the early Church see J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 5th ed. (London, 1977), pp. 83-162; Eric Osborn, *The Emergence of Christian Theology* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 173-196 emphasises that, though there were Trinitarian 'formulae' or expressions in the early church, this did not develop into doctrine until the fourth century; Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids, 2003) characterises the devotion of the early church as 'Binitarian', rather than Trinitarian: see pp. 134-153.

[25] Osborn, *The Emergence of Christian Theology*, p. 7; Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, pp. 640-1. Celsus, for example, accused Christians of acting inconsistently by rejecting the worship of multiple Gods, claiming they worship one God, but also worshipping Christ. See Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, p. 608.

[26] Osborn, *The Emergence of Christian Theology*, p. 174.

[27] Origen, *De Principiis*, 1.1.6: 'Non ergo aut corpus aliquod, aut in corpore esse putandus est Deus, sed intellectualis natura simplex nihil omnino in se adjunctionis admittens; uti ne majus aliquid et inferius in se habere credatur, sed ut sit ex omni parte *monas* et *henas*…', ed. J. P. Migne, PG (Paris, 1857), vol. 11, col. 123, trans. G. W. Butterworth, *Origen: On First Principles, being Koetschau's Text of the De Principiis Translated into English, Together with an Introduction and Notes* (New York, 1966), p. 10.

[28] J. Dillon, 'Origen's Doctrine of the Trinity and some later Neoplatonic Theories', *Neoplatonism and Early Christian Thought: Essays in Honour of A. H. Armstrong* (Michigan, 1981), pp. 19-23.

> the Holy Spirit is still less, and dwells with the saints alone. So in this way the power of the Father is greater than that of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and that of the Son is more than that of the Holy Spirit, and in turn the power of the Holy Spirit exceeds that of every other holy being.[29]

Tertullian, on the other hand, offered a new and sophisticated conceptualisation of the 'creation' or development of the Trinity. Importantly, as well as initiating the idea of a unifying substance, Tertullian was also the first author to use the term 'Trinity' (*trinitas*) to express the idea of a three-fold but unified God.[30] His ideas on the Trinity's formation are most extensively outlined in his treatise *Against Praxeas*, written in around 213 in response to the supposedly heretical views of the Monarchian Praxeas, who supported an interpretation of the unity of the Godhead and not the division of the three persons.[31] Tertullian wrote that:

> The one only God has also a Son, his Word who has proceeded from himself, by whom all things were made and without whom nothing has been made: that this [Son] was sent by the Father into the virgin and was born of her both man and God, Son of man and Son of God: that he suffered, died, and was buried, according to the scriptures, and, having been raised up by the Father and taken back into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father… and thereafter he, according to his promise, sent from the Father the Holy Spirit the Paraclete, the sanctifier of the faith of those who believe in the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.[32]

In this passage, Tertullian conceptualises a 'threefold' development of the Trinity, one that began with the Father creating the Son at the beginning of time, and then the Son, with the

---

[29] Origen, *De Principiis*, 1.3.5: 'Arbitror Deum quidem Patrem, cum omnia contineat, ad unumquodque entium pervenire, esse unicuique impertientem de suo: ipse enim est qui est. Minor vero Patre Filius ad sola rationabilia pervenit; est enim secondas a Patre. Adhuc etiam minor Spiritus Sanctus, ad solos sanctus pertingit. It ex hoc major est potestas Patris quam Filii et Spiritus sanctii; ac rursum praestantior est sancti Spiritus virtus quam aliorum sanctorum entium.' ed. Migne, PG, vol. 11, col. 151, trans. Butterworth, *Origen: On First Principles*, pp. 33-34.

[30] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean*, VIII, XI, ed. and trans. Evans, *Tertulliani*, pp. 90, 131, pp. 96, 99-101, 143, 140. See Andrew B. McGowan, 'Tertullian and the Trinity', *God in Early Christian Thought: Essays in Honour of Lloyd G. Patterson*, ed. Andrew B. McGowan, Brian E. Daley and Timothy J. Gaden (Leiden, 2009), pp. 61-82 (p. 63).

[31] Ernest Evans, 'Introduction', in *Tertulliani Adversus Praxean Liber: Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas: The text edited, with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Ernest Evans* (London, 1948), pp. 18-22.

[32] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean*, II: '… ut unici dei sit et filius, sermo ipsius qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt et sine quo factum est nihil: hunc missum a patre in virginem et ex ea natum hominem et deum, filium hominis et filium dei, et cognominatum Jesum Christum: hunc passam, hunc mortuum et sepultum secundum scripturas, et resuscitatum a patre et in caelo resumptum sedere ad dexteram patris… qui exinde miserit, secundum promissionem suam, a patre spiritum sanctum paracletum, sanctificatorem fidei eorum qui credunt in patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum', ed. and trans. Ernst Evans, *Tertulliani Adversus Praxean Liber: Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas: The text edited, with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Ernest Evans* (London, 1948), pp. 90, 131.

Father, sending forth the Holy Spirit. Though this interpretation implies a temporal hierarchy, with the different persons created at different times, there is not the same hierarchy in their power that is present in Origen's conceptualisation. Tertullian is simultaneously keen to emphasise God's 'one-ness', and is the first author to discuss a 'unity of substance' (*substantiae unitatem*) from which the Father, Son and Spirit derive:

> They are all of the one, namely by unity of substance (*per substantiae scilicet unitatem*), while none the less is guarded the mystery of that economy which disposes the unity into trinity…[33]

Thus, Tertullian argued that each of the persons of the Trinity are 'one' by a uniting substance, but 'three' in the way in which they proceed from one another.

Despite the developments in Trinitarian theology brought about by these early writers, it was not until the fourth century, and specifically in response to the Arian Controversy, that an orthodox definition of the Trinity was first formalised. The 'heresy' for which Arius (250 or 256-336), the Alexandrian priest, was condemned, and the debates that ensued between him, his supporters and the early Christian bishops, has received extensive study from scholars.[34] From what can be re-constructed of Arius' theology from his letters and the accusations levelled against him, it appears that he held that God created the Son at a finite point in time and that, significantly, there was a time when the Son did not exist.[35] These concepts were strongly opposed by Arius' bishop Alexander of Alexandria (d. 326 or 328), who believed the Son to be one with the Father and to have been created at the same time as the Father; in opposition to Arius, therefore, Alexander held that there was never a time without the Son.[36] Supporters rallied on either side and the debate that ensued drove the convening of two councils. The First Council of Nicea, organised by Emperor Constantine (c. 272-337) in 325, sought to establish an orthodox, and anti-Arian, definition of the Trinity.[37] The resulting Nicene Creed specifically emphasised that the Son and the Father were one and the same being, stating:

---

[33] Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean*, II: '… ex uno omnia, per substantiae scilicet unitatem, et nihilo minus custodiatur sacramentum quae unitatem in trinitatem disponit…', ed. and trans. Evans, *Tertulliani*, pp. 90-1, 132.

[34] The most significant studies on the Arian Controversy include: Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine, vol. 1: The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)* (Chicago, 1971); R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God* (Edinburgh, 1988); Rowan Williams, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (Grand Rapids, 2001); Lewis Ayres, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (New York, 2004); Charles Freeman, *AD 381: Heretics, Pagans, and the Dawn of the Monotheistic State* (New York, 2009).

[35] For Arius' theological views see Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine*, pp. 3-16, 99-123.

[36] Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine*, pp. 139-145; Ayres, *Nicea and Its Legacy*, pp. 15-6.

[37] J. N. D Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 3rd ed. (London, 1972), pp. 205-254.

> We believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible.
> And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten from the Father, only-begotten that is, from the substance of the Father, God from God, light from light, true God from true God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father, through whom all things came into being, things in heaven and things on earth, Who because of us men and because of our salvation came down and became incarnate, becoming man, suffered and rose again on the third day, ascended to the heavens, will come to judge the living and dead.
> And in the Holy Spirit.
> But as for those who say, There was when He was not and Before being born He was not, and that He came into existence out of nothing, or who assert that the Son of God is of a different hypostasis or substance, or is subject to alteration or change – these the Catholic and apostolic Church anathematises.[38]

Significantly, in stating that Son is one substance (*substantia*) with the Father, the council firmly opposed any suggestion of his subordination.[39] Not only were Arius and his supporters renounced through the words of the Nicene Creed itself, but the council also issued their excommunication and condemned their beliefs as heresy.[40]

The second council to be held on this issue, the Council of Constantinople, was presided over by the Alexandrian bishop Athanasius (c. 296-373) in 381. The council maintained an insistence on the *homoousis*, or united substance, of the Father and Son, and whilst not extending this to the Holy Spirit, established that the Spirit was 'co-worshipped and co-glorified with Father and Son'.[41] Though Trinitarian doctrine remained controversial and much debated throughout the fourth and fifth centuries, the statements issued at these two councils brought about what has been termed a 'pro-Nicene consensus' across both Eastern and Western churches.[42] On the whole, influential theologians writing shortly after

---

[38] 'Credimus in unum deum patrem omnipotentem visibilium et invisibilium factorem. Et in unum dominum Jesum Christum filium dei, natum de patre, hoc est de substantia patris, deum de deo, lumen de lumine, deum verum de deum vero, natum non factum, unius substantiae cum patre, quod Graeci dicunt homousion, per quem Omnia facta sunt sive quae in caelo sive quae in terra; qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descenddit, incarnatus est, homo factus est, passus est et resurrexit teria die, ascendit in caelos venturus iudicare vivos et mortuos. Et in spiritum sanctum. Eos autem qui dicunt: erat quando non erat, et: priusquam nasceretur non erat, et quia ex nullis extantibus factus est, quod Graeci exuconton dicunt, vel alia sustantia, dicentes mutabilem et convertibilem filium dei, hos anathematizat catholica et apostolica ecclesoia.' ed. and trans. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, pp. 215-216, Latin edition, Norman P. Tanner, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, vol. 1: Nicaea I to Lateran V* (Washington, 1990), p. 5.
[39] For the significance of the term *substansia*, translated from the Greek *ouisa*, to describe the relationship between the Father and Son see Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine*, pp. 181-207.
[40] Ayres, *Nicaea*, pp. 85-104.
[41] 'cum patre et filio coadorandum et conglorificandum,' ed. Tanner, *Decrees*, p. 24.
[42] For a discussion of this term and its use see Ayres, *Nicea and Its Legacy*, pp. 236-240.

the Councils of Nicea and Constantinople, such as Gregory of Nyssa (c. 335-c.395) and Augustine of Hippo, conformed to the Trinitarian doctrine issued at these councils.[43]

The other major upheaval in Trinitarian doctrine that was to have a lasting effect on the formation of the early church in both the East and West was the *filioque* controversy. Whilst the Arian heresy had centred on the relationship between the Father and Son, the debates on this topic that ensued over the course of the seventh to the early eleventh century concerned the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the Father and Son. Whilst the Western tradition claimed the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son (the term *filioque* meaning 'and the Son'), Eastern theologians and writers held this to be heretical, and claimed the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father alone.[44] The Western interpretation of the procession of the Spirit from both the Father and Son had been accepted and discussed by Western theologians such as Hilary of Poitiers (c. 310-c.367), Jerome (c.347-420) and Augustine, but the first recorded use of the *filioque* phrase as part of the Nicene Creed is in the late sixth century, at the Third Council of Toledo in 589.[45] Though the phrase was not necessarily added to the Nicene Creed at this council,[46] it became standard in the liturgy of the Spanish church in the years following, and was then gradually adopted throughout the Latin West.[47]

This major doctrinal difference between the Eastern and Western Churches was maintained in an 'uneasy peace'[48] until the turn of the eleventh century, when the dispute between Cardinal Humbert (c. 1000-1061) and Patriarch Michael Cerularius (c. 1000-1059) in 1054, amidst other political and doctrinal tensions, caused what is now known as the 'Great Schism' between the Eastern and Western Church.[49] The schism initiated a wave of responses in the form of councils, synods and theological tracts from both Eastern and

[43] Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine*, pp. 459-556; Ayres, *Nicea and Its Legacy*, pp. 133-383.
[44] For responses to *filioque* in the Eastern and Western traditions see Edward Siecienski, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (Oxford, 2010), pp. 33-50 and 51-72.
[45] Siecienski, *The Filioque*, p. 69.
[46] It is possible either that the Council used a pre-amended version of the Nicene Creed, or even that the *filioque* was added slightly later. See A. E. Burn, 'Some Spanish MSS of the Constantinopolitan Creed', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 9 (1908), pp. 301-3.
[47] Siecienski, *The Filioque*, pp. 69-70.
[48] H. B. Swete, *On the History of the Doctine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, (Cambridge, 1876), pp. 168-172; Siecienski, *The Filioque*, p. 111; As Steven Runciman has argued, this 'peace' was due in part to the political dynamics of the Roman Curia which, in the tenth century, was heavily influenced by pro-Byzantine popes and statesmen: Steven Runciman, *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and Eastern Churches during the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Oxford, 1955), p. 27.
[49] For the political nuances of the schism see Siecienski, *The Filioque*, pp. 69-70; Henry Chadwick, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church, From Apostolic Times until the Council of Florence* (Oxford, 2003), p. 218.

Western perspectives, which sought to prove the accuracy of their respective claims.[50] The *filioque* was widely supported throughout the medieval West over the course of the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, with theologians such as Anselm (1033/4-1109), Peter Lombard (c. 1096-1160), Bonaventura (1221-1274) and Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) writing in support of the doctrine.[51] Attempts were also made, particularly in the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries, to reconcile the Eastern and Western perspectives on the *filioque*, but strong opposition on both sides to any negotiation meant East and West retained firmly opposing views on the procession of the Holy Spirit.[52]

By the turn of the eleventh century, the doctrine of the Trinity in the medieval West had thus become firmly established. Out of the ambiguities and often contradictions of scripture, Early Church theologians and officials had constructed a concept central to Christian doctrine and belief. In the West, the fundamentals of Trinitarian belief rested on the idea that Christ was 'one' with God, and that the Holy Spirit proceeded from them both. This view was largely defined in response to threats, whether in the form of 'heresy' or an opposing doctrinal standpoint, to this definition of the Trinitarian nature of God. As will be explored, the concept of the Trinity – and its form in visual and material culture – would go on to be shaped by these factors throughout the course of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. For this reason, its iconographic representation often stands at the interface of orthodoxy and heresies, emerging as a creative attempt to boldly imagine the unimaginable.

Framing the Trinity

As a concept fundamental, arguably central, to Christian worship and belief, the Trinity formed an equally integral part of some of the earliest iconographic surveys of Christian and medieval art. A. N. Didron[53] and, to a slightly lesser extent, Emile Mâle[54] both dedicate sections of their monographs to the subject. Importantly, these scholars were among the

[50] These included, among others, Anselm's *De Processione Spiritus Sancti*, which summarised his support of the filioque cause at the Synod of Bari in 1098. See Siecienski, *The Filioque*, pp. 117-8.
[51] Thomas Aquinas was particularly involved in these debates and was asked to construct a statement on the Latin views to the filioque by Pope Urban IV. See Michael Fahey and John Meyendorff, *Trinitarian Theology East and West: St Thomas Aquinas and St Gregory Palamas* (Brookline, 1977); Giles Emery, *Trinity in Aquinas* (Ypsilanti, 2003) and *The Trinitarian Theology of St Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford, 2007); Michael Torre, 'St John Damascene and St Thomas Aquinas on the Eternal Procession of the Holy Spirit', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 38 (1994), pp. 303-27.
[52] Siecienski, *The Filioque*, pp. 133-150, 151-182.
[53] A. N. Didron, *Iconographie chrétienne: histoire de Dieu* (Paris, 1843) discusses the iconography of God pp. 147-571.
[54] Emile Mâle, *L'Art Religieux du XIIe siècle en France: Étude sur les origines de l'iconographie du Moyen Age*, (Paris, 1922).

first to attempt to codify the various representations the Trinity and its persons, forming classifications that are now central to the art-historical analysis of Trinitarian images. Didron, for example, divides his section on the iconography of God into sections on the representation of the Father, Son and Spirit, and then the Trinity, which is itself structured around individual iconographies, including the *Gnadenstuhl* and Seated Trinity.[55] These initial studies laid much of the groundwork for later analyses of Trinitarian images and iconographies. Today, however, their conclusions are considered out of date due to the discovery of new material and developments in the study of iconography.[56]

As the twentieth-century scholars of iconography such as Aby Warburg, Fritz Saxl and Erwin Panofsky were often concerned more overtly with iconology and the methods and approaches involved in iconographic study, their work does not contain the same sustained focus on the Trinity as a specific investigation. Nevertheless, these scholars' pioneering efforts to develop earlier classification systems by interrogating a work's iconographic meaning offered new perspectives on what constituted Trinitarian imagery. This is exemplified in Panofsky's 1938 response to Herman Beenken's criticism of his earlier article on the Ghent Altarpiece, in which Panofsky argues that the intrinsic meaning of a singular figure of 'God' could signify all three persons of the Trinity even though the form of the image itself depicts just one divine person.[57] In doing so, Panofsky set up a mode of 'seeing' Trinitarian images that moved beyond the formal and often restrictive identification of an image as Trinitarian based purely on the visual representation of the three persons. His observations are critical to the foundation of scholarly interest in medieval Trinitarian iconography. However, as is discussed in more detail below, whilst acknowledging the potential of a single image of the Deity to function as a representation of the Trinity, this thesis focuses on Trinitarian visualisations in which all three persons of the triune God are depicted visually.[58]

By the mid-twentieth century, scholars became increasingly interested in the more formal identification of Trinitarian iconographic groups. Wolfgang Braunfels' short monograph *Die*

---

[55] Didron, *Iconographie chrétienne*: iconography of God the Father, pp. 148-215; God the Son, pp. 215-402; the Holy Spirit, pp. 403-498; and the Trinity pp. 499-583. The section on the Trinity describes the iconography of the Seated Trinity (pp. 562-7) *Gnadenstuhl* (pp. 568-71).

[56] For example, Mâle, *L'Art Religieux*, pp. 182-185 believed the iconography of the *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity had been invented at St Denis under Abbot Suger due to its use in one of Suger's Anagogical windows. This is discussed in more depth in chapter two, pp. 95-7.

[57] Erwin Panofsky, 'Once More "The Friedsam Annunciation and the Problem of the Ghent Altarpiece"', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 20, no. 4 (Dec., 1938), pp. 419-442. Written in response to Hermann Beenken, 'The Annunciation of Petrus Cristus in the Metropolitan Museum and the Problem of Hubert Van Eyck', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 19, no. 2 (Jun., 1937), pp. 220-241, which was itself a response to Panofsky, 'The Friedsam Annunciation and the Problem of the Ghent Altarpiece', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 17, no. 4 (Dec., 1935), pp. 432-473.

[58] See pp. 40-43.

Heilige Dreifaltigkeit, published in 1954, draws on Didron's study and illustrations, similarly dividing his discussion into iconographic or thematic groupings.[59] André Grabar's discussion of Trinitarian imagery in his study on the origins of Christian iconography also shows deference to these iconographic groups in its framing of early representations of the Trinity as mere forerunners of, and ultimately inferior to, later 'perfected' and standardised Trinitarian iconographies.[60] His disparaging comments that late Antique and early medieval artists 'failed' in their efforts to produce images of the Trinity as their designs did not last or become popular iconographies reveals the hierarchies often inherent in the study of twentieth-century art history, in which the standardisation of an image was seen as a measure of its success.[61]

Scholars in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century attempted to provide a more comprehensive approach to the study of the Trinity in art, acknowledging the importance of iconographic classifications while progressing beyond these categories to consider material that fell outside these isolated groupings. François Boespflug, by far the most prolific scholar on the representation of God and the Trinity in the Middle Ages, considers a wide and rich corpus that includes not only the visual arts but theological and philosophical writing, mystical texts and literature in his analysis of the development and dissemination of Trinitarian iconographies. His work has focused on the relationship between visionary texts and iconography, exploring the influence of preachers and mystics such as Norbert of Xanten and Robert of Deutz on contemporary imagery.[62] He has also examined Trinitarian imagery through the lens of specific Biblical events such as the Visitation of Abraham.[63] Boespflug's major monographs, in continuing to encompass this diverse subject matter as well as a wide geographic and temporal scope, present a broad

---

[59] Wolfgang Braunfels, *Die Heilige Dreifaltigkeit* (Düsseldorf, 1954).

[60] André Grabar, *Christian Iconography: A Study of Its Origins* (Princeton, 1968). For the Trinity see pp. 112-123.

[61] Grabar, *Christian Iconography*, p. 112: 'Christian theological iconography in late antiquity was incomplete and accidental, taking initial steps in various directions, retaining a few of the results, and quickly abandoning others… The difficulty of transposing the ideas of Christian doctrine into images did not prevent artists from attempting certain essential themes. Their achievements are very unequal, and they include a number of failures. One of these is the image of the Trinity. The image-makers failed here, not surprisingly, because the subject is a most difficult one… No satisfactory iconography of the dogmas of the Trinity has ever been achieved, and the best proof of this is that all iconographies that have ever been proposed have been rapidly abandoned…'

[62] François Boespflug, 'La Trinité au Moyen Âge: visions et images (XIIe-XIVe siècle)', *Expérience religieuse et expérience esthétique: Rituel, Art et Sacré dans les Religions* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1993), pp. 121-153; 'La Vision de la Trinité de Norbert de Xanta et de Robert de Deutz', *Revue de sciences religieuses*, vol. 71 (1997), pp. 205-229; 'Le Diable et la Trinité tricéphalous: À propos d'une pseudo-"vision de la Trinité" advenue àun novice de saint Norbert de Xanten', *Revue de sciences religieuses*, vol. 72 (1998), pp. 156-175.

[63] François Boespflug, 'Autour de l'hospitalité d'Abraham dans la Bible et le Coran, et de son écho dans l'art chrétien de Moyen Âge (XIIIe-XVIe s.)', *Le comparatisme et l'histoire des religions*, ed. François Dunand (Paris, 1997), pp. 315-343.

overview of the use of Trinitarian iconography in the Middle Ages.[64] They also focus on the much wider and more general topic of the representation of God, rather than Trinity in isolation.

Boespflug's studies with narrower temporal perspectives often focus on the later medieval period.[65] His co-authored article with Yolanta Zaluska engages with some examples from the temporal core of this thesis, but it still takes a temporally and geographically broad approach to the topic, considering the representation of the Trinity across Western art from the Carolingian era up to the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215.[66] Whilst these publications have provided important foundations for understanding the wider trends in Trinitarian imagery over this period, this broad approach has inevitably led to generalisations about the origins and development of certain iconographies, with the contextual intricacies of an iconography's creation often not considered in enough depth. As discussed in chapters one and two, this has meant important questions about where and when iconographies developed have sometimes been left unanswered.[67] Furthermore, much of Boespflug's work was also completed before, or without the knowledge of, the discovery of important images of the Trinity, which have challenged previously well-established theories on the development of medieval Trinitarian iconographic chronology.[68] By including these discoveries, this thesis presents a new understanding of how the representation of the Trinity changed, focusing especially on the period of c. 1000–1300 and including a host of 'forgotten' and 'uncovered' objects that did not feature in previous surveys.

Barbara Raw's monograph *Trinity and Incarnation in Anglo-Saxon Art and Thought*, published in 1997, is a rich resource for art historians and theologians, but, for the question at hand, it shares some of the same limitations as Boespflug's publications.[69] As stated in her introduction, Raw's study addresses a gap in the scholarship on medieval Trinitarian imagery, which had often overlooked the Anglo-Saxon contribution; Francis Wormald was

---

[64] François Boespflug, *Le Dieu des peintres et des sculpteurs: L'invisible incarné* (Paris, 2010); *Dieu et ses images: une histoire de l'Eternel dans l'art* (Montrouge, 2011).

[65] For example: François Boespflug, 'Dieu en pape: une singularité de l'art religieux de la fin du Moyen Âge', *Revue Mabillon: Revue internationale d'histoire et de littératures religieuses*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1991), pp. 167-205; 'La passion de la Trinité dans l'art flamand du XVe siècle', Dieu à l'épreuve de notre cri, ed. A. Guesché (Paris 1999), pp. 45-67; *The Trinité dans l'art d'Occident (1400-1460): sept chefs-d'oeuvre de la peinture* (Strasbourg, 2000); *Trinität: Dreifaltigkeitsbilder im später Mittelalter* (München, 2001); *Dieu dans l'art à la fin du Moyen Âge* (Genève, 2012).

[66] François Boespflug and Yolanta Zaluska, 'Le dogme trinitaire et l'essor de son iconographie n Occident de l'epoque carolingienne au IVe Concile du Latran (1215)', *Cahiers de civilisation medievale*, vol. 37 (1994), pp. 181-240.

[67] Discussed further below, p. 46, pp. 85-87.

[68] This is particularly the case for the discovery of the wall paintings at Houghton-on-the-Hill in Norfolk, which contain an early *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity not mentioned by Boespflug. For a discussion of these paintings see pp. 88-103.

[69] Barbara Raw, *Trinity and Incarnation in Anglo-Saxon Art and Thought* (Cambridge, 1997).

one of the only scholars to discuss the topic briefly in a short article in 1963.[70] Unlike Boespflug, Raw's study is limited to tenth- and eleventh-century England, but the decision to examine two, albeit linked, concepts in tandem often leads to a slightly unfocused discussion. This is accentuated further by the equal attention given to the representation of the Trinity and Incarnation in both art and thought.[71] Raw should be commended for redressing the balance of art-historical scholarship on Trinitarian imagery, which, hitherto, was dominated by continental case studies. Nevertheless, as with Boespflug, though the fundamentals of Anglo-Saxon Trinitarian imagery are outlined, the competing purposes of the study mean the intricacies of the development of Trinitarian imagery in this period are somewhat obscured.

In contrast to these broader studies, scholarship on medieval Trinitarian imagery has also tended to focus around one specific iconographic type. The most frequently discussed is the *Gnadenstuhl* or Throne of Mercy Trinity, and its recurrence in scholarship is undoubtedly a reflection of the iconography's popularity in the Middle Ages. Aside from discussions in Didron and Mâle's surveys, the first sustained study on the *Gnadenstuhl* appeared in 1932, as part of W. L. Hildburgh's analysis of an unusual bronze crucifix in the Victoria and Albert Collections.[72] Hildburgh concluded that the *Gnadenstuhl* developed out of an image of the *Dextera domini* above the cross. This idea was then gradually adopted in later scholarship, becoming the dominant theory for the origins of this particular iconography.[73] The argument appears, for example, in Gertrud Schiller's second volume of *Iconography of Christian Art*,[74] Sarah Jane Pearman's 1974 PhD dissertation on the *Gnadenstuhl*,[75] and in the more recent discussion of an early example of a *Gnadenstuhl* in John Munns' *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Norman England*.[76] As discussed in chapter two of this thesis, the recent discovery of an image of an early *Gnadenstuhl* located in a parish church in Norfolk has challenged Hildburgh's conclusions about when and where the iconography first appeared, calling into

[70] Raw, *Trinity and Incarnation*, p. 1; Francis Wormald, 'Late Anglo-Saxon Art: some Questions and Suggestions', *Studies in Western Art*, ed. M Meiss (Princeton, 1963), pp. 19-26, reprinted in Francis Wormald, *Collected Writings, I: Studies in Medieval Art, 6th to the 12th centuries*, ed. J. J. G. Alexander, T. J. Brown and Joan Gibbs (London, 1984), pp. 105-10.
[71] For the justification of this approach see Raw, *Trinity and Incarnation*, pp. 2-4.
[72] W. L. Hildburgh, 'A Medieval Bronze Pectoral Cross: Contributions to the Study of the Iconography of the Holy Trinity and of the Cross', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 14, no. 2 (1932), pp. 79-102.
[73] This is discussed in more depth below, pp. 85-86.
[74] Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, vol. II, pp. 122-4.
[75] Sara Jane Pearman, 'The Iconographic Development of the Cruciform Throne of Grace from the Twelfth to the Sixteenth Century', unpublished PhD dissertation (Case Western Reserve, 1974), pp. 19-21.
[76] John Munns, *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Norman England: Theology, Imagery, Devotion* (London, 2016), pp. 45-58.

question the validity of this argument.[77] The origins of the *Gnadenstuhl* iconography thus require a thorough re-evaluation in the light of these discoveries.

The Seated Trinity, the second most popular representation of the Trinity in the Middle Ages after the *Gnadenstuhl*, has also been discussed independently. Ernst H. Kantorowicz, in his 1947 article on the 'Winchester Quinity' image in the eleventh-century *Prayerbook of Aelfwine*, was the first to suggest that the iconography developed from the image of the two seated 'Lords' above Psalm 109 in the Utrecht Psalter.[78] Judith Kidd has provided a more recent re-evaluation of Kantorowicz's conclusions in relation to new research on eleventh-century Westminster where the *Prayerbook of Aelfwine* was produced, but aside from this response his arguments on the Seated Trinity have otherwise been accepted in later scholarship.[79] As the second-most popular representation of the Trinity in the Middle Ages after the *Gnadenstuhl*, the origins and dissemination of this particular iconography deserve to be investigated in more depth. Chapter one offers a thorough reassessment of the Seated Trinity image, analysing its development within the cultural and artistic milieu of eleventh-century England.

Other scholars have focused on producing detailed studies of a single image of the Trinity, or series of images, as a means of reflecting on wider trends in medieval Trinitarian imagery. Jeffrey Hamburger, for example, dedicated a significant portion of his monograph on the Rothschild Canticles to the elaborate and highly unusual series of Trinitarian images that form part of the book's extensive narrative cycle.[80] This analysis was developed and extended by Barbara Newman in a 2013 article that looked more closely at the relationship between the text and accompanying Trinitarian images.[81] Though this remarkable set of illuminations, probably made in Flanders in the very early fourteenth century, fall outside of the temporal and geographic scope of this thesis, the imaginative rending of the Trinity throughout the series attests to the creative and at times obscure approach of medieval artists to this subject matter. Other case-study approaches to Trinitarian iconography include Otto V. Simson's analysis of Massaccio's fresco of the Trinity in the church of

---

[77] See below, pp. 85-96.
[78] Ernst H. Kantorowicz, 'The Quinity of Winchester', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 29, no. 2 (Jun., 1947), pp. 73-85. See pp. 40-5.
[79] Judith Kidd, 'The Winchester Quinity Reconsidered', *Studies in Iconography*, vol. 7-8 (1981-2), pp. 21-33. Kantorowicz's arguments are taken up, for example, in Boespflug and Zaluska, 'Le dogme trinitaire', p. 214.
[80] Rothschild Canticles, Flanders, c. 1300-20 (Yale, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, MS 404); J. Hamburger, *The Rothschild Canticles: Art and Mysticism in Flanders and the Rhineland c. 1300* (Yale, 1990), pp. 118-142.
[81] Barbara Newman, 'Contemplating the Trinity: Text, Image, and the Origins of the Rothschild Canticles', *Gesta*, vol. 52, no. 2 (Sep., 2013), pp. 133-159.

Santa Maria Novella in Florence,[82] which situates the paintings' iconography within its historical context, and Catherine E. Karkov's discussion of the illumination of the Trinity on the first folio of the Harley Psalter.[83]

Scholarship on the iconography and artistic representation of the Trinity in the Middle Ages has thus been characterised by two distinct approaches. On the one hand, following the precedent set by early iconographers such as Didron and Mâle, scholars have attempted to classify and codify Trinitarian iconography and track the development over these images over the course of the Middle Ages. Though more recent studies, particularly by Boespflug and Raw, have worked to contextualise these iconographic trends through consideration of the relationship between Trinitarian imagery and contemporary theology, literature and other media, the broad geographic, temporal or thematic scope of these studies has resulted in a general overview of the subject matter, rather than a detailed and contained discussion. On the other hand, studies that have focused on a single Trinitarian iconography or image, whilst offering a comprehensive analysis of these individual topics, have often failed to account for the wider Trinitarian art historical contexts in which these images were created. Due to its popularity in the Middle Ages, the iconography of the *Gnadenstuhl* has also tended to dominate discussion. Furthermore, with the exception of a few recent studies, the majority of the historiography was produced in the twentieth century, and thus before the discovery of images that challenge previously well-accepted ideas about the origins and development of medieval Trinitarian iconography.[84] A current, balanced and critical assessment of the topic therefore seems timely.

Method and Approach

The range and diversity of Trinitarian imagery in the period c. 1000-1300 has driven this thesis' unique methodological approach, in which the most common iconographic representations of the Trinity are examined in parallel with the most 'unusual'. This method has been developed with the view that it might provide a more holistic overview of Trinitarian iconography than previous studies have allowed. As the first study to directly compare both 'usual' and 'unusual' Trinitarian images, it offers a rich and more complete picture of the ways in which the 'unimaginable' Trinity was imagined in the visual culture of Western Europe. In particular, whilst the more common iconographies discussed in the

[82] Otto V. Simson, 'Über die Bedeutung von Masaccios Trinitatsfresko in S. Maria Novella', *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen*, 8 (1996), pp. 119-159.
[83] Catherine E. Karkov, 'Reading the Trinity in the Harley Psalter', *Crossing Boundaries: Interdisciplinary approaches to the art, material culture, language and literature of the early medieval world: essays presented to Professor Emeritus Richard N. Bailey OBE, on the occasion of his eightieth birthday* (2017), pp. 90-6.
[84] Munns, *Cross and Culture*, pp. 45-58 is the most recent study to discuss the *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity.

first three chapters of this thesis have received considerable attention in scholarly literature, the more 'unusual' Trinitarian images examined in the final two chapters have often been overlooked as 'outliers' or deviations from the more common forms. Their perceived 'failure' to become popular or well used has prevented their inclusion from major iconographic studies on this topic. By re-incorporating these 'outliers' back into the center of the discussion, this thesis more fully encapsulates the inventive and imaginative approach to Trinitarian imagery in the period c. 1000-1300. Indeed, one of the major conclusions of this thesis is that 'unusual' iconographic representations of the Trinity are integral to understanding responses to wider theological and cultural trends, as they provide tangible evidence of an artist's adaption and manipulation of more common imagery for their own purpose.

This inclusive approach to both conventional and unconventional representations of the Trinity has also driven the temporal and geographic scope of the thesis. As the first two chapters focus on the invention of the *Gnadenstuhl* and Seated Trinity, they cover the period and regions in which these forms first appeared. The earliest extant images of the Seated Trinity occur in southern English art in the early eleventh century; the earliest surviving image of a *Gnadenstuhl* appears as part of an early twelfth-century wall painting in East Anglia. Both chapters thus primarily contextualise these images within English art and culture, whilst also looking more broadly to these images' connections with contemporary developments in the wider Western European artistic landscape. The scope of chapter three is necessarily broader, as it considers the rise of the *Gnadenstuhl* and Seated Trinity in both continental and insular European art over the course of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. The final two chapters, on the other hand, return to a focus on Trinitarian images produced in England. They explore how and why, following the invention, reception and standardisation of the *Gnadenstuhl* and Seated Trinity, artists working in the thirteenth century created new and inventive designs to depict the Trinitarian God.

Although the period under consideration in this thesis is relatively broad, covering three centuries in its entirety, this chronological framework, stretching from c. 1000–1300, has been necessary in order to fully encapsulate the context in which the iconography of the Seated Trinity and *Gnadenstuhl* evolved, both became standardized, and grew to immense popularity. When analysing individual images central to this wider narrative, the discussion remains focused on the immediate temporal and geographic context in which they were created, with the view that this approach will expose more defined conclusions about the invention, dissemination or 'unusual' nature of Trinitarian images. At the same time, I hope this study will generate insight into the artistic representation of the Trinity outside of the

geographic and temporal bounds considered in this study, as well as shedding light on the processes of medieval image-making and invention more widely.

The iconographic focus of this study has also determined the types of source material analysed throughout. The frequency with which medieval iconography was transmitted across different media, and the often fluid boundaries between various artistic forms, has been well documented, and holds true for the majority of Trinitarian images discussed in this thesis.[85] Consequently, no limitations have been placed on the types of media discussed, in order that the rich and complex context in which these iconographies developed might be fully explored. Furthermore, as images are never produced in a vacuum or independent of the culture in which they are created, non-visual sources also form an important part of the discussion. Visionary and mystical writings, liturgical texts, and Biblical exegesis and commentaries are all considered as essential components in the construction and invention of Trinitarian imagery. So too are concepts of space and performance, particularly in relation to the practice of the liturgy. In this way, this thesis shares the approach of scholars such as Raw and Boespflug, who also reach beyond visual sources in their analyses to consider the more complex context in which Trinitarian iconographies were formed.

Whilst taking a comprehensive approach to media and source material, this thesis is more focused in its discussion of variations in Trinitarian iconography and representation. Rather than providing an exhaustive survey of the many different types of Trinitarian images to appear over the course of the Middle Ages, the discussion specifically addresses, on the one hand, the most common iconographies, and on the other, the most unusual. Although the diversity of medieval Trinitarian imagery is acknowledged throughout, a more sustained discussion around these themes allowed for a richer and more detailed interrogation of the contexts in which 'usual' and 'unusual' representations of the Trinity were created. It is hoped that this comparative approach will speak to wider questions of invention and image making in the period under consideration. However, in order that these themes be explored in enough depth, representations of the Trinity that fall in between these two categories are not central to the discussion. The representation of the Trinity as three separate beings, for example, appeared infrequently throughout the Middle Ages, and did not enjoy the same popularity as the Seated or *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities; as such, it is not discussed at length.[86]

[85] For the transmission of iconography and art not only across media but also geographical and religious boundaries see *Translatio, Or the Transmission of Culture in the Midde Ages and the Renaissance: Modes and Messages*, ed. Laura Holden Hollengreen (Turnhout, 2008); *Mechanisms of Exchange: Transmission in Medieval Art and Architecture of the Mediterranean, ca. 1000-1500*, eds. Heather E. Grossman and Alicia Walker (Leiden, 2013).
[86] For the representation of the Trinity as three persons see Boespflug and Zaluska, 'Le dogma trinitaire', pp. 188-191.

Similarly, diagrammatic representations of the Trinity, notably the image of the Shield of Faith, or *Scutum fidei*, gained some popularity, particularly in scholarly circles, but again appear much less than the Seated Trinity or *Gnadenstuhl*.[87] Symbolic representations of the Trinity, for example the appearance in triplicate of certain architectural features, such as windows or steps, also fall outside the scope of this thesis. They are incredibly varied and relatively difficult to categorise, and therefore deserve a full study of their own. Nevertheless, it is hoped that this type of imagery, and their relationship to the Trinitarian images discussed at length in this thesis, may prove fruitful avenues for future research.

Aims of the Thesis

The first three chapters of this thesis concern the invention and dissemination of the two most common representations of the Trinity in the Middle Ages: the Seated or 'Psalter' Trinity, and the *Gnadenstuhl*, or 'Throne of Grace' Trinity. The Seated Trinity, the subject of my first chapter, is an early medieval Trinitarian image that represents the Father and Son as anthropomorphic figures sat side-by-side on a throne, dais, or bench, with the dove of the Holy Spirit flying between them. Derived from imagery related to the opening verse of Psalm 109, this iconography first takes form in manuscript art and material objects associated with monastic centres in southern England around the first half of the eleventh century. The chapter reappraises the traditional assumption that the iconography was inspired by the illustration of Psalm 109 in the Utrecht Psalter, which shows the two 'Lords' seated side-by-side on a globe.[88] It is argued that this iconic and influential image was transformed into the Seated Trinity shortly after the Utrecht Psalter arrived in Canterbury at the turn of the eleventh century.

My second chapter provides a reassessment of the origins and development of the *Gnadenstuhl*, which is believed to have appeared first in southern England in the late eleventh or early twelfth century. The *Gnadenstuhl* represents the Father holding the crucified son on the cross whilst the dove of the Holy Spirit flies between them. The first extant example of this image appears as part of a series of early twelfth-century wall paintings in the parish church of St Mary at Houghton-on-the-Hill in Norfolk, which were uncovered in the mid-1990s. Before this rediscovery, scholars assumed that the design of the *Gnadenstuhl* originated in the monastic visual culture of Northern France in the early twelfth century. This chapter re-evaluates the formation and crystallisation of one of the most enduring devotional iconographies in medieval Europe by suggesting that the 'invention' of the *Gnadenstuhl* is related to contemporary developments in the ceremony of the mass.

---

[87] For the Shield of Faith see Michael Evans, 'An Illustrated Fragment of Peraldus's *Summa* of Vice: Harleian MS 3244', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 45 (1982), pp. 32-55 and Suzanne Lewis, *The Art of Matthew Paris in the Chronica Majora*, (Berkeley, 1987), pp. 194-7.
[88] Utrecht Psalter, Rheims, c. 820 (Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS 32).

The third chapter addresses a series of challenges and upheavals in Trinitarian theology over the course of the twelfth century. During this period, an increasing number of theologians, including Roscelin of Compiègne (c. 1050-c. 1125), Peter Abelard (1079-1142), Gilbert of Poitiers (after 1085-1154) and Joachim of Fiore (c. 1135-1202), were accused of heresy and brought to trial on the basis of their Trinitarian doctrine. This chapter provides a detailed and new study of how artists may have responded to the contentious and precarious representation of Trinitarian theology in the twelfth century. It concludes by considering how the establishing of an 'orthodox' definition on Trinitarian theology at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 led to the 'standardisation' of Trinitarian iconography in the early thirteenth century, culminating in the adaptation and increase in the widespread use of 'orthodox' images of the Seated Trinity and the *Gnadenstuhl*.

This overview of the formation of conventional Trinitarian iconography provides an important contextual foundation for the final two chapters. Each focuses on a series of especially unusual images of the Trinity produced in England in the thirteenth century. They consider why, in a period of increasing iconographic 'standardisation', artists departed from traditional artistic formulae to create new, inventive, and deeply imaginative Trinitarian images.

Chapter four explores the phenomenon of the three-faced or three-headed Trinity. Three examples of this type survive from thirteenth-century England. The earliest appears as an illuminated initial accompanying Psalm 109 in a book known as the Bible of William of Hales, which was written and illuminated at Salisbury Cathedral in 1254.[89] An almost identical three-faced head appears in a label stop in Salisbury Cathedral chapter house, completed in the 1260s–70s. The first part of this chapter explores the relationship between these two examples, interrogating their possible iconographic connection to depictions of Janus as a three-faced man, images which first appear in early thirteenth-century Calendar illuminations made in both England and France. The second half of this chapter focuses on an extremely unusual representation of a three-headed Trinity in a series of late thirteenth-century narrative miniatures depicting scenes from the Old and New Testament, now in a book known as the St John's Psalter.[90]

Chapter five examines another series of highly innovative images of the Trinity in a late thirteenth-century bestiary produced in England, currently held in the Bibliothèque Nationale

[89] Bible of William of Hales, England (Salisbury), 1254 (London, BL MS Royal 1 B XII).
[90] St John's Psalter, England (London?), c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College MS K 26).

de France in Paris.[91] This bestiary includes large illuminations of allegorical and moral scenes, as well as traditional images of beasts and animals. It is in these allegorical images that we find two inventive representations of the Trinity: the unique depiction of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit suspended in the tree of life in the Garden of Eden (f. 54r) and an image of a *Gnadenstuhl* in which the Father is shown as identical to the Son, with blood issuing from his hands, feet, and side (f.61r). The allegorical images in the bestiary correspond closely to the allegorical interpretation of the animals in the accompanying text. The close consultation of the text on behalf of the artist or designer has resulted in the production of deeply inventive Trinitarian imagery that constitutes a total departure from more established iconographic patterns in an attempt to reflect new allegorical ideas.

This PhD thesis offers the first detailed analysis of the development of Trinitarian iconography in English art in the period c. 1000-1300. In so doing, it also confronts larger art historical questions about the process of image making, the influence of theology on the invention of tradition, and the transmission of ideas in medieval visual culture. In examining how artists conceptualised God as paradoxical, triune, and 'unimaginable' being, this thesis considers what it meant to truly 'imagine' the impossible in the Middle Ages.

[91] Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969).

Chapter One: The Seated Trinity

Introduction

The origins of the Seated Trinity can be traced to one of the most spectacular artistic productions of the Carolingian period, the Utrecht Psalter, and its re-interpretation in the visual culture of eleventh-century England.[1] The iconography typically shows an anthropomorphic representation of God the Father and God the Son, sitting side by side on a throne-like bench, with the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove flying between them. This representation most frequently appears alongside Psalm 109 in Psalters and Bibles, due to its relationship to the opening words to this Psalm, which begins: 'The Lord said to my Lord: Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstool'.[2] Because of this scriptural association, the iconography has been referred to as a Psalter Trinity, or 'Trinité du Psautier'.[3] Though the origins of the iconography are certainly rooted in this scriptural tradition, as this chapter explores, the image was also used outside of this context, in association with a wide variety of different texts and also in different media. It is possible that one of the earliest extant examples of the Seated Trinity type is found outside of manuscript illumination, on the magnificent eleventh-century Seal Matrix of Godwin, now in the British Museum.[4] As this iconography was not limited to Psalter illustration, the preferred term for this type of Trinity, which will be used throughout this thesis, is the more descriptive Seated Trinity, rather than 'Psalter Trinity'. Nevertheless, unlike the *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity, which proliferated across many different types of media, the vast majority of extant examples of Seated Trinities are most frequently found in manuscript illumination, and are typically depicted in the historiated initial accompanying Psalm 109.

This chapter traces the development and transmission of the iconography of the Seated Trinity in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries. It is argued that the design of the Seated Trinity derives from the image accompanying Psalm 109 in the Utrecht Psalter, which depicts the Father and Son sat side-by-side in conversation. This iconic and influential

---

[1] Utrecht Psalter, Rheims, c. 820 (Utrecht, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, MS 32). The Utrecht Psalter is discussed in more depth below, pp. 55-59. For the iconography of the Seated Trinity see Ernst H. Kantorowicz, 'The Quinity of Winchester', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 29, no. 2 (Jun., 1947), pp. 73-85; Judith Kidd, 'The Winchester Quinity Reconsidered', *Studies in Iconography*, vol. 7-8 (1981-2), pp. 21-33; François Boespflug and Yolanta Zaluska, 'Le dogme trinitaire et l'essor de son iconographie en Occident de l'époque carolingienne au IVe Concile du Latran (1215)', *Cahiers de civilisation medieval*, 37, no. 147 (July-September 1994), pp. 181-240 (pp. 207-220).

[2] Psalm 109:1; 'Dixit dominus domino meo: sede a dextris meis, donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum'. The numbering of Psalms throughtout this thesis adheres to the Vulgate tradition. In most Protestant Bibles, following the Hebrew numbering system, Psalm 109 is numbered 110.

[3] Boespflug and Zaluska, 'Le dogme trinitaire', p. 207.

[4] London, BM, museum number 1881, 0404.1

image was transformed into the Seated Trinity shortly after the Utrecht Psalter arrived in England at the turn of the eleventh century. Two images from the eleventh century attest to the importance of the Utrecht design in the formation of this iconography: the first in the *Prayerbook of Aelfwine*, made in Winchester in c. 1023-31, and the second on the seal matrix of Godwin dating from around 1040. These images, the only two examples of the Seated Trinity to survive from the eleventh century, though ultimately dependant on the words of Psalm 109 through their connection with the Utrecht Psalter design, are reemployed in contexts outside of Psalm illustration. These early images are often associated with ideas of authority and hierarchy, and circulate on objects connected to individuals or institutions with power and status. From these early elite origins, the iconography of the Seated Trinity then disseminated throughout wider visual culture, to be used predominantly in the manuscript illumination of Psalters and Bibles.

The Seated Trinity in the Eleventh Century

Psalm 109 in the New Testament and the Works of the Church Fathers

From the time of the Early Church and throughout the Middle Ages, it was believed that David, the Biblical King of Israel and Judah, composed the book of the Psalms.[5] As such, the psalms were read as divinely inspired texts about God and the heavenly realms. Psalm 109, with its emphasis on two 'Lords' seated next to one another, offered a particularly unique insight on the character of God:

The Lord said to my Lord: sit thou at my right hand:	*Dixit Dominus Domino meo: Sede a dextris meus*
Until I make thy enemies thy footstall	*Donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum*
The Lord will send forth the sceptre of thy power out of Sion:	*Virgam virtutis tuae emittet Dominus ex Sion:*
Rule thou in the midst of thy enemies.	*Dominare in medio inimicorum tuorum*
With thee is the principality in the day of thy strength:	*Tecum pricipium in die virtutis tuae:*
In the brightness of the saints:	*In splendoribus sanctorum:*

[5] For the Book of Psalms in the Early Church see *The Harp of Prophesy: Early Christian Interpretation of the Psalms*, ed. Brian E. Daley, S. J. Kolbet and Paul R. Kolbet (Notre Dame, IN, 2015); for the Psalms in the Middle Ages see *The Place of the Psalms in the Intellectual Culture of the Middle Ages*, ed. Nancy van Deusen (New York, 1999); Annie Sutherland, *English Psalms in the Middle Ages, 1300-1450* (Oxford, 2015); *The Psalms and Medieval English Literature: From the Conversion to the Reformation*, ed. Tamara Atkin and Francis Leneghan (Cambridge, 2017).

From the womb before the day star I begot thee.	*Ex utero, ante luciferum genui te*
The Lord hath sworn, and he will not repent:	*Juravit Dominus, et non poenitebit eum:*
Thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech.	*Tue es sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech.*
The Lord at thy right hand hath broken kings in the day of his wrath.	*Dominus a dextris tuis; confregit in die irae suae reges.*
He shall judge among nations, he shall fill ruins:	*Judacabit in nationibus; implebit ruinas:*
He shall crush the heads in the land of the many.	*Conquassabit capita in terra multorum.*
He shall drink the torrent in the way:	*De torrente in via bibet:*
Therefore he shall lift up the head.[6]	*Propeterea exaltabit caput.*

Though the Psalm is ambiguous about the precise identification of the two Lords, it touches on certain themes that give some indication as to both Lords' characteristics. One Lord instructs the other, implying a sense of hierarchy. At the same time, this Lord also invites the other Lord to 'sit at his right hand' (*Sede a dextris meus*), suggesting that he is granting this second Lord power and authority. The idea of being at the 'right hand' (*dextris meus*) was used frequently throughout the Bible as a way of denoting greatness, power and protection from God.[7] The second Lord is described as ruling over his enemies, as well as being a judge among the nations. Significantly, he is also described as being a 'priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech' (*Tue es sacerdos in aeternum secundum ordinem Melchisedech*), a reference to the character from the book of Genesis who was both king and priest, and who blessed Abraham after battle with bread and wine.[8]

Though the iconography of the Seated Trinity is derived ultimately from the opening words of Psalm 109, the image also developed in response to various interpretations and elaborations on the Psalm by later authors. In the New Testament, Psalm 109 is quoted a number of times by both Christ and Peter, who use the Psalm as evidence for Christ's

[6] Psalm 109:1-7.
[7] For example, the right hand of God is also described as enacting justice and power over enemies (Exodus 15:6; Psalm 20:9; Psalm 47:11; Psalm 109:5; Psalm 117:16) offering protection (Job 40:9; Psalm 15:8-11; Psalm 16:8; Psalm 120:5; Isaiah 41:10) and as a sign of a son's inheritance (Genesis 35:18; Genesis 48:14-18). See also Gamble Leigh Madsen, 'Medieval Visions of the Godhead: Peter Lombard's Commentary on Psalm 109', unpublished PhD dissertation, University of South California (2004), pp. 18-19.
[8] Genesis 14:18-20.

divinity and his ultimate resting place after his ascension at the right hand of the Father. The words of Psalm 109 were also discussed extensively by the Church Fathers, who derived two main themes from the seven verses: the Trinitarian nature of God, and the dual nature of Christ as both human and divine. In addition to these Biblical and patristic sources, various medieval commentaries and glosses offered interpretations of both the Psalm itself and the work of the Church Fathers. A survey of the Biblical and patristic perspectives on Psalm 109 provides the context for later discussions of medieval commentaries on these verses, and the potential interaction between the image of the Seated Trinity and these various interpretations on Psalm 109.

The Psalmist's words, and the themes that they invoke, were elaborated upon in the New Testament. Christ is recorded in Mark's Gospel as quoting from the Psalm himself in response to the Pharisees questions about his claims to be the Messiah. The Gospel states:

> And Jesus answering, said, teaching in the temple: How do the scribes say that Christ is the son of David? For David himself saith by the Holy Ghost: The Lord said to my Lord, Sit on my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstall. Therefore David calleth him Lord, and whence is he then his son? And a great multitude heard him gladly.[9]

Here Jesus clearly equates the 'Lord' (*Dominus*) referred to in Psalm 109 with Christ, the Messiah, whom he states is more than just the earthly son of David. This is clarified later on in the Gospel of Mark, when Jesus is brought in front of the high priests before his crucifixion. Asked whether he is Christ, son of the blessed God, Jesus answers: "'I am. And you shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of the power of God, and coming with the clouds of heaven.'"[10] In this verse, Christ identifies himself not only as Christ, but also as the 'Lord' of Psalm 109, sitting at the right hand of God the Father.

Later on in the New Testament, the Psalm is again quoted during Peter's speech at Pentecost. After receiving the Holy Spirit, Peter is described in the book of Acts as delivering a sermon to the crowd that had gathered. Using a number of references from the Old Testament, Peter ends his sermon by quoting from Psalm 109:

> This Jesus hath God raised again, whereof all we are witnesses. Being exalted therefore by the right hand of God, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost,

[9] Mark 12:35-7: 'Et respondens Jesus dicebat, docens in templo: Quomodo dicunt scribae Christum filium esse David? Ipse enim David dicit in Spiritu Sancto: Dixit Dominus Domino meo: Sede a dextris meis, donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum. Ipse ergo David dicit eum Dominum, et unde est filius ejus? Et multa turba eum libenter audivit.'
[10] Mark 14:62: 'Jesus autem dixit illi: Ego sum: et videbitis Filium hominis sedentem a dextris virtutis Dei, et venientem cum nubibus caeli.'

> he hath poured forth this, which you see and hear. For David ascended not into heaven; but he himself said: The Lord said to my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstall. Therefore let all the house of Israel know most certainly, that God hath made both Lord and Christ, this same Jesus, whom you have crucified.[11]

In this passage, Peter decisively confirms that the 'Lord' referred to in Psalm 109 is not David, but Jesus, whom God the Father has 'made' (*fecit*) Lord and Christ, and who is seated at his right hand.

The identification of the second 'Lord' of Psalm 109 with the person of Christ was a theme continued in the works of the Church Fathers. Jerome (c. 347-420), writing in the late fourth century, commented on the Psalm in one of his homilies, using the Psalm's Messianic themes as evidence against contemporary heresies such as Arianism, which questioned the divine nature of Christ and his equal relationship to the Father.[12] Jerome begins by clarifying the dual nature of Christ as man and God, stating:

> He who is the Son of God is also the Son of David; there is not one Son and another son; I do not make two persons, one in God and another in man; but He who is the Son of God is Himself also the Son of David.[13]

Here Jerome draws on themes already touched upon by Christ and Peter in the New Testament, in which Jesus is acknowledged as both the son of David and of God, thus revealing his dual human and divine nature. He states that these two titles do not refer to two individual people, but these two parts of Christ's nature are one.[14] Jerome is also clear, however, in his identification of the two Lords of the Psalm as Christ and the Father:

> "The Lord said to my Lord: Sit at my right hand". In the Hebrew, the first title of Lord is written in those characters that are reserved for God alone, but the second title of Lord is

---

[11] Acts 2:32-6: 'Hunc Jesum resuscitavit Deus, cujus omnes nos testes sumus. Dextera igitur Dei exaltatus, et promissione Spiritus Sancti accepta a Patre, effudit hunc, quem vos videtis, et auditis. Non enim David ascendit in caelum : dixit autem ipse : Dixit Dominus Domino meo : Sede a dextris meis donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum. Certissime sciat ergo omnis domus Israel, quia et Dominum eum, et Christum fecit Deus, hunc Jesum, quem vos crucifixistis.'

[12] These homilies were only attributed to Jerome at the end of the nineteenth century by Germain Morin, 'Les Monuments de la prédication de saint Jérôme, *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, vol. 1 (1896), pp. 393-434. For the Arian heresy, see above, p. 31.

[13] Jerome, *Tractatus de Psalmo*, vers. 1: 'Nobis ergo qui filius Dei est, ipse est et filius David: non alius filius et alius filius, non facio duas personas in Deo et homine; sed ipse qui filius Dei est, ipse est et filius David.' ed. G. Morin et al, *Tractatus de Psalmo*, *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera: Pars II. Opera Homiletica: Tractatus sive homiliae in Psalmos, in Marci evangelium aliaque varia argumenta*, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis (Turnhout, 1958), vol. 78, pp. 222-230, trans. Marie Liguori Ewald, *The Homilies of St Jerome,* 2 vols. (Washington, 1964-1966), I (1964), p. 270.

[14] Jerome, *Tractatus de Psalmo*, 1, ed. Morin et al, *Tractatus de Psalmo*, p. 222.

> written with letters ordinarily respectful in polite address, as for instance, a master is called lord by those who serve him, and as kings are called lords. Understand then: "The Lord said to my Lord" to mean, to the Lord to whom is given the command to be seated. God does not sit; He who has assumed a human body sits; hence, he who is told to be seated is man, the Incarnate Word.[15]

Jerome's exposition thus emphasises two distinct themes expressed in Psalm 109, that of Christ's dual nature as son of man and Son of God, and the idea that the first Lord of the Psalm is the Father calling to the second Lord of the Psalm, the Son, to join him at his right hand. Augustine's (354-430) interpretation of Psalm 109 in the *Expositions on the Psalms* similarly echoes these two major themes. Augustine is clear in his Christological interpretation of Psalm 109, stating that: 'The Psalm is one of those promises, surely and openly prophesying our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; so that we are utterly unable to doubt that Christ is announced in this Psalm.'[16] Referencing Christ's own quotation of the Psalm in the Gospel of Mark, Augustine also emphasises Christ's dual identity as both the Son of David and the Lord of David, clarifying Christ's statement in the Gospels that he is both.[17] Augustine's exposition elaborates fairly extensively on the place of Christ at the right hand of the Father. He states that this verse is an illusion to Christ's place of honour in heaven beside his Father:

> We know that Christ sits at the right hand of the Father, since his resurrection from the dead, and ascent into heaven… So that in this very circumstance, that Christ took upon Him the flesh, that He died in the flesh, that He rose again in the same flesh, that in the same He ascended into Heaven, and sits at the right hand of His Father, in this same flesh so honoured, so brightened, so changed into a heavenly garb, He is both David's Son, and David's Lord.[18]

---

[15] Jerome, *Tractatus in Psalmos*, 1: '*Dixit Dominus Domino meo: Sede a dextris meis*. In hebraico primum nomen Domini his litteris scribitur, quibus de Deo tantum scribitur. Secundum vero nomen Domini his litteris scribitur, quibus solent homines dominum vocare: quomodo et a quorundam vocatur dominus a servo, et reges vocantur domini. Vide ergo quid dicat. *Dixit dominus domine meo* : huic Domino, cui praecipitur ut sedeat. Deus non sedet, qui homo est, qui adsumptus est.' ed. Morin et al, *Tractatus de Psalmo*, p. 222, trans. Ewald, *The Homilies of St Jerome*, p. 271.

[16] Augustine, *Ennarrationes in Psalmos*, In Psalmum CIX, 3: 'Ex his promissionibus est psalmus iste, Dominum et salvatorem nostrum Jesum Christum certe aperteque prophetans ; ut omnino dubitare non possimus Christum annuntiari psalmo hoc', ed. J. P. Migne, PL (Paris, 1865), vol. 37, col. 1447, trans. John Henry Parker, *Expositions on the Book of Psalms,* vols. 1-5 (Oxford, 1847-1857), V (1853), p. 232.

[17] Augustine, *Ennarrationes in Psalmos*, In Psalmum CIX, 3-4, ed. Migne, PL, vol. 37, col. 1447-8.

[18] Augustine, *Ennarrationes in Psalmos*, In Psalmum CIX, 7: 'Novimus Christum sedere ad dexteram Patris post resurrectionem a mortuis, et is coelos ascens onem... Ergo et eo ipso quod carnem accepit Christus, quod in carne mortuus est, quod in eadem carne resurrexit, quod in eadem ascendit in coelum, et sedet ad dexteram Patris, et in eadem ipsa carne sic honorata, sic clarificata, sic in coelestem habitum commutate, et filius est David, et Dominus est David,' ed. Migne, PL, vol. 37, col. 1450, trans. Parker, *Exposition on the Book of Psalms*, pp. 236-7.

In this passage, Augustine establishes not only the physical location of 'the right hand of the Father' (*sedere ad dexteram Patris*) as heaven, but also situates this place temporally within the Christian narrative, after Christ's death, Resurrection and final Ascension. The vision of the two 'Lords' in Psalm 109, for Augustine and for many early Christians, thus reflected the current state of heaven.

Cassiodorus (c. 485-c. 585), the Roman statesman and writer, also composed an exposition on Psalm 109 that was to become influential in later medieval commentaries.[19] Written in the mid sixth century, Cassiodorus' exposition is significant for its reorganisation of some of the major themes already explored by the New Testament authors and by Jerome and Augustine. Each of the commentaries in his *Expositio in Psalterium* begins with a section on the 'division' of the Psalm, before the subsequent 'explanation'.[20] This 'division' section presents a summary of the overarching themes addressed in the Psalm in relation to the relevant verses. Thus Cassiodorus argues that Psalm 109 primarily addresses three distinct themes: in verses one and two, the words of the Psalm illustrate the words spoken from the Father to the Son, and also reveal the 'true' dual nature of Christ as human and divine; verse three reveals the nature of the Father's divinity, but only 'to a limited extent, in accordance with the feeble limit of our ability to understand'; and the final verses, from four to seven, specifically address the humanity of the Son.[21] Cassiodorus summarises his interpretation of the Psalm by stating that it is 'in these sections the Word made flesh, the Lord Christ, could be acknowledged by this threefold illumination.'[22] This tripartite division is taken up in the later twelfth-century *Glossa Ordinaria*, and also influences Peter Lombard's Commentary on the Psalm.[23]

Cassiodorus' section on the division of Psalm 109 is preoccupied predominantly with the relationship between the Father and the Son and the nature of both of these Persons divinity and/or humanity. These themes continue to predominate Cassiodorus' discussion in the 'explanation' section of his commentary, particularly in his explanation of verses one and two.[24] It is in the discussion of verse three, however, that we find the first brief but

[19] For the context of Cassiodorus' work on the Psalms and its later medieval use see Gerda Heydemann, 'The Orator as Exegete: Cassiodorus as a Reader of the Psalms' in *Reading the Bible in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jinty Nelson and Damien Kempf (London, 2015), pp. 19-42.
[20] Cassiodorus, *In Psalterium Expositio*, ed. J. P. Migne, PL (Paris, 1865), vol. 70, cols. 25-1056.
[21] Cassiodorus, *In Psalterium Expositio*: '… inchoat Pater naturam ejus divinitatis pro medulo nostrae capacitatis aliquatenus indicare…' ed. Migne, PL, vol. 70, col. 793, trans. P. G., Walsh, *Explanation on the Psalms*, Ancient Christian Writers, 51, 3 vols. (New Jersey, 1991), III (1991), pp. 120-121.
[22] Cassiodorus, *In Psalterium Expositio*: '… ut in his capitibus Verbum caro factum, quod est Dominus Christus tripliei illumination potuisset agnosci…' ed. Migne, PL, vol. 70, col. 793, trans. Walsh, *Explanation on the Psalms*, p. 121.
[23] Madsen, 'Medieval Visions', p. 50
[24] Cassiodorus, *In Psalterium Expositio*, ed. Migne, PL, vol. 70, cols. 793-5.

explicit reference to the role of the Holy Spirit in relation to these themes. Verse three of Psalm 109 begins 'With thee is the principality (or beginning) in the day of thy strength', and Cassiodorus explains how this refers to the identity of both the Father and Son as the 'beginning', an idea that is alluded to the New Testament, namely in John 1:1 ('in the beginning was the word…') and in John 8:25, where Christ tells the Pharisees "'I am the beginning'", both of which are referenced in the explanation.[25] Cassiodorus clarifies that the joint title of 'the beginning' held by the Father and the Son does not constitute that there were two beginnings, but 'just as there is one God, so clearly there is also one Beginning'.[26] His discussion is similar to Augustine's exposition on the same verse, which also states that the 'beginning' (*principium*) in Psalm 109 refers to the title given to both the Father and Son by John in the Gospels. However, unlike Augustine, Cassiodorus extends this analysis to include the third person of the Trinity, stating: 'Undoubtedly we must hold the same belief also about the Holy Spirit, for when scripture spoke of the beginning, it added: *And the spirit of God was borne over the waters*.'[27] In stressing that all three Persons were present in the beginning during creation, Cassiodorus ensures that verse three of Psalm 109 is not simply read in relation to either the Father or the Son, or even to both, but that the entire 'oneness' of God as expressed in all three Persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is referred to as the 'beginning' in the Psalm.

The nature of the relationship between the Father and Son is however still of primary importance to Cassiodorus in his interpretation of Psalm 109. After stating that the Spirit was in the beginning with the Father and Son, he goes on to use verse three of the Psalm as a defence against the Arian belief that the Son was inferior to the Father. Drawing on the words of Christ in the book of John, in which Christ assures the apostle Philip that those who see him see the Father, Cassiodorus states that those who 'have begun to be enlightened by the fullest brightness' will be able to observe:

> Christ the Beginning in the Father who is the Beginning, in company with the Holy Spirit. Hence the Arian infidelity should cease to mount. Father and Son are called the Beginning so that their coeternity may be made clear; for if there had been a time when the Son was not, only the Father could be called the Beginning.[28]

---

[25] Ibid, cols. 795-6.
[26] Cassiodorus, *In Psalterium Expositio*: 'sed sicut unus Deus, ita et unum constat esse principium', ed. Migne, PL, vol. 70, col. 795, trans. Walsh, *Explanation on the Psalms*, p. 123.
[27] Cassiodorus, *In Psalterium Expositio*: 'Hoc etiam et de Spiritu sancto constat sine dubio sentiendum. Nam cum de principio loqueretur, subjunxit: *Et Spiritus Dei superferebatur super aquas*', ed. Migne, PL, vol. 70, col. 795, trans. Walsh, *Explanation on the Psalms*, p. 123.
[28] Cassiodorus, *In Psalterium Expositio*: 'Tunc enim, quando per gratiam Domini plenissimo coeperint splendore radiare, vident pricipium Christum in principio esse Patre cum sancto Spiritu. Quapropter perfidia desinat Ariana con-urgere. Ideo enim principium Pater et Filius dicitur, ut eorum

Thus, though the Spirit is included in Cassiodorus' description of the heavenly vision that will be witnessed by the enlightened, it is the coeternity of the Father and Son that is emphasised in his explanation, in refutation of the Arian heresy. This concentration on the relationship between the Father and the Son is underscored in Cassiodorus' description of the relationship of the three Persons: though the Son is 'in' (*in*) the Father, the Holy Spirit is more loosely described as being 'with' or 'in company' (*cum*) with the other two Persons.

The Holy Spirit is mentioned just once again in the exposition of Psalm 109, in Cassiodorus' explanation of verse five, which begins: 'The Lord at thy right hand has broken kings in the day of his wrath'.[29] Cassiodorus explains that it is all three persons of the Trinity that enact this 'day of wrath' (*die irae)*: 'What the Father is said to have done was clearly and beyond doubt performed also by the Son and the Holy Spirit.'[30] Again, however, he goes on to explain the role of the Father and Son in the enacting of this wrath, without elaborating on the role of the Holy Spirit. It is clear that, in his exposition on this Psalm, Cassiodorus is working to a clear objective: to disprove and repudiate the claims made by proponents of the Arian heresy, who purportedly rejected the idea of the divinity of Christ and his coeternity with God the Father. His emphasis on the relationship between the Father and the Son is intended to substantiate orthodox claims that Christ is divine and equal with the Father.

By the late sixth century, the patristic works of early Christianity had thus established an authoritative interpretation of Psalm 109. Influential writers such as Jerome, Augustine and Cassiodorus, following interpretations in the New Testament, had identified the 'Lords' referred to throughout the Psalm as Christ and the Father. These two figures were recognised as ruling side-by-side in heaven, as powerful lords over their enemies. This exegetical interpretation, and specifically the designation of the two 'Lords' as Christ and the Father, was to have a profound effect on the later artistic interpretation of Psalm 109. Its influence over the visual programme of one magisterial work in particular, the ninth-century Utrecht Psalter, would go on to inspire a new image of the Trinity in which the two seated 'Lords' of the opening verses of Psalm 109 were clearly rendered as the Father and Son.

---

coaerternitas declaretur; nam si esset tempus quando non erat Filius, solus Pater dici potuit esse principium.' ed. Migne, PL, vol. 70, col. 795, trans. Walsh, *Explanation on the Psalms*, p. 123-4.

[29] Cassiodorus, *In Psalterium Expositio*, ed. Migne, PL, vol. 70, cols. 797-8.

[30] Cassiodorus, *In Psalterium Expositio*: 'Quod Pater dicitur fecisse, hoc et Filium, hoc et Spiritum sanctum sine dubio constat operatum.' ed. Migne, PL, vol. 70, col. 797, trans. Walsh, *Explanation on the Psalms*, p. 126.

The Utrecht Psalter

The Utrecht Psalter is one of the most ambitious and influential works of the Carolingian renaissance.[31] Completed in Rheims in around the year 820, the 166 drawings that accompany each of the 150 Psalms and additional Canticles are delicately and exquisitely rendered, communicating the themes of the Psalms with expression and dynamism. The book was completed by a team of around eight artists and scribes probably connected to the monastery of St Rémy in Rheims.[32] A masterpiece of Carolingian artistic and cultural production, the Utrecht Psalter continued to be highly valued throughout the Middle Ages. In the eleventh century, the book was transported to Christ Church, Canterbury, where the style and iconography of its illuminations had a profound influence on artistic production in England.[33] As will be demonstrated, the image used in the Utrecht Psalter to represent the two 'Lords' from the first verse of Psalm 109 was to have a significant impact on the shaping of the iconography of the Seated Trinity in the eleventh century.

The illustrations of the Psalms in the Utrecht Psalter often follow closely the narrative progression of the Psalm. Thus, the illustration to Psalm 109 (f. 64v; fig. 1.1) shows a image of a group of saints below a bright star, in reference to the third verse of the Psalm, an image of the Lord defeating kings, in reference to verses five and six, and an image of a warrior drinking from the 'torrent in the way', mentioned in verse seven and here

---

[31] Utrecht Psalter, Rheims, c. 820 (Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS 32). Scholarship on the Utrecht Psalter is extensive. For the most significant studies see J. J. Tikkanen, *Die Psalterillustration im Mittelalter*, 3 vols. (Helsingfors, 1895-1900), III (1990), pp. 172-320; E. T. DeWald, *The Illustrations of the Utrecht Psalter* (Princeton, 1932); Francis Wormald, *The Utrecht Psalter* (Utrecht, 1953); Dimitri Tselos, 'The Influence of the Utrecht Psalter in Carolingian Art', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 39, no. 2 (1957), pp. 87-96 and 'English Manuscript Illustration and the Utrecht Psalter', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 41, 2 (1959), pp. 137-149; S. Dufrenne, *Les Illustrations du Psautier d'Utrecht: sources et apport carolingien* (Paris, 1978); C. R. Dodwell, 'The final copy of the Utrecht Psalter and its relationship with the Harley and Eadwine Psalters', *Scriptorium*, 44 (1990), pp. 21-53; *The Utrecht Psalter in Medieval Art: Picturing the Psalms of David*, ed. K. van der Horst, William Noel and W. C. M. Wüstefeld (Turnhout, 1996); C. M. Chazelle, 'Archbishops Ebo and Hincmar of Reims and the Utrecht Psalter', *Speculum*, vol. 72 (1997), pp. 1055-1078; T. A. Heslop, 'The Implication of the Utrecht Psalter in English Romanesque Art', *Romanesque Art and Thought in the Twelfth Century: Essays in Honour of Walter Cahn* (Princeton, 2008), pp. 267-290.

[32] For the Utrecht Psalter's place of production see Koert van der Horst, 'The Utrecht Psalter: Picturing the Psalms of David', in *The Utrecht Psalter in Medieval Art*, pp. 22-84 (p. 23). Establishing the division of hands in the Utrecht Psalter is complex due to the similarities in the style of the illustrations. Tikkanen's initial proposal for the division of hands (Tikkanen, *Die Psalterillustration im Mittelalter*, III, pp. 316-320) is still mostly accepted within the scholarly literature. For a useful summary outlining the differences in scholars' estimations for the division of work, see Van der Horst, 'Table of Attributions' in 'The Utrecht Psalter: Picturing the Psalms of David', *The Utrecht Psalter in Medieval Art*, pp. 48-49.

[33] Tselos 'English Manuscript Illustration and the Utrecht Psalter', pp. 137-149; William Noel, 'The Utrecht Psalter in England: Continuity and Experiment', *The Utrecht Psalter*, pp. 120-165; Jessica Brantley, 'The Iconography of the Utrecht Psalter and the Old English Descent Into Hell', *Anglo-Saxon England*, vol. 28 (1999), pp. 43-63; Heslop, 'The Implication of the Utrecht Psalter in English Romanesque Art', pp. 267-90

represented as a stream flowing from a hole in the ground. At the very top of the illumination is a depiction of the two Lords from the very first line of Psalm 109 (fig. 1.2). These two figures are shown seated within a mandorla, which is flanked by six angels. The Lord to the left is seated on a square, throne-like seat, whilst the second Lord to the right is shown on a round object that is possibly meant to signify a globe. The two Lords are further differentiated by their haloes - the Lord to the left is shown crossed-nimbed, whilst the Lord to the right is shown with a plain halo – and also by their gestures, with the Lord to the left reaching out with both hands to the Lord on the right, who is shown holding a book. Beneath the two figures, directly under both their feet, two bodies representing the 'enemies' are shown lying prostrate with their hands over their heads.

As with the description of the two Lords in Psalm 109, the identification of the two men in the Utrecht Psalter is left fairly ambiguous, save for the minor visual details mentioned above. Scholars are divided as to whom these two Lords represent. Ernst H. Kantorowicz identified the two Lords in the Utrecht Psalter as representing the two natures of Christ in his 1947 article on the 'Winchester Quinity', an unusual illustration of Psalm 109 in the eleventh-century *Prayerbook of Aelfwine* made at the New Minster at Winchester.[34] Kantorowicz saw the Lord to the left as a representation of the 'Son of God', the *Filius Dei*, and the Lord to the right as the *Filius David*, the incarnate Christ, accounting for this interpretation with reference to both the visual aspects of the Utrecht Psalter image and to glosses on the Psalm that emphasise the Christ's dual nature. The *Filius David*, Kantorowicz states, can be identified by his crossed halo and throne-like seat, whilst the *Filius Dei* figure to the right is conversely 'seated on the celestial globe as King of the Universe'.[35] Kantorowicz supports this interpretation with reference to the gloss on the Psalm in the Eadwine Psalter, made in the mid-twelfth century in Canterbury.[36] As is discussed below, the design of this manuscript was heavily influenced by the Utrecht Psalter, which was almost certainly in Canterbury throughout the eleventh and twelfth centuries.[37] The gloss, Kantorowicz states, is based on the *Glossa ordinaria*, and, in the section for Psalm 109, 'the human nature of the one seated at the right side of the one whose nature is divine, is

[34] Kantorowicz, 'The Quinity of Winchester', pp. 75-6.
[35] Ibid, p. 76.
[36] Trinity College MS R 17 1, f. 199v. For the Eadwine Psalter see Dodwell, 'The final copy of the Utrecht Psalter and its relationship with the Harley and Eadwine Psalters', pp. 21-53; *The Eadwine Psalter: Text, Image and Monastic Culture in Twelfth-Century Canterbury*, ed. Margaret Templeton Gibson, T. A. Heslop and Richard W. Pfaff (London, 1992); Phillip Pulsiano, 'The Old English Gloss of the Eadwine Psalter', *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, 2000), pp.166-194; Catherine E. Karkov, 'The Scribe Looks Back: Anglo-Saxon England and the Eadwine Psalter', *The Long Twelfth-Century View of the Anglo-Saxon Past* (Farnham, 2015), pp. 289-306; Mark Faulkner, 'The Eadwine Psalter and Twelfth-Century English Vernacular Literary Culture', *The Psalms and Medieval English Literature: From the Conversion to the Reformation* (Cambridge, 2017), pp. 72-107.
[37] See below, pp. 60-61.

stressed time and time again.'[38] Kantorowicz goes on to say that the *Glossa ordinaria* is itself based on Jerome's interpretations of Psalm 109, which also emphasises 'that the throne-sharing Jesus was not Christ *secundum divinitatem* – who, of course, held the throne of heaven from eternity – but Christ *secundum humanitatem*, who rose from the dead and ascended in the flesh.'[39]

Kantorowicz's interpretation of the two Lords in the Utrecht Psalter as representing the two natures of Christ is certainly plausible, but his reasoning is problematic. The gloss on which he bases his interpretation is contained in a manuscript that, though closely related to the Utrecht Psalter, was made over three hundred years later.[40] He is also relatively vague in his analysis of the gloss' interpretation of Psalm 109, simply stating generally that the theme of the two natures of Christ is mentioned frequently in the text.[41] Furthermore, as has been discussed, Jerome's exposition on Psalm 109, on which Kantorowicz's interpretation of the Utrecht image relies, whilst certainly addressing the issue of Christ's two natures, ultimately identifies the two 'Lords' of Psalm 109 as the Father and the Son.[42] Other important patristic writers, such as Augustine and Cassiodorus, also draw the same conclusions.[43]

Furthermore, a comparison of the image of the two Lords of Psalm 109 with two additional images in the Utrecht Psalter reveals enough similarities to suggest that one of the figures in the Psalm 109 image is almost certainly intended as a representation of the Father. In the Utrecht Psalter, the Psalms are followed by a series of Canticles (ff. 83v-91v), which are also extensively illustrated. The Canticles were almost certainly completed by a different artist to that of Psalm 109, but, as is often noted in the scholarly literature on the Utrecht Psalter, the close style and iconography of the illustrations throughout the manuscript suggest that the artists worked in close collaboration with one another, maintaining 'an astonishing unity' in their designs.[44] The similarities between the representations of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit discussed below suggest that, though the images were completed by separate artists, there was an agreed consensus among each of the artists on the attributes that should be used to distinguish the three persons of the Trinity.

---

[38] Kantorowicz, 'The Quinity of Winchester', p. 76.
[39] Ibid.
[40] The relationship between these two manuscripts is discussed below, pp. 60-61.
[41] Kantorowicz, 'The Quinity of Winchester', p. 76: 'The gloss, added to Psalm 109 in the Canterbury Psalter and phrased apparently after the text of the *Glossa Ordinaria*, even begins with the summary *Maria est Christus secundum utramque naturam*. Moreover, in the explanation following thereafter, the human nature of the one seated at the right side of the one whose nature is divine is stressed time and time again.'
[42] See above, pp. 49-50.
[43] See above, pp. 50-54.
[44] Van der Horst, 'The Utrecht Psalter: Picturing the Psalms of David', in *The Utrecht Psalter in Medieval Art*, p. 47.

Two images shown alongside the Gloria (f. 89v, figs. 1.3-1.4) and the Creed (f. 90r, figs. 1.5-1.6) depict God the Father with similar attributes to the 'Lord' on the right in the Psalm 109 drawing. Both the Gloria and the Creed were part of a series of non-scriptural texts added to the pre-existing group of canticles from the Old and New Testament during the Carolingian reform of the liturgy.[45] The Gloria (beginning *Gloria in excelsis*) was performed at Matins and Vespers and includes a section on the three persons of the Trinity:

> O Lord God, heavenly King; God the Father almighty; O Lord the only-begotten son Jesu Christ
> Oh Lord God Lamb of God, Son of the Father; that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us.
> Thou that takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer; thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us.
> For thou only art holy; thou only art the Lord.
> Thou only, O Christ; with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father. Amen.[46]

A scene of heavenly worship above the text illustrates these verses (fig. 1.3). Two groups of people are shown in tiers one above the other, their heads and hands raised upwards towards the heavens. In the lower group, an angel hands two palm branches to individuals, in reference to the first verse of the Gloria that declares that God brings peace on earth and goodwill to men. Above these two groups of worshippers is a representation of the Trinity and the Virgin, flanked by six angels (fig. 1.4). God the Father is shown seated on a round globe, holding a book in his left hand and raising his right hand towards the group of figures on his right. He is encircled by a mandorla and shown with a plain halo. To his left hand side is a lamb, reflecting the name given to Christ in the Gloria. To the Father's right hand side is a group of figures: the Virgin is shown standing, holding the Christ-child in her arms. Christ is shown with a cruciform halo and raises his right hand towards God the Father. The dove of the Holy Spirit is shown perching atop the Virgin's head, facing away from the Father but down towards the Christ-child. This unusual depiction of the Virgin, Christ-child and dove of the Holy Spirit would go on to inform the iconography of an early

[45] Van der Horst, 'The Utrecht Psalter: Picturing the Psalms of David', in *The Utrecht Psalter in Medieval Art*, p. 40.
[46] 'Domine Deus, rex caelestis; Deus Pater omnipotens; Domine fili unigenite Jesu Christe. Domine Deus, Agnus Dei, filius, Patris; qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere nobis. Qui tollis peccata mundi, suscipe deprecationem nostram; qui sedes ad dexteram Patris, miserere nobis. Quoniam tu solus Altissimus, Jesu Christe; cum Sancto Spiritu; in gloria Dei Patris. Amen.

eleventh-century image known as the 'Winchester Quinity', discussed in more detail below.[47]

This curious arrangement of figures is derived in some respects from the words of the Gloria. Christ is shown both as a Lamb and as the 'only-begotten son', (*fili unigenite*) as a child in the Virgin's arms. The Father is shown ruling over the earth as the 'heavenly King' (*rex caelestis*) and the Holy Spirit is shown 'with' (*cum*) Christ, leaning down towards him. However, the artist of this illustration has also added a number of additional visual elements to the image: though Christ is described as an 'only-begotten son' in the Gloria, the role of the Virgin as his mother is not mentioned. The Holy Spirit is not described as a dove, though the artist has chosen to show him as one. There are also parts of the Gloria that the artist does not choose to illustrate: interestingly, the description of the Son at the 'right hand of God the Father' (*sedes ad dexteram Patris*) is not depicted.

A similar arrangement of figures is depicted on the opposing page to the Gloria, on f. 90r. This page contains further collection of Canticles, including the Apostles Creed. The Creed, like the Gloria, also mentions the three persons of the Trinity:

> I believe in God the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth
> I also believe in Jesus Christ his only son, our Lord
> Conceived of the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary
> Suffered under Pontius Pilate; crucified, dead and buried, he descended into hell
> Rose again the third day
> Ascended into heaven
> Sat down at the right hand of the Father
> Thence he is come to judge the living and the dead
> I believe in the Holy Ghost
> The Holy Catholic Church, the communion of the saints
> The remission of sins
> The resurrection of the flesh and life eternal, Amen.[48]

The narrative of Christ's life explained briefly in the Creed is depicted more extensively in a series of scenes above the Creed text (fig. 1.5). Above these narrative episodes is a

[47] See below, pp. 66-69.
[48] Credo in Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, creatorem caeli et terrae. Et in Jesum Christum, Filium eius unicum, Dominum nostrum. Qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto; natus ex Maria Virgine. Passus sub Pontio Pilato; crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus; descendit ad inferna. Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis. Ascendit ad caelum. Sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis. Inde venturus judicare vivos et mortuos. Credo et in Spiritum Sanctam Sanctam Ecclesiam catholicam, sanctorum communionem, Remissionem peccatorum, Carnis resurrectionem, vitam aeternam. Amen.'

representation of the three persons of the Trinity (fig. 1.6). As in the Gloria illustration, the Father is shown with a plain halo, seated on a globe inside a mandorla. The Virgin is also shown holding the Christ-child, and the Holy Spirit is depicted as a dove resting on her head. However, in the Creed image, the Virgin is shown placing the Christ-child onto a cushion atop an additional globe next to the Father in reference to the seventh verse of the Apostle's Creed that states Christ sat down at the right hand of the Father.

Though both the Creed and the Gloria mention Christ as sitting at the right hand of the Father, it is unclear why only the Creed illustration represents this idea. However, the differentiation in both images between the persons of God the Father and God the Son, and the similarities between the representation of the Father in the Creed and Gloria illustrations and in the image of the right hand Lord in the illustration of Psalm 109, confirms that it is very likely that the Psalm 109 image was intended as a representation of the Father and Son, rather than the two natures of Christ. In all three illustrations, the Father is shown with a plain halo, sitting atop a circular globe. In the Psalm 109 and Gloria illustrations, he is also shown holding a book. These indications suggest that there were certain iconographic devices used to represent God the Father throughout the Utrecht Psalter, and that the artist of the Psalm 109 illustration employed these intentionally in his depiction of the two 'Lords'.

The Utrecht Psalter in England

Though written and illuminated in the ninth century in Rheims, by the early eleventh century, perhaps even by the year c. 1000, the Utrecht Psalter was in Christ Church Cathedral, Canterbury.[49] It is not known how or why the manuscript was brought to England, though it has been suggested that the acquisition of the Utrecht Psalter was made in response to Dunstan's (909-988) reforms in the tenth century and a rising demand for books of this kind.[50] Renewed political links between England and the continent may also have facilitated the exchange of manuscripts between institutions.[51] The Psalter's existence in Canterbury from the eleventh century is evidenced by the close similarities between its illustrations and those of three manuscripts illuminated in Canterbury between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries: the Harley Psalter, begun in the second decade of the eleventh

[49] For scholarship on the Utrecht Psalter in England see above, pp. 54, n. 121.
[50] Koert Van Der Horst, 'The Utrecht Psalter', p. 33.
[51] William Noel, *The Harley Psalter* (Cambridge, 1995), p. 189, n. 10.

century; the Eadwine Psalter, dating from c. 1150; and the Paris Psalter, made in around c. 1180-1200.[52]

These books are often described as 'copies' of the Utrecht Psalter due to the very close similarities between the illustrations, but, as both William Noel and T. A. Heslop have demonstrated in their respective work on the Harley Psalter and Eadwine Psalter, to see each manuscript as a copy of Utrecht is an over-simplification of the reasons for their production.[53] All three manuscripts modify the images in Utrecht to various degrees for a variety of reasons, meaning that each should be seen not as a remaking or copy of an old manuscript, but, as Noel states, a 'making [of] a new one', for use in a specific place and at a specific time.[54] It is likely that the Harley, Eadwine and Paris Psalters were made for use by the Christ Church community, and probably for private reading, rather than in a liturgical context.[55] It is more useful to see the illustrations of these three books, then, as heavily influenced by the Utrecht illuminations, rather than as direct copies of them.

Nevertheless, the illuminations in each of the Psalters show remarkable similarities to the Utrecht Psalter, and as a result the precise relationship between the four Psalters has been much debated. Adelheid Heimann argued that the Eadwine and Paris Psalters show enough differences to Utrecht and Harley to suggest that they were made in relation to a lost manuscript that was itself a copy of the Utrecht Psalter.[56] C. R. Dodwell argued that the artist of the Paris and Eadwine Psalters did have access to the Utrecht Psalter, and drew on these sources directly, but states that there is no evidence to suggest they consulted Harley.[57] Noel supports Dodwell's interpretation, whilst providing a more extensive analysis of the relationship between Harley and Eadwine: he argues that both were made under the direct influence of Utrecht Psalter, but, though the later artists of the Eadwine Psalter were likely aware of the Harley Psalter, they 'show very little sign of understanding the interests in Harley.'[58] He suggests that the reason the twelfth-century community at Christ Church

---

[52] Harley Psalter, England (Canterbury), 1st half of the eleventh century (London, BL Harley MS 603); Eadwine Psalter (Cambridge, Trinity College MS R. 17. 1); Paris Psalter (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS Lat. 8846). For the relationship between these manuscripts and the Utrecht Psalter see A. Heimann, 'The Last Copy of the Utrecht Psalter', *The Year 1200: A Symposium* (New York, 1975), pp. 313-338; Dodwell, 'The final copy of the Utrecht Psalter and its relationship with the Utrecht and Eadwine Psalters', pp. 21-53; Noel, 'The Utrecht Psalter in England: Continuity and Experiment', pp. 120-165.
[53] William Noel, *The Harley Psalter*, p. 189; T. A. Heslop, 'Decoration and Illustration: The Psalm Illustrations' in *The Eadwine Psalter: Text, Image, and Monastic Culture in Twelfth-Century Canterbury* (London, 1992), pp. 43-52.
[54] Noel, *The Harley Psalter*, p. 204.
[55] Ibid, p. 197.
[56] A. Heimann, 'The Last Copy of the Utrecht Psalter', pp. 313-338.
[57] C. R. Dodwell, 'The final copy of the Utrecht Psalter and its relationship with the Utrecht and Eadwine Psalters', *Scriptorium* 44 (1990), pp. 21-53.
[58] Noel, *The Harley Psalter*, p. 203.

may have instigated the creation of the Eadwine Psalter was because of the inadequacies they perceived in the Harley Psalter, and their wish for a more contemporary and up-to-date illustrated Psalter.[59]

Significantly, what these studies on the relationship between the Harley, Eadwine and Paris Psalters have shown is the esteem with which the illustrations in the Utrecht Psalter were held in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. That the artists of the two later Psalters chose to refer back to Utrecht, rather than to Harley, is evidence of the value of the Utrecht Psalter and its illustrations. The immediate importance and influence of the iconography used in Utrecht on the three later Psalters is also perceivable in the numerous iconographic details maintained across all four books. The following section addresses the similarities in the illustration of Psalm 109 in the Utrecht and the Harley Psalter, before going on to assess the impact of this design on early eleventh-century images created around the same time that Harley was being made.

The Illustration of Psalm 109 in the Harley Psalter

Though work on the Harley Psalter began in the early eleventh century, probably around c. 1010, a number of artists and scribes continued in their efforts to complete the Psalter throughout the eleventh century and into the twelfth century.[60] The eleventh-century work over the eleven quires of the manuscript can be divided into two distinct phases: the first consisting of the completion of quires 1-4 and 9-11 by four artists, one scribe and one artist-scribe in the period c. 1010-1025; and the second, much more extended phase coinciding with the first phase in around c. 1020 but continuing until c. 1130, which saw the completion of quires 5-8, as well as corrections to the earlier text, by an additional four artists, one scribe and one artist-scribe.[61] This second phase saw a halt in work on the Psalter after 1090, before a final effort was made to complete the illustrations by one artist in around c. 1130. Altogether, eight artists, two scribes and two artist-scribes worked on the Harley Psalter over a period of more than a century. However, the Psalter remained incomplete: the final Psalm in the manuscript is Psalm 143, which is illustrated with an image of David and on f. 73v.[62]

---

[59] Noel, *The Harley Psalter*, p. 203.
[60] For a detailed discussion of the phases of work in the Harley Psalter, see Noel, *The Harley Psalter*, pp. 183-7. See also Richard Gameson, 'The Anglo-Saxon Artists of the Harley 603 Psalter', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, vol. 143 (1990), pp. 29-48.
[61] Noel, *The Harley Psalter*, pp. 183-7; Van Der Horst, Noel and Wüstefeld, eds. *The Utrecht Psalter,* no. 28, p. 234.
[62] The reason the Harley Psalter is incomplete may be because of damage and loss to the final section of the manuscript, but Noel argues that sequence of production suggests the last section of the manuscript was never started. See Noel, *The Harley Psalter*, p. 186.

Due to the long period of production and the high number of artists working on the Harley Psalter, the extent to which the illustrations to the Psalms adhere to or deviate from the illuminations in the Utrecht Psalter vary. However, the scribe-artist that completed the text and illustration to Psalm 109, named as 'scribe-artist D2' by Noel, shows one of the closest adherences to the Utrecht Psalter images.[63] This scribe-artist worked during the first phase of production, and completed all the illuminations in quire 9, as well as some of the text.[64] His strict observance of Utrecht's images also extended to his production of the text: in contradiction to the rest of Harley's text, which uses the Roman version of the Psalms, the first section of quire 9 completed by the artist-scribe D2 follows the Gallican version of the Psalms also used in Utrecht. However, at f. 54r, the scribe that completed the rest of the text in the first phase of production took over from the scribe-artist D2, and completed the rest of the quire in the Roman version of the Psalms.[65] Thus, the Roman version of the Psalm text accompanies Psalm 109 on f. 56v. The Roman Psalter was the version used for the liturgy at Canterbury in the eleventh century, which may be the reason that the second scribe of quire 9 felt it was more appropriate than the Gallican for use in the Harley Psalter.[66]

Despite these irregularities in the versions of the Psalm used across the Utrecht and Harley Psalters, the similarities between the two illustrations of Psalm 109 are striking. Though the illumination on f. 56v (figs. 1.7-1.8), as with the rest of the illustrations in the Psalter, is completed as a coloured line drawing rather than the monochrome used in Utrecht, the visual layout and iconography is very similar across the two Psalm images. There are a number of minor differences between the two scenes: the image in the Utrecht Psalter of the army being crushed by Christ, for example, shows the soldiers being forced into a narrow valley-like pit by Christ who advances with spears, whilst the same group of soldiers shown in Harley hover above a slightly larger expanse of ground. The image of the 'torrent in the way', from the final verse of the Psalm, is also altered slightly in Harley, depicted as a swirling pool rather than the simpler circular opening in Utrecht. Similarly, the images of the two Lords show minor differences across the two Psalters, particularly in the representation of the circular mandorla surrounding the two figures: in Utrecht, the mandorla is more of an oval shape, and the haloes of the two Lords extend slightly over its frame, whilst in Harley the mandorla is shown as an almost a perfect circle, with the haloes of the two Lords positioned just within the frame.

---

[63] Noel, *The Harley Psalter*, p. 60.
[64] Ibid, p. 184.
[65] Ibid, p. 68.
[66] Nicholas Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066* (Leicester, 1996), pp. 261-5.

However, the similarities between these two illustrations are much more marked than their differences. The scribe-artist D2 in the Harley Psalter maintained much of the iconographic details and visual nuances presented in Utrecht. In Harley, as in Utrecht, the Lords are shown with the same round, clean-shaven faces and short dark hair. The Lord on the left is shown with a nimbed halo, whilst the Lord on the right has a plain halo, and both are shown seated on objects that mirror those in Utrecht: the Lord on the left is shown on a square-like seat, whilst the Lord on the right is seated atop a circular, globe-like object. The Harley artist has also skilfully emulated the gestures of the two Lords: as in Utrecht, the Lord to the left bends towards the Lord on the right with both of his hands raised, whilst the Lord to the right is sat in a more upright position, his right hand positioned on the knee of the other Lord and his left hand shown supporting a book balanced on his own knee. In Harley as in Utrecht, both Lords look directly at one another. This detail, in addition to their tender gestures to one another, re-enforces the idea implied in the Psalm that the two Lords are engaged in an intimate conversation. The 'enemies' of the Lords in the Harley image are also positioned in the same manner to Utrecht, with the body of one of the enemies shown flung over that of the other beneath the feet of the two Lords. In both instances, the enemy to the right is shown with his eyes closed, his hands splayed out in front of him, whilst the enemy to the left is shown with his eyes open, straining his head upwards as if to try to see the two Lords above him. These idiosyncratic similarities indicate careful study on the part of the scribe-artist D2 in the Harley Psalter, testifying to his interest in and respect for the visual programme of an esteemed Carolingian book.

A comparison of the image of the two Lords of Psalm 109 in the Utrecht and Harley Psalters demonstrates just how closely the scribe-artist D2 of Harley followed the illustrations in the Utrecht Psalter. This fidelity to the Utrecht Psalter illustrations seems to be particularly unique to artist-scribe D2, though many of the other Harley illustrations completed by different artists also show remarkable similarities to the Utrecht images. However, artist-scribe D2's concern to faithfully reproduce the iconography of the two seated 'Lords' in the Utrecht Psalter is particularly significant when considered alongside the wider dissemination of this iconography in the early eleventh century. Two images made in the fifty years after the Utrecht Psalter's arrival in Canterbury, and shortly after the artist-scribe D2 was working on the Harley Psalter, also represent the Father and Son in a way that closely resembles the illustration of the seated 'Lords' in the Utrecht Psalter: the 'Winchester Quinity', an illustration from the early eleventh-century *Prayerbook of Aelfwine*, and the ivory seal matrix of Godwin, dating to around 1040. The decision in each of these cases to preserve the fundamental elements of the iconography used in Utrecht is testament

to the importance and influence of the Utrecht Psalter illustrations in England in the early eleventh century. Moreover, in each of these examples, the artists' slight adaptions of the iconography of the two seated 'Lords' demonstrates an active and even critical engagement with this subject.

However, despite the impact of the depiction of the two seated 'Lords' on wider Trinitarian iconography, the influence of this image on the illuminations in the Harley Psalter is not as evident. The Psalter is introduced on the first folio by a full-page painted drawing of the Trinity within a mandorla, surrounded by worshipping angels (f. 1r; fig. 1.9). The image has severely oxidised, but enough remains to show it was originally a good-quality pen drawing with washes of colour to highlight drapery and details. It was probably completed by an artist named as artist 'I' by Noel, who was likely working in the second phase of work on the Harley Psalter, probably in the third or fourth decade of the eleventh century.[67] This artist also completed the image of an archbishop in the *Beatus* initial on folio 2r.[68] As in other contemporary representations of the Seated Trinity, the Father and Son are shown in anthropomorphic form, whilst the Holy Spirit is shown as a dove-like bird. The Father and Son are also shown seated on a cushioned throne, but, instead of sitting side-by-side, the Father occupies the central position on the throne whilst the Son, depicted as a smaller and thus potentially much younger figure than the Father, is shown perched on the Father's right knee. The Father and Son are shown in an intimate embrace, with their heads bent towards one another and the Father's hand reaching around the Son to hold his face. The dove of the Holy Spirit perches on the Father's left arm, and reaches up to whisper into his ear, a gesture reminiscent of depictions of the Evangelists or saints receiving wisdom from the Holy Spirit to write.[69] The Father holds the bottom of the dove's tail, thus uniting all three persons of the Trinity through the medium of touch.

This remarkable and in many ways sensitively thought-out image of the Trinity appears to be unique; no other images survive in which each of the three persons are shown in the same intimate embrace. However, the arrangement does echo images that became particularly popular in Eastern art, in which the Son is shown seated on the Father's lap.[70]

---

[67] Noel, *The Harley Psalter*, pp. 136-140, particularly p. 139 and pp. 193-194; Catherine E. Karkov, 'Reading the Trinity in the Harley Psalter', *Crossing Boundaries: Interdisciplinary approaches to the art, material culture, language and literature of the early medieval world: essays presented to Professor Emeritus Richard N. Bailey OBE, on the occasion of his eightieth birthday* (2017), pp. 90-6.

[68] Noel, *The Harley Psalter*, p. 144.

[69] For example, illustration of St John the Evangelist, Single Leaf from the Gospel Book of Abbot Wedricus, Canterbury or Cambrai, c. 1147 (Avesnes-sur-Helpe, Société Archéology et Historique); illustration of St Gregory in a Benedictine Breviary, Germany (Würzburg), after 1154 (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Canon. Liturg. 297), f. 10v.

[70] For this type see Francis Boespflug and Yolanta Zaluska, 'Le dogma trinitaire et l'essor de son iconographie en Occident de l'epoque carolingienne au IVe Concile du Latran (1215)', *Cahiers de*

This image type undoubtedly derived from the image of the Virgin and child, and emphasised the paternal nature of the Father.[71] However, it was more conventional to show the Father and Son seated frontally, looking straight out at the viewer, and to depict the two figures alone, without the dove of the Holy Spirit. The Harley Psalter is unique in the addition of the dove, as well as the dynamism and expression it gives the three persons, showing them united as one through touch and gesture and through the large, all-encompassing mandorla.

It is curious that the artist that completed this full-page illustration did not draw on the image of the two seated 'Lords' as inspiration for their depiction of the Trinity; the illustration to Psalm 109 would have been complete by the time they were working, and, as will be explored, became an important model from which the iconography of the Seated Trinity developed in the mid-eleventh century. Nevertheless, the image does share some features with the image of the two 'Lords' and the Seated Trinity. All three persons, for example, are shown seated on a throne and surrounded by a mandorla, and they inhabit a heavenly realm or space, indicated by the flying angels. Most significantly, the image of the Father cradling the Son, perhaps derived from images of the Father holding the Son in his lap, is transformed into a representation of the Trinity through the dove of the Holy Spirit. This transformation echoes the development of the image of the two 'Lords' into that of the Seated Trinity. As the following sections will explore, both the 'Winchester Quinity' in the *Prayerbook of Aelfwine* and the seal matrix of Godwin maintain the iconography established in Utrecht of the Father and Son sat side-by-side whilst also adapting this image with addition of the third person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit.

The 'Winchester Quinity' in the Prayerbook of Aelfwine

The drawing of the 'Winchester Quinity', from the manuscript known as the *Prayerbook of Aelfwine* (f. 75v, fig. 1.10), conflates the iconography of the seated Father and Son in the Utrecht Psalter with another image in the Utrecht Psalter: that of the Virgin holding the infant Christ, with the dove of the Holy Spirit perched on her head.[72] Although the artist of

---

civilisation médiévale, vol. 37, no. 147 (July-September 1994), pp. 197-201. For example: Lectionary, 11th century, Constantinople (Athos, Dionysiou Monastery MS 587), f. 3v

[71] Boespflug and Zaluska, 'Le dogma trinitaire', pp. 197-8.

[72] *Prayerbook of Aelfwine*, England (Winchester?), 3rd decade of the eleventh century (London, BL MS Cotton Titus D XXVII). BL Cotton MS Titus D XXVII originally formed one manuscript together with BL Cotton MS Titus D XXVI. For both of these volumes see N. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, vol. II (Oxford, 1990), n. 202; Beate Günzel*, Aelfwine's Prayerbook (London, British Library, Cotton Titus D. xxvi+xxvii)* (London, 1993); for the 'Quinity' illustration see Kantorowicz, 'The Quinity of Winchester'; Kidd, 'The *Quinity of Winchester* Reconsidered', pp. 21-33.

the Prayerbook image is clearly drawing on iconography used in the Utrecht Psalter, their inventive reimagining of these designs, and the repurposing of the iconography originally used as an illustration of Psalm 109 for use alongside specific Offices, reflects very specific Trinitarian concerns at Winchester in the early eleventh century.[73]

As is evidenced by the calendar and litany of the saints, the prayer book was most likely written at the New Minster in Winchester in the first half of the eleventh century and may have belonged to Ælfwine (d. 1047), who served as the Abbot of the New Minster at Winchester from 1032-47.[74] It is likely that the manuscript was written for him personally, before he became the abbot, probably some point before 1029.[75] It is also probable that the manuscript was originally one volume, and was separated when they were in the library of Sir Robert Cotton.[76] The Quinity image is one of three full-page drawings in the prayer book; the other two images are of the Crucifixion on f. 65v and St Peter seated on a stool holding his keys on f. 19v. Each image is placed before the relevant office; thus the image of Peter is situated before the collects for the feasts of an apostle, the image of the crucifixion before the devotions to the Holy Cross, and the image of the Trinity with the Virgin before the Office of the Trinity, Office of the Holy Cross and Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary.[77] Significantly, the Trinity, the Virgin and St Peter were the patrons of the New Minster at Winchester, where the manuscript was written and most likely used.[78] It is possible that these dedications drove the content and iconography of the illustrations.[79]

The Trinity image consists of five figures grouped within a rounded frame, which is divided at the centre by a semi-circular ring on which three of the five figures sit. The two seated figures to the right of the circular frame are almost identical in appearance, with small beards and shoulder-length hair. The figure to the far right holds an open book in his left hand, whilst gesturing with an open hand to the figure to his right. This figure alternately holds a closed book in his left hand, whilst gesturing with a more closed hand to the figure on his left. Both figures turn their heads towards one another, as if engaging in conversation, and their haloes slightly overlap to accommodate for this movement of their heads. The identical appearance of the two seated figures, and their similarity to the

---

The image of the Virgin, Christ-child and dove of the Holy Spirit appears on ff. 89v and 90r of the Utrecht Psalter, discussed above, pp. 57-59.

[73] Kidd, 'The *Quinity of Winchester* Reconsidered', pp. 21-33.

[74] Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts*, n. 202.

[75] Günzel, *Aelfwine's Prayerbook*, pp. 1-2.

[76] Ibid, p. 4.

[77] Ibid, p. 12.

[78] Ibid.

[79] This is discussed in more detail below with reference to the Trinity, pp. 41-3. See also Kidd, 'The *Quinity of Winchester* Reconsidered', pp. 22-3.

depiction of the two 'Lords' in the Utrecht Psalter, would suggest they are a representation of God the Father and God the Son.

To their left is an image of the Virgin, shown crowned and holding the Christ-child on her knee. Christ holds an open book with his left hand and raises his right hand in a gesture of blessing. The dove of the Holy Spirit is shown perched on the head of the Virgin, facing away from the Christ and the Father and looking downwards, to the Christ-child on the Virgin's knee. Below this group, extending out of the circular frame, are three further figures: directly beneath the feet of the central figure, a naked man is shown bound at the wrists and ankles, curled up as if in pain or agony. He is shown directly above an open hellmouth, which rises up out of an outer square frame. To the left and right of this hellmouth are two further characters, labelled 'Arrius' and 'Judas'. These figures are also bound at the ankles and raise a hand to their heads in a gesture of despair, whilst Judas is shown holding a broken rod.

In his article on the Winchester image, Ernst Kantorowicz was the first to recognise that the artist of the prayer book drew on multiple images from the Utrecht Psalter to form this unusual arrangement.[80] As Kantorowicz points out, this bringing together of five persons in one image, which he names a 'Quinity', resulted from an amalgamation of three images from the Utrecht Psalter: the illustrations for Psalm 109 (f. 64v), the Gloria (f. 89v) and the Creed (f. 90r). Whilst the two identical 'Lords' are taken from the Psalm illumination, the Virgin, Christ and Holy Spirit are depicted as they are in the Creed and Gloria images: the virgin holds the Christ-child on her lap, whilst the dove of the Holy Spirit rests on her head. Kantorowicz rightly points to the abnormality of this design: the inclusion of the Christ-child on the Virgin's knee means that the figure of Christ is repeated twice in the same image, albeit as a young child and grown adult.[81] He accounts for this repetition of the figure of Christ, however, by suggesting that the artist of the Winchester prayer book's intention was to simultaneously represent the three persons of the Trinity and the two natures of Christ in one image. Drawing on his interpretation of the Utrecht Psalter as showing both the incarnate Christ, the Son of David, and the heavenly Christ, the Son of God, Kantorowicz argues that the 'throned *Christus Deus* and in Infant *Jesus homo* in the arms of Mary belong together; together they form, as it were, one Person, the divine and the incarnate Christ, that is, the "complete" Saviour *secundum divinitatem* and *secundum*

[80] Kantorowicz, 'The Quinity of Winchester', p. 79.
[81] Ibid, pp. 73-4.

humanitatem. The enigmatic character of the drawing thus derives from the artist's strange endeavor to show the Second Person in its two natures simultaneously.'[82]

Judith Kidd has since reassessed Kantorowicz's conclusions about the 'Winchester Quinity', situating the image more thoroughly in the context in which it was created.[83] Kidd argues that the image was influenced by the particular devotional characteristic of Winchester in the eleventh century, with the unification of the images of the Virgin and child and the Trinity explained by evidence for a growth in devotion to both the Virgin and the Trinity at the New Minster in Winchester in this period.[84] The building was dedicated to the Virgin and the Trinity, and also contained a tenth-century sculptural programme on the tower of the New Minster that contained images of its patrons.[85] A description in the New Minster *Liber Vitae* of the tenth-century tower indicates that an image of the Virgin Mary was positioned over the door of the tower, whilst the second story of the tower contained an image of the Trinity, and the third an image of the banner of the Holy Cross.[86] Kidd points out that these three types of sculpture correspond to the offices that follow the Quinity image, thus marking a connection between the manuscript and the sculptural programme of the tower.[87] Whilst still drawing on themes in Psalm 109, from which the image of the seated 'Lords' is ultimately derived, the 'Winchester Quinity' also reflects the immediate intellectual and devotional environment of the New Minster in the early eleventh century. The particular devotion to both the Trinity and Virgin at Winchester, witnessed in the visual programme of the New Minster itself, can be seen to have influenced the adaption of the Utrecht design into a 'Quinity'.

Kantorowicz and Kidd's studies on the image of the 'Winchester Quinity' in the *Prayerbook of Aelfwine* have thus established the possible sources for its unusual design (the image of the two seated 'Lords' and the Virgin and Child in the Utrecht Psalter) and the reason that these independent images may have been amalgamated into one illustration in an eleventh-century book made in the New Minster at Winchester. However, the significance of this image to the development of the iconography of the Seated Trinity can be emphasised still further. Though the peculiar arrangement of these five figures was not to become standardised in later images of the Trinity and Virgin, the distinctive adaption of the two 'Lords', clearly derived from the Utrecht Psalter, within a Trinitarian context is evidence of

[82] Kantorowicz, 'The Quinity of Winchester', pp. 79.
[83] Kidd, 'The Quinity of Winchester Reconsidered', p. 21.
[84] Ibid, p. 22.
[85] Ibid, p. 22. For the tower see R. N. Quirk, 'The Winchester New Minster and its Tenth Century Tower', *Journal of the British Archeological Association*, 3, 24 (1961), pp. 16-54.
[86] New Minster *Liber Vitae*, England (Winchester), c. 1031-1771 (London, BL Stowe MS 944). Kidd, 'The Quinity of Winchester Reconsidered', pp. 22-3; Quirk, 'The Winchester New Minster', p. 33.
[87] Kidd, 'The Quinity of Winchester Reconsidered', p. 23.

their interpretation in eleventh-century English visual culture. Though the 'Winchester Quinity' image may, as Kantorowicz argues, be a depiction of the dual nature of Christ, it is certainly also an attempt to visualiase the Trinitarian nature of God. Father, Son and Spirit are all present, in addition to the Virgin and child. Significantly, the two seated figures are clearly rendered as the Father and Son, not the two natures of Christ. The 'Winchester Quinity' is thus a testament to the artistic interpretation of the seated 'Lords' of the Utrecht Psalter as the Father and Son in eleventh-century England, and the desire to 'Trinitarianise' this scene with the addition of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove.

Furthermore, the 'Winchester Quinity' also alludes to the other themes associated with this image in the eleventh-century context in which it was circulating. Notably, all five figures in the scene are depicted as victors ruling over the 'enemies' Arius and Judas. It seems unlikely that this refers to contemporary events; there are no known incidents of heresy related to Arius' teaching in eleventh-century England, and it is more likely that both Judas and Arius operate here as tropes of sin and evil than as records of 'heretical' events.[88] Arius in particular makes a fitting antithesis to the Trinity, as it was this doctrine specifically that he was accused of denying.[89] Rather, the inclusion of the defeat of 'enemies' beneath the feet of the five persons seems to indicate the triumph of the orthodox doctrines of the incarnation and the Trinity over heresy and evil in general. It emphasises the power and authority of Christianity and of the church. As we will see, this theme of authority is also implicit in the other eleventh-century Trinitarian re-interpretation of the Utrecht image, the seal matrix of Godwin. These shared themes show that, when the image of the seated 'Lords' in the Utrecht Psalter was reappropriated in eleventh-century English visual culture, it was often utilised as an image that conveyed status and power, whether that of an institution or an individual.

The Seal Matrix of Godwin

Though the 'Winchester Quinity' image is one of the earliest extant examples to include the dove of the Holy Spirit with the representation of the seated Father and the Son, the inclusion of the Christ-child and Mary, and the positioning of the dove atop the head of the Virgin, was not to become standard in later Seated Trinity images. In later examples of the iconography, predominantly from the early thirteenth century on, the dove of the Holy

[88] Kidd, 'The Quinity of Winchester Reconsidered', pp. 27-9, argues that the monks at Winchester may have been aware of a trial of a 'heretic' that took place in Orleans in 1022, and this may have affected the iconography of the Quinity image. However, this trial did not specifically concern Arian heresy, and even if the monks did know of the trial it is unclear why this would be incorporated into an image so specifically connected to Winchester.
[89] See above, p. 31.

Spirit is typically positioned between the heads of the Father and the Son.[90] It is very likely that the earliest example to show the dove of the Holy Spirit flying between the Father and the Son is found on the matrix of the Seal of Godwin, now in the British Museum, which dates to around 1040 (figs. 1.11-1.13).[91] The seal matrix is made of walrus ivory, and measures 86 millimeters in height and 45 millimeters in width. It is comprised of a handle, containing the image of the Trinity, and a rounded seal matrix, which is carved on both sides: the obverse shows the bust of a man in profile, and the reverse is carved with an image of a seated figure. The figure on the obverse of the seal is shown with long hair and a beard, wearing a clasped tunic, and holding a sword with his right hand. Around the figure is the inscription: + SIGILLVM : GODÞINI MINISTRI (the seal of Godwin the thegn). The figure on the reverse of the seal is shown seated towards their viewer, but with their face turned in profile, towards the right. The figure is beardless with short hair, and holds what appears to be a book in their left hand, whilst their right hand is shown raised. Surrounding the figure is the inscription: + SIGILLVM : GODEGYÐE MONACHE DŌDATE (the seal of Godgyða, a nun given to God). The reverse of the handle has been left without an image. The matrix of Godgyða is slightly inferior in design and style to that of Godwin's, which, in addition to the fact that it is placed on the back of the seal, suggests that it may have been added sometime after the seal was first made.[92] T. A. Heslop has suggested that Godgyða may have been Godwin's widow or daughter, and that after his death she appropriated his seal and adapted it for her own use.[93]

Scholars have dated the seal matrix of Godwin to around 1040 on the basis of stylistic affinities between the seal design and contemporary royal coins that also date to around this period.[94] Harthacnut's 'arm and sceptre' issues, such as the coin now in the Royal Albert

---

[90] See below, pp. 170-173.

[91] London, BM, museum number 1881, 0404.1. For the matrix see O. M. Dalton, *Catalogue of the Ivory Carvings of the Christian Era with Examples of Mohammedan Art and Carvings in Bone in the Department of British and Medieval Antiquities and Ethnography of the British Museum* (London, 1909), pp. 32-33, no. 31; A. B. Tonnochy, *Catalogue of British Seal-dies in the British Museum* (London, 1952), pp. 1-3; R. H. M. Dolley, *Anglo-Saxon Pennies* (London, 1964), p. 78; E. Okasha, *A Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions* (Cambridge, 1971), p. 119; S. E. Rigold, 'Seals and Titles', *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. 44 (1974), pp. 99-106 (p. 100); T. A. Heslop, 'English Seals from the Mid-Ninth Century to 1000', *Journal of the British Archeological Association*, 133, (1980), pp. 1-16; Leslie Webster, Janet Backhouse and D. H. Turner, *The Golden Age of Anglo-Saxon Art, 966-1066* (London, 1984), p. 112; Boespflug and Zaluska, 'Le dogma trinitaire et l'essor de son iconographie', p. 228; David A. Hinton, *Gold and Gilt, Pots and Pins: Possessions and People in Medieval Britain* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 146-7; Catherine E. Karkov, *The Art of Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2011), pp. 130-1.

[92] Tonnochy, *Catalogue of British Seal-dies*, pp. 2-3, Heslop, 'English Seals', p. 5 and Hinton, *Gold and Gilt*, p. 146 both argue that Godgyða's seal must be later, whilst Dolley, *Anglo-Saxon Pennies*, has argued that Godgyða's seal die is an earlier design.

[93] Heslop, 'English Seals', p. 6. Heslop, p. 15 also suggests that, instead of using the seal for issuing administrative rights, Godgyða may have used it to seal letters.

[94] This dating is supported by Rigold, 'Seals and Titles', p. 100; Okasha, *Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions*, p. 119; Heslop, 'English Seals', p. 6.

Memorial Museum and Art Gallery in Exeter (fig. 1.14), show particularly close parallels with Godwin's seal die.[95] These coins show Harthacnut in profile, holding a jeweled scepter. Unlike Godwin, Harthacnut wears a helmet, but he is similarly dressed in a tunic that is clasped at his shoulder. Though he holds a scepter, rather than a sword, the raised gesture of his arm also closely resembles Godwin's. S. E. Rigold has suggested that the iconography of Anglo-Saxon coins often reflected that of the king's seal, perhaps indicating that Godwin's seal matrix is a conscious imitation of Harthacnut's own seal.[96] This connection, in addition to the title of 'thegn' included on the inscription of the seal die and the prestigious and costly material used to make the matrix, would suggest that Godwin was a significant member of the Anglo-Saxon aristocracy.[97] However, efforts to identify him in surviving records remain inconclusive.[98] Still less is known about the nun Godgyða, whose seal die has no close surviving parallels in coin design and whose name does not appear in any extant early eleventh-century records.[99] Heslop has suggested that the iconography of Godgyða's seal die, like that of Godwin's, is influenced by royal seals, particularly that of Edward the Confessor who was the first king to adopt an image of himself enthroned on his seals and coins shortly after c. 1050.[100]

Like the 'Winchester Quinity', the image on the handle of the matrix draws on the iconography of the two Lords in the Utrecht Psalter (fig. 1.13). Two almost identical figures are shown seated within an oval mandorla that forms the edges of the seal handle. The figure to the right holds a scepter in his right hand, whilst the figure to the left holds a book in his left hand and raises his right hand in a gesture of blessing. Both figures are nimbed and turn their faces towards one another, though the figure to the left is shown turning slightly more to his left: his face is almost in profile, and his feet are shown pointing towards the other figure. The positioning of the right-hand figure at a more inverted angle may suggest that he is the Son, receiving the power and authority offered by the left hand figure of God the Father, who gives this instruction to the Son from a more authoritative, frontal seated position. Boespflug and Zaluska also propose that the sceptre carried by right

---

[95] Arm and sceptre' coin of Harthacnute, England, c. 1040 (Exeter, Royal Albert Memorial Museum and Art Gallery, museum no. 7/2003). On the dating of Harthacnut's 'arm and sceptre' coins, see P. Seaby, 'The Sequence of Anglo-Saxon Coin Types, 1030-50', *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. xxvii (1958), pp. 111-46.
[96] Rigold, 'Seals and Titles', pp. 99-101.
[97] Kantorowicz, 'The Quinity of Winchester', pp. 73-4, n. 6 and Okasha, *Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions*, p. 118 both understood the word 'ministri' to refer to the role of a priest or 'minister', but as Tonnochy, *Catalogue of British Seal-dies*, pp. 2-3 and Heslop, 'English Seals', p. 5 have shown, independent from the word 'ecclesiae', the term 'ministri' was more likely to refer to the role of a thane. This interpretation is supported by the aristocratic iconography on the seal die.
[98] On the possibilities of Godwin's identity, see Heslop, 'English Seals', p. 6, n. 35.
[99] Heslop, 'English Seals', p. 6.
[100] Ibid, pp. 6-7.

hand Lord is suggestive of the dominant authority the Father.[101] Below the feet of both the seated individuals is a figure lying facedown but with their head twisted up as if to look back at the two figures above.

In these respects, the iconography on the seal matrix of Godwin is very similar to the representation of the two Lords in the Psalm 109 illustration in the Utrecht Psalter and the seated Father and Son in the Winchester Prayerbook. However, it is possible that the matrix handle also contained a representation of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove. The very top part of the matrix handle, at the point where the two sides of the mandorla meet over the Father and Son's heads, has been quite significantly damaged. An inspection of the reverse of the handle in particular suggests that the very top section of the mandorla has been snapped away from the main handle; the edges have been left jagged and pointed (fig. 1.12).[102] There also appears to have been significant damage to the upper section on the obverse of the handle: not only are parts of the mandorla frame missing, but also part of the design inside the mandorla frame. Between the Father and Son's heads is a rounded section of broken ivory measuring approximately 5mm in height and 4mm in width. From this rounded segment a thinner piece of ivory extends upwards towards the mandorla frame. This line divides to form either side of the mandorla frame, and the right extension finishes in an additional piece of raised ivory. The surface of this raised section is uneven, as if the former design has been removed rather roughly.

It is possible that this damaged section is all that remains of a depiction of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove, descending from above between the heads of the Father and Son.[103] The circular piece would have formed the dove's halo, the upward extension its neck, and the piece of ivory remaining on the right of the mandorla would likely have formed part of its outstretched wing. The design of this dove may have been similar to the dove depicted in the 'Winchester Quinity', which is also shown with a halo. It is unclear why the seal matrix handle has been damaged. In his article on early English seals, Heslop has suggested that elaborately made seals may have been worn round the neck as a sign of status.[104] It is likely they would have been hung from the top part of the handle, which may indicate why

[101] Boespflug and Zaluska, 'Le dogma trinitaire', p. 228.
[102] This damage is confirmed in Dalton, *Catalogue of the Ivory Carvings of the Christian Era*, pp. 32-33, no. 31.
[103] This is questioned by Kantorowicz, 'The Quinity of Winchester', pp. 74, n. 6, who does not think a dove was ever depicted between the two 'Lords'. However, it is unclear as to whether Kantorowicz ever saw the seal in person, and his assessment of the seal relies on information given by Mr T. D. Kendrick: 'The assumption is that a small piece of ivory, which is broken away above the heads, displayed the dove. However, Mr T. D. Kendrick of the British Museum, has been kind enough to inspect the seal once more and to inform me that he does not think it is possible to identify with certainty the object above the two heads.'
[104] Heslop, 'English Seals', p. 4.

the seal of Godwin has been damaged in this particular area. However, this does not account for the damage to the Godwin seal below the very upmost part of the handle, in the section between the Father and Son's heads. If the Holy Spirit was depicted here, it may be possible that the dove was purposefully removed, though there is no precedent for this kind of erasure in any other images of the Seated Trinity.

If the damage to the seal matrix of Godwin does indeed suggest that the dove of the Holy Spirit was originally shown flying between the heads of the Father and the Son, then this is the first extant example in which the iconography of the two seated 'Lords', derived ultimately from the Utrecht Psalter, is adapted to incorporate the person of Holy Spirit independent of any other figures. Though the Winchester Prayerbook image does incorporate the Holy Spirit as part of the 'Quinity', the addition of the Virgin and the Christ-child means that the image is not solely a representation of the Trinity. Furthermore, the arrangement of the three persons of the Trinity on the seal matrix, with the dove flying between the heads of the Father and Son, was to become the standard way of depicting the Seated Trinity. Though this design is clearly drawn from the images of the two Lords in the Utrecht Psalter, and possibly from the Trinitarian interpretation of this image in the 'Winchester Quinity', the image of the Trinity on the handle of the seal matrix of Godwin is the first extant example to show a Seated Trinity in the form that was to become popular.

That this design appears on the seal matrix of Godwin is significant for a number of reasons. Firstly, it is interesting that the seal appears to have been made for use by a secular patron, Godwin the thegn. This provenance suggests that image of the seated 'Lords' used in the Utrecht Psalter influenced iconography outside of the illumination of manuscripts for elite clerical audiences. The Trinity image on the seal matrix of Godwin suggests that the imagery of the two seated 'Lords' from the Utrecht Psalter, and the Trinitarian adaption of this iconography as attested to by the 'Winchester Quinity' image, may have had wider circulation in the early eleventh century than the extant material suggests. Though the seal matrix would certainly have been made for a very elite, wealthy patron, who may have had connections to important centres of learning, his choice to incorporate this image onto a seal matrix demonstrates that ideas related to the depiction of the Trinity as the two 'Lords' of Psalm 109 were not just limited to manuscript illustration or monastic audiences in the eleventh century.

Furthermore, the choice of this imagery for use on a secular seal is of importance to our wider understanding of this design, particularly in relation to the similar image in the *Prayerbook of Aelfwine*. As in the 'Winchester Quinity', the two Lords and the dove the Holy

Spirit are shown ruling powerfully over their enemy, prostrate below their feet. Notably, the Lord to the right holds a sceptre, further emphasising his role as judge and ruler. This sceptre directly refers to verse two of Psalm 109, which states: 'The Lord will send forth the sceptre of thy power out of Sion: Rule thou in the midst of thy enemies.' It is possible to see how an image of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit ruling powerfully over their enemies may have been appealing to wealthy patron, and would have communicated a very specific message about the owner of the seal matrix. In addition, the emphasis on authority and victory evidences a connection between the seal matrix image and the 'Winchester Quinity' beyond the iconography of the two seated 'Lords'. The theme of authority and power, alluded to in Psalm 109, finds currency in both of these images. Interestingly, this is a theme that, on the whole, does not continue to be associated with the Seated Trinity beyond the eleventh century. In contrast, the extant examples from the eleventh century would suggest that the iconography of the seated Father and Son was disseminated along with ideas of authority, power and status.

Constructing the Seated Trinity in Eleventh-Century England

The present discussion has shown how the iconography of the two seated 'Lords', derived ultimately from the Utrecht Psalter, was transformed into an image of the Trinity through the addition of the Holy Spirit in the early eleventh century. The invention of this Trinitarian image occurred as a result of the Utrecht Psalter's influential impact on English art and iconography after its arrival in Canterbury in the early eleventh century. However, beyond the examples in the 'Winchester Quinity' and seal matrix of Godwin, no other extant examples of the Seated Trinity survive from the eleventh century. The next extant example of this design appears in around c. 1130, in a depiction of a vision experienced by Christina of Markyate (c. 1096- after 1155) in the St Albans Psalter. It is unclear as to why almost a century exists between the Trinity design on the seal matrix of Godwin and the image in the St Albans Psalter. It is possible that a loss of material from this period obscures the use of the Seated Trinity iconography in the eleventh century; this would certainly account for why the design does not fall into disuse, and continues to be popular in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. As is discussed below, the vision of Christina of Markyate would also suggest that this is the case.

The Seated Trinity in the Early Twelfth Century

Christina of Markyate and the St Albans Psalter

The relationship between the magnificently illuminated St Albans Psalter, made at St Albans

Abbey second quarter of the twelfth century,[105] and the mystic and anchoress Christina of Markyate, has been long acknowledged.[106] The Psalter may have originally been intended for monastic use by the community at St Albans, but at some point in its production history was almost certainly adapted for use by Christina.[107] The deaths of Christina and her family are recorded in the Calendar of the St Albans Psalter, as is the dedication of the priory that she established at Markyate in 1145.[108] The Calendar also contains several feasts that associate its use not only at St Albans but also Ramsey Abbey, which was close to Huntington, to the place of Christina's birth.[109] Her presence is discernable in the programme of illumination; two illustrations depict her explicitly, one in the initial to Psalm 105 (p. 285) and the other in the image discussed below, which depicts her vision of the Trinity (p. 403, fig. 1.15), whilst twenty initials in the Psalter depict prominent women.[110] The description in Christina's *Life* of her close involvement with the monastic community at St Albans in the early twelfth century, and specifically with Geoffrey de Gorron (d. 1146), Abbot of St Albans from 1119-1146, explains why such a luxurious Psalter was so specifically designed around a single individual.[111]

---

[105] St Albans Psalter, England (St Albans), c. 1030 (Hildesheim, Dombibliothek MS St. God. 1). The date of the St Albans Psalter remains contentious. It is generally agreed that the Psalter was completed during the abbacy of Goeffrey de Gorron (1119-1146), but it has been dated variously between 1120s and 1140s. For an overview of this historiography see Peter Kidd, 'Contents and Codicology', *The St Albans Psalter (Albani Psalter)* ed. Jochen Bepler, Peter Kidd, and Jane Geddes (Simbach am Inn, 2008), pp. 41-156 (pp. 139-143). Kidd concludes that the Psalter was most likely completed in the 1130s.

[106] The first sustained study of the St Albans Psalter by Adolph Goldschmidt, *Der Albanipsalter in Hildesheim und seine Beziehung zur symbolischen Kirchensculptur des XII. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1895) did not fully explore the Psalter's connections to Christina; this was first considered in depth by C. H. Talbot, *The Life of Christina of Markyate: A Twelfth Century Recluse* (Oxford, 1959), pp. 23-27 and Otto Pächt, C. R. Dodwell and Francis Wormald, *The St Albans Psalter* (London, 1960), particularly pp. 5-6, 24-30. See also Christopher J. Holdsworth, 'Christina of Markyate', *Medieval Women: Essays Presented to R. M. T. Hill on the Occasion of her 70th Birthday*, ed. Derek Baker, Studies in Church History, 12 (Oxford, 1978), pp. 185-204; T. A. Heslop, 'Christina of Markyate's Psalter', *The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain*, vol. 2, *The Middle Ages*, ed. Boris Ford (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 164-70; Morgan Powell, 'Making the Psalter of Christina of Markyate (The St Albans Psalter)', *Viator*, 36 (2005), pp. 293-335 and 'The Visual, The Visionary and Her Viewer: Media and Presence in the Psalter of Christina of Markyate', *Word and Image*, 22 (2006), pp. 340-62; Jane Geddes, *The St Albans Psalter: A Book for Christina of Markyate* (London, 2005).

[107] For a discussion of the scholarship on the adaption of the Psalter see Kidd, 'Contents and Codicology', pp. 106-9.

[108] For a transcription of the Calendar and discussion of these entries see Francis Wormald, 'Description of the Manuscript and Commentary on the Calendar and Litany', in Pächt, Dodwell and Wormald, *The St Albans Psalter*, pp. 3-48 (pp. 23-30). See also Geddes, *The St Albans Psalter*, pp. 90-2.

[109] Wormald, 'Description of the Manuscript, pp. 27-30; Geddes, *The St Albans Psalter*, pp. 89-90.

[110] Geddes, *The St Albans Psalter*, pp. 94-104. The initial to Psalm 105 was painted on a separate piece of vellum and added to the Psalter, possibly, though not necessarily, at a later date. See C. R. Dodwell, 'The Initials' in Pächt, Dodwell and Wormald, *The St Albans Psalter*, pp. 181-274 (p. 200); Geddes, *The St Albans Psalter*, pp. 94-7 and Kidd, 'Contents and Codicology', p. 104-8.

[111] Talbot, *The Life of Christina of Markyate*, p. 6, suggests the author was a monk at St Albans, but does not specify an individual. Katie Ann-Marie Bugyis, 'The Author of the Life of Christina of Markyate: The Case for Robort de Gorron (d. 1166)', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 68, no. 4 (2017), pp. 719-46 has recently suggested the author may have been Robert de Gorron, Abbot Geoffrey de Gorron's nephew.

At least four artists worked on the Psalter illumination: the series of full-page miniatures of biblical scenes and the illustrated *Chanson of St Alexis* were completed by the so-called 'Alexis Master'; the Calendar and Psalms, and selection of Canticles and sections of the Litany were illuminated by artists 1 and 2; and a third artist completed a separate initial for Psalm 105 on p. 285.[112] Artists 1 and 2 show considerable uniformity in their style and design of the Psalms and Litany miniatures, suggesting that they worked very closely. The image of Christina's vision of the Trinity is painted at the end of the Athanasian Creed and beginning of the Litany section, on p. 403 by artist 2.[113]

The miniature depicting Christina's vision of the Trinity is remarkable for its iconography and layout. In the left section of the illustration, contained within its own gold frame, two figures representing the Father and Son are shown standing facing one another, each with one hand raised in a gesture of blessing. They are identical in appearance, with long brown hair, small pointed beards and golden, nimbed haloes. The dove of the Holy Spirit, also wearing a crossed halo, is positioned between them, each of its feet resting on the heads of the two standing figures. The head and upper body of the dove extends out of the upper frame, so that it appears to be moving in an upward motion. Interestingly, the wings of the dove were originally drawn spread outwards across the top of the frame, as is attested to by faded lines of brown ink that have since been erased. This original design was then altered and the dove's wings painted closed.[114]

Below and to the right of the Trinity image a group of six women kneel, holding up two open books between them. Amidst this group is tonsured monk, who points to these two books. The books are both inscribed in Latin, with the book on the left reading 'God the Father of heaven have mercy. God the Son, redeemer of the world have mercy,'[115] whilst the book to the right reads 'God the Holy Spirit have mercy. Holy Trinity one God have mercy'.[116] The layout of the miniature and text suggests that the scribe did not originally plan for such an elaborate illustration at this point. In order to frame his miniature within a rectangular border, the artist has incorporated the final four lines of the previous text into the upper section of his miniature, though has still kept the text separate from the rest of the miniature with an additional border. These lines form the end of the Athanasian Creed, which precedes the Litany in the Psalter.

---

[112] Geddes, 'The Illustrations', *The St Albans Psalter (Albani Psalter)* ed. Jochen Bepler, Peter Kidd, and Jane Geddes (Simbach am Inn, 2008), pp. 157-220.
[113] Geddes, 'The Illustrations', p. 218.
[114] Kidd, 'Contents and Codicology', p. 109.
[115] 'pat[er] de ce[li]s d[eu]s. m[iserere nobis]. fili rede[m]ptor mundi d[eu]s m[iserere nobis].'
[116] 'Sp[iritu]s s[an]cte d[eu]s. m[iserere nobis]. S[an]c[t]a t[ri]nitas un[us] d[eu]s m[iserer nobis].'

Since C. H. Talbot's edition and translation of the *Life of Christina* in 1959, comparisons have been drawn between Christina's Trinitarian vision recorded in her *Life*, and the image on the Litany page in the St Albans Psalter.[117] In the *Life*, the passage describing Christina's vision of the Trinity occurs shortly after her profession and consecration at St Albans in c. 1131,[118] and before the accession of King Stephen in 1135.[119] After spending time fasting and in prayer, she is described as experiencing a vision of the Trinity:

> For Christina saw herself in a kind of chamber, pleasing in its material, design, and atmosphere, with two venerable and very handsome personages clothed in white garments. Standing side-by-side, they differed neither in stature nor beauty. On their shoulders a dove far more beautiful than other doves seemed to rest.[120]

This passage is remarkable both for the way it describes the Trinity and in the close relation between the description and the image in the St Albans Psalter. The image of the Trinity in the St Albans Psalter corresponds to the account of the Christina's vision in the *Life* in a number of respects. The Father and Son are shown standing side-by-side, with almost identical features. The representation of the dove also suggests a relationship to the *Life* text: the dove's wings were originally drawn open, as can still be seen above the frame of the image, and then painted shut, possibly to accommodate for the description in the *Life* that states that the dove was resting, rather than flying.[121] However, there are also a number of differences between the *Life* account and the St Albans image. The two men in Christina's vision are described as wearing white garments, whilst in the St Albans Psalter they wear a mixture of blue, red and green clothes. Significantly, the *Life* describes Christina as initially witnessing this vision alone, though Abbot Geoffrey joins her in the midst of her vision.[122] Conversely, in the St Albans Psalter, six women and one monk are also depicted to the right of Trinity, though, interestingly, only one woman, at the very front of the group, reaches with her hand over the border dividing the image of the Trinity from the other figures, suggesting that it is primarily through her that the vision is witnessed. It is thus possible that this woman is a representation of Christina. The account in the *Life* also

---

[117] Heslop, 'Christina of Markyate's Psalter', pp. 164-70; Morgan Powell, 'The Visual, The Visionary and Her Viewer', *Word and Image*, pp. 340-62; Geddes, *The St Albans Psalter*, pp. 99-101; Kidd, 'Contents and Codicology', pp. 108-9.
[118] *The Life of Christina of Markyate*, ed. and trans. Talbot, pp. 146-7.
[119] Ibid, pp. 160-161.
[120] *The Life of Christina of Markyate*: 'Vidit siquidem Christina se in camera quadam. material arte. et odore gratifica. duabus venerandis et admodum speciosis. albisque indutis assistere personis. Que collateraliter stantes. nulla stature vel decoris differencia discrepabant. In quorum humeris Columba. sed et ipsa speciem excedens aliarum columbarum. quiescere videbatur.' ed. and trans. Talbot, *The Life of Christina of Markyate*, pp. 156-7.
[121] Kidd, 'Contents and Codicology', p. 109.
[122] *The Life of Christina of Markyate*, ed. and trans. Talbot, pp. 156-7.

describes the vision as taking place in a beautiful room or chamber, something that may be alluded to in the image in the St Albans Psalter by the separate frame shown around the Trinity, but is not detailed explicitly. The framing is more likely used to emphasise that the idea that the Trinity is witnessed as part of a vision, an aspect that again may be indicative of the relationship between the image and the *Life* text, which is very clear that about the visionary status of Christina's encounter with the Trinity.

The relationship between the *Life* and the St Albans Psalter is complicated not only by the visual discrepancies between the image and the text, but also in the difficulties in the dating of the composition of the *Life*. The text in the Tiberius manuscript is incomplete, finishing abruptly mid-sentence and missing an account of Christina's life in the 1140s.[123] In his edition of the *Life*, Talbot assumed that the manuscript was damaged, and missing the folios containing the final portion of Christina's *Life*, including her death. Also acknowledging that the author has a seemingly close relationship with Christina and an intimate knowledge of life in St Albans during her time there, he concluded that the original text must have been written shortly after Christina's death, which was sometime after 1155, by someone associated with St Albans.[124] Rachel Koopmans has recently re-examined the final passages of the *Life*, questioning Talbot's assumption that it is incomplete because of a loss of folios in the Tiberius manuscript.[125] Instead, from an analysis of two further summaries of Christina's *Life* in the *Gesta abbatum monasterii Sancti Albani* and a c. 1600 account written by Nicholas Roscarrock (1548-1633/4), which also come to a halt at the same point as the Tiberius manuscript, she persuasively argues that Christina's *Life* is incomplete not because of damage to the Tiberius manuscript but because work on the *Life* was abandoned by its twelfth-century author.[126] Drawing on what we know of the tensions caused in the St Albans community by Christina's close relationship with Abbot Geoffrey, Koopmans suggests that, after Geoffrey's sudden death in 1146, Christina's influence at St Albans, as well as the *Life* that was being completed for her, abruptly ended.[127] Though the *Life*, in some respects, seemed to be an attempt to initiate a cult for Christina at St Albans, no evidence for her cult survives and Koopmans even argues that there was a deliberate effort by the monks who succeeded Geoffrey's abbacy to wipe out Christina's legacy.[128] Koopmans thus concludes that the text was probably abandoned around the time of Geoffrey's death in 1146, and was thus likely written in the period c. 1140-50.

---

123 Talbot, *The Life of Christina of Markyate*, p. 4
124 Ibid, pp. 6-10.
125 Rachel M. Koopmans, 'The Conclusion of Christina of Markyate's *Vita*', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 51, 4 (2000), pp. 663-698.
126 Ibid, p. 694.
127 Ibid.
128 Ibid, p. 695.

However, a more precise date for the completion of Christina's *Life* does not help to date the completion of the St Albans Psalter, despite the very close connections between the Litany image and the description of Christina's vision in this text. It is possible that the vision was known to the artist or designer of the St Albans image prior to the writing of the *Life*, either orally or through an alternative written source, and that he drew on this account as inspiration for the illumination at the beginning of the Litany in the Psalter. It is likely that the Trinity image in the St Albans Psalter is not a visual rendering of the *Life* text, or that the text is based on the image in the St Albans Psalter, but it is reasonable to conclude that both the image and text are different, independent expressions of an account of a vision known to the St Albans community in the mid twelfth century.

Discussions of the Trinity image in the St Albans Psalter have been primarily concerned with the intricacies of the relationship between the Litany image and Christina's *Life*, as well as the implications of this relationship on the debates surrounding Christina's ownership of the Psalter. Whilst these are important concerns for the study of the St Albans Psalter itself, the significance of Christina's vision and the Litany image in the wider context of Trinitarian iconography in the twelfth century has been overlooked. The written description of Christina's Trinitarian vision in the *Life*, and the visual rendering of the vision in the St Albans Litany image, is strikingly similar to the iconography of the Seated Trinity. Though neither the Father nor the Son are shown seated on a throne, Christina's vision as recorded in her *Life* and the St Albans Psalter Litany image accords in a number of respects to this iconography. The spatial arrangement of the three Persons, with the Father and Son 'standing side by side' (*Que collateraliter stantes*) and the Holy Spirit positioned 'on their shoulders' (*In quorum humeris*) is reminiscent of the Seated Trinity iconography, in which the dove flies between the Father and Son. It is also significant that the Father and Son are shown anthropomorphically, whilst the Holy Spirit is perceived as being in the form of a dove. Furthermore, one of the most interesting aspects of the passage in Christina's *Life* is the account of the Father and Son as differing 'neither in stature nor beauty' *(nulla stature vel decoris differencia discrepabant*), a detail that is reflected in the Litany image. That the text specifies this visual similarity between the two persons of the Trinity is significant: in images of the Father and Son before and contemporary with Christina's *Life*, their appearances are nearly always very similar, if not identical. The two Lords in the Utrecht Psalter have round, youthful faces with short dark hair, and the Lords in both the 'Winchester Quinity' image and the Seal of Godwin have almost identical features.

It is thus possible that Christina's vision, and the image related to her vision in the St Alban's Psalter, is in some respects a reflection of contemporary Trinitarian iconography, in particular that of the Seated Trinity. In her article on the written accounts of Trinitarian visions from the seventh to the twelfth centuries, Florence Close has noted how these visionary texts often draw on contemporary images, referring their reader to known iconographic models. As Close states, this textual interaction with contemporary iconography prompts us to question the reciprocal influence of theological treatises, mystical texts and images, which, she argues, were all employed together in an attempt to explain and understand the mystery of the Trinity.[129] Though Close does not discuss Christina's vision and the related St Albans image in great detail, she also recognises the similarities between this textual account of the Trinity and the iconography of the Seated Trinity.[130] It is certainly possible that Christina, a wealthy and influential prioress with access to St Albans, which itself would have held resources that included some of the best and most ambitious artistic works of the twelfth century, may have seen and been familiar with the iconography of the Seated Trinity, already in use by this period. The only extant image of the Seated Trinity to pre-date Christina's *Life* is the Seal Matrix of Godwin, made almost a century before the St Albans Psalter image and the written account of Christina's vision. However, it is very likely that a lack of surviving material obscures the use of this form in the hundred years between the making of the Seal Matrix and the vision experienced by Christina. Though the Seated Trinity iconography may not have been used widely in English and continental art in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, it is very likely that it was more commonplace than the extant examples suggest. The familiarity with Seated Trinity iconography to which Christina of Markyate's vision and the associated Litany image attest suggest the form was used and known within the St Albans community but almost certainly wider afield in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Conclusion to Chapter One

By investigating the origins of the image of the two seated 'Lords' and its gradual dissemination in eleventh- and twelfth-century England, this chapter has established how, when and where the iconography of the Seated Trinity was developed. Though ultimately rooted in the illustration of the two 'Lords' of Psalm 109 in the ninth-century Utrecht Psalter, the Seated Trinity first appeared in southern English art shortly after the arrival of this Psalter in England at the turn of the eleventh century. The unusual illustration of the

[129] Florence Close, 'Imaginer L'Indicible: À propos de la mise en mouvement des images dans les récits de visions de la Trinité des hagiographes et des mystiques médiévaux (VIIe-XIIe siècles)', *MethIS*, 5 (2016), pp. 49-76 (p. 56).
[130] Close, 'Imaginer L'Indicible', pp. 60-1.

Trinity alongside the Virgin and Christ-child in the *Prayerbook of Aelfwine* attests to the influence of the Utrecht Psalter's depiction of the two 'Lords' in manuscript illumination in the first half of the eleventh century. This 'Quinity' design, which amalgamated two images in the Utrecht Psalter, was not however to become standard in medieval iconography. The earliest representation of a Seated Trinity without the depiction of the Virgin and Christ-child appears on the ivory seal matrix of Godwin, made in around 1040. Importantly, this design demonstrates the influence of the image of the two seated 'Lords', and their transformation into a depiction of the Trinity with the addition of the dove of the Holy Spirit, outside of manuscript production for monastic audiences, and onto objects made for and used by secular, though stile elite, patrons. This is the only image of the Seated Trinity to survive until Christina of Markyate's vision of the Trinity in the first half of the twelfth century, and its near-contemporary illustration in the St Albans Psalter. The similarities between Christina's description of the Trinity and the Seated Trinity would nevertheless suggest that she was aware of this particular design, and that, by the early twelfth century, the iconography was more widespread than the surviving examples suggest.

Towards the end of the twelfth century, the iconography of the Seated Trinity begins to be used outside of England. The design appears, for example, in a manuscript of Gilbert of Poitiers' Commentary on the Psalms, probably produced in southwest Germany in the second half of the twelfth century.[131] From the turn of the thirteenth century, images of the Seated Trinity survive in much greater number, frequently appearing in association with Psalm 109 in Psalters and Bibles, but also outside these contexts as independent representations of the Trinitarian God.[132] As chapter three will explore, it is possible that one of the factors that led to the rise in the Seated Trinity's popularity was the formulation of an 'orthodox' definition of Trinitarian belief at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 following a period of instability in the later twelfth century.

At the same time that the Seated Trinity was gradually gaining in popularity, an alternative representation of the Trinity, now known as the *Gnadenstuhl* or 'Throne of Mercy' Trinity, also began to take hold in the visual culture of Western Europe. With the Crucifixion as its central component, the *Gnadenstuhl* offered a radically different interpretation of the Trinitarian God to that of the Seated Trinity, one that focused primarily on Christ's sacrifice on the cross and the role the Father and Holy Spirit in this pivotal moment in Christian Biblical history. As chapter two will explore, it is likely that the iconography developed out of the visual milieu related to the celebration of the mass. Though first appearing just short

[131] For this manuscript, see below, pp. 149-155.
[132] See below, pp. 170-173.

of a century after the invention of the Seated Trinity, the *Gnadenstuhl* also experienced a gradual rise in popularity during the twelfth century before becoming the most common representation of the Trinity from the turn of the thirteenth century on.

Chapter Two: The *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity

Introduction

The iconography of the *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity typically shows God the Father seated on a throne, holding the crucified Son on the cross, with the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove flying between the Father and Son.[1] This iconography is remarkable for being the most common way of representing the Trinity in the Middle Ages: extant *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities are more numerous than any other type of Trinitarian image from this period. Today, scholars assume that the earliest extant example dates from the late eleventh or early twelfth century, and the form was used consistently throughout the Middle Ages until the sixteenth century.[2] The geographical scope of the *Gnadenstuhl* iconography is also unparalleled in comparison with other Trinitarian iconographies. Extant examples of the *Gnadenstuhl* survive in a large number from central Europe, as well as from wider afield, such as southern Spain, Denmark, and the Outer Hebrides.[3] Also remarkable is the use of the *Gnadenstuhl* iconography in many different types of media, from illuminated manuscripts to wall paintings, ivories, sculpture, stained glass and metalwork. Towards the end of the fourteenth and into the fifteenth century the iconography also became particularly popular in alabaster sculpture.[4] As well as this proliferation across various media, the *Gnadenstuhl* iconography is extraordinary for its longevity, persisting into the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, where the form was popular during the Renaissance and used in well-known works such as Masaccio's Trinity fresco in the Basilica of Santa Maria Novella in Florence (1425), Botticelli's *Trinity with Saints* (1491-94), now in the Courtauld Gallery in London, and Dürer's *Adoration of the Trinity* (1511) in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna.

---

[1] Scholarship on the iconography of the *Gnadenstuhl* is extensive. The most significant studies include: A. N. Didron, *Iconographie chrétienne: histoire de Dieu* (Paris, 1843), pp. 568-71; Emile Mâle, *L'Art Religieux du XIIe siècle en France: Étude sur les origines de l'iconographie du Moyen Age*, (Paris, 1922), pp. 95-7; W. L. Hildburgh, 'A Medieval Bronze Pectoral Cross: Contributions to the Study of the Iconography of the Holy Trinity and of the Cross', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 14, no. 2 (1932), pp. 79-102; Wolfgang Braunfels, *Die Heilige Dreifaltigkeit* (Düsseldorf, 1954); Gertrude Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, vol. II, trans. J. Seligman (London, 1972), pp. 122-4; François Boespflug and Yolanta Zaluska, 'Le dogme trinitaire et l'essor de son iconographie n Occident de l'epoque carolingienne au IVe Concile du Latran (1215)', *Cahiers de civilisation medievale*, vol. 37 (1994), pp. 202-207; John Munns, *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Norman England: Theology, Imagery, Devotion* (London, 2016), pp. 45-58.

[2] The earliest extant example of a *Gnadenstuhl* appears as part of a wall painting in the church of St Mary in Houghout-on-the-Hill, Norfolk. This painting, and the issues relating to its dating, are discussed below, pp. 88-96.

[3] Throne of Mercy Trinities were a particularly popular subject for church wall paintings in medieval Denmark; see Knud Baning, *A Catalogue of the Wall Paintings in the Churches of Medieval Denmark, 1100-1600*, vol. II (Copenhagen, 1976), p. 132; an interesting sixteenth-century Throne of Mercy is the principle subject of the tomb of Alasdair MacLeod in St Clements Church, Rodel, Isle of Harris.

[4] Francis Cheetham, *English Medieval Alabasters: With a Catalogue of the Collection in the Victoria and Albert Museum* (London, 2005), pp. 296-312.

From the earliest surviving example of a *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity on the walls of a parish church in Norfolk, this chapter charts the development of the iconography throughout the course of the twelfth century. The chapter begins with a discussion of the origins of *Gnadenstuhl* terminology. It then proceeds to a comparison of several of the earliest *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities, revealing a hitherto unnoticed but common connection: these early images appear to serve a direct purpose related to the ceremony of the mass and its related visual milieu. Its origins may therefore be related to eleventh- and twelfth-century Eucharistic imagery, serving as a helpful and effective visual fusion of the recognizable representations of the *Majestas Domini* and the Crucifixion, two images frequently associated with the Canon of the Mass. Whilst the majority of twelfth-century depictions of the *Gnadenstuhl* imply that its design functions in a specifically Eucharistic context, by the turn of the thirteenth century the iconography began to be used in much more diverse cases, finding currency in imagery related to visionary texts, romances, biblical narratives, the Psalms (particularly Psalm 109), and used in the decoration of Apocalypses, Bestiaries, Bibles moralisées, altar pieces, and the domestic sphere. In the first instance, this examination of the earliest representations of the *Gnadenstuhl*, which includes wall paintings and manuscripts, will explore their site-specific function in order to determine how the composition unites several iconographic ideas into a single image to convey a clearer doxological understanding of the triune God. Then, it will proceed to offer a new explanation of the transmission and reception of this design across medieval Europe.

The Origins of *Gnadenstuhl* Terminology

It is unclear whether any contemporary term existed to describe the *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity in the Middle Ages. It has been suggested that the modern German term used to denote this iconography, 'Gnadenstuhl', was also a contemporary medieval term, yet the origins of this particular terminology are considerably more recent.[5] In studies on the Throne of Mercy Trinity, it is often noted that the word *Gnadenstuhl* is used by Martin Luther (1483-1546) in his translation of Exodus 25:17-22 to denote the lid which closed the Ark of the Covenant.[6] The process by which the Lutheran translation of the Exodus passage was transferred to the Throne of Mercy image had however not been considered in full until a recent article by Berthold Kress, whose analysis of a 1548 wooden relief by Peter Dell the Elder (1490-1552) provided this link between the two terminologies (fig. 2.1).[7] The relief, which was destroyed during the Second World War but fortunately well photographed, was an adaption of a

[5] Wolfgang Braufnels, *Die Heilige Dreifaltigkeit* (Berlin, 1954), p. 3.
[6] Gertrude Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, p. 123; Sara Jane Pearman, 'The iconographic development of the cruciform throne of grace', p. 2.
[7] Berthold Kress, 'A Relief by Peter Dell (1548) After a Drawing by Paul Lautensack, and the Origins of the Term "Gnadenstuhl"', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 73 (2010), pp. 181-194.

design by the German artist Paul Lautensack (1478-1558) that survives as a drawing in a manuscript dated to 1535.[8] It is unclear as to whether Dell worked with Lautensack to produce the relief more than a decade later, but the relief does show some inconsistencies and even misunderstandings of Lautensack's drawing, suggesting that Dell may have produced the relief with reference to the drawing but without Lautensack present.[9] The wooden relief shows a Throne of Mercy Trinity poised on top of the Ark of the Covenant and surrounded by various other Biblical scenes. Interestingly, in this respect, Dell's relief echoes the iconography of the Anagogical window in the Basilica of St Denis, discussed below.[10] The relief is inscribed with various religious terms in Latin as well as the vernacular German, which are added in conjunction with their pictorial counterparts, such as '*Gott*' (God), '*Tauff*' (Baptism) and '*Mensch*' (man). In a similar manner, the lid of the Ark of the Covenant, which, significantly, is in the very centre of the image, is inscribed with the term 'Gnadenstuhl', in reflection of Luther's vernacular translation of the lid of the Ark of the Covenant.

As indicated by Kress, this term was mistakenly understood as referring to the whole Trinity composition, rather than simply the Lutheran term for the lid of the Ark of the Covenant, by Ernst aus'm Weerth, a Bonn professor who acquired the Dell relief for the Kaiser-Friedrich Museum in 1853.[11] In a later 1876 article Ernst aus'm Weerth names the iconographic form of the Trinity in which the Father holds the crucified Son in his lap as a 'Gnadenstuhl', indicating that the Dell relief explicitly uses this term to denote this type of Trinity. The word was then used to describe this type of Trinity a year later in H. Otte's 1877 edition of the Archaeological Dictionary, and then used more widely in art historical literature.[12] In English the word was translated as 'Throne of Mercy', or 'Throne of Grace', and in French, Trône de Grâce, which are all used interdependently to refer to the *Gnadenstuhl.*

The *Dextera domini*, the *Majesta* and the Crucifixion: Possible Iconographic Antecedents for the Gnadenstuhl

The earliest extant example of the Throne of Grace Trinity appears as part of a series of wall paintings in the small parish church in Houghton-on-the-Hill, Norfolk, which were probably completed at the turn of the twelfth century (figs. 2.2-2.21).[13] Recently

[8] Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Kupferstichkabinett Hs. 79 C 4, f. 1r.
[9] Berthold Kress, *Divine Diagrams: The Manuscripts and Drawings of Paul Lautensack (1477/8-1558)* (Leiden, 2004), pp. 267-8.
[10] See pp. 127-128.
[11] Kress, 'A Relief by Peter Dell', p. 194
[12] Ibid, p. 194
[13] The date of the paintings is discussed in more depth below, pp. 94-97.

rediscovered and restored, the appearance of an early twelfth-century *Gnadenstuhl* on the walls of a small and remote English parish church challenged and transformed previous assumptions about the origins and development of the iconography. Before the discovery of the Houghton paintings, scholars claimed that its origins lay in artistic developments on the French/German border in the tenth and eleventh centuries.[14] This view depended largely on W. L. Hildburgh's study of a bronze cross currently held in the Victoria and Albert Museum, which shows the hand of God the Father and the dove of the Holy Spirit descending above the head of the crucified Christ. Drawing on other similar examples, Hildburgh argued that this iconography formed the first stage in the development of the image of the *Gnadenstuhl*.[15] The next 'formative stage', Hildburgh suggested, could be seen on two portable altars, one made in Hildesheim in c. 1120-30, and another probably made in Cologne in 1160-80, which both show the bust of the Father above the Crucifixion.[16] By cross-examining these three examples, he intuited that a process of design evolution in which the hand of the Father above Christ on the cross was enlarged to include more his presence, first with his head and hands and later with a more complete rendering of his upper body, eventually culminating in the depiction of the entire body of the Father supporting Christ on the cross. This hypothesis therefore tracks the invention of the *Gnadenstuhl* as a careful visual revelation of the increasingly noticeable participation of the Father, who is seen enabling his Son to triumph in his Passion alongside the presence of Holy Spirit.

The discovery at Houghton-on-the-Hill of a 'complete' representation of the *Gnadenstuhl* that pre-dates the 'formative stages' defined by Hildburgh complicates the chronology and

---

[14] For this argument see in particular Emile Mâle, *L'Art Religieux du XIIe siècle en France: Étude sur les origines de l'iconographie du Moyen Age*, p. 140, trans. Marthiel Mathews, *Religious Art in France: The Twelfth Century, A Study of the Origins of Medieval Iconography* (Princeton, 1978), p. 183; W. L. Hildburgh, 'A Medieval Bronze Pectoral Cross: Contributions to the Study of the Iconography of the Holy Trinity and of the Cross', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 14, no. 2 (1932), pp. 79-102; Gertrude Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, vol. II, trans. J. Seligman (London, 1972), pp. 122-4; Sara Jane Pearman, 'The Iconographic Development of the Cruciform Throne of Grace from the Twelfth to the Sixteenth Century', unpublished PhD dissertation (Case Western Reserve, 1974), pp. 19-21; Francis Boespflug and Yolanta Zaluska, 'Le dogma trinitaire et l'essor de son iconographie en Occident de l'epoque carolingienne au IVe Concile du Latran (1215)', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 37, no. 147 (July-September 1994), pp. 181-240.

[15] Hildburgh, 'A Medieval Bronze Pectoral Cross', pp. 79-102. One of the most well-known of the examples discussed by Hildburgh is the magnificent cross of Lothar, made in c. 1000 for the Holy Roman Emperor Otto III, in which the crucifixion engraving on the obverse of the large golden cross also shows the hand of the Father descending above the head of the crucified Son, holding a laurel-leaf crown containing the dove of the Holy Spirit.

[16] Hildesheim Altar, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. 10-1873; for the Hildesheim Altar see below, pp. 96-9; Portable Altar of St Mauritius, Siegburg, St Servatius, Treasury. Hildburgh dates the St Mauritius altar to around 1135, though more recent studies suggest it was made around the same time as the Hildesheim altar, around 1160-80. See Peter Lasko, *Ars Sacra, 800-1200* (Middlesex, 1972), p. 213, plate 239 and Clemens M. Bayer, 'Der Mauritius-Tragaltar in Siegburg: Bemerkungen zu Datierung, Ikonographie und Ikonologie unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Inschriften, *Heimatblätter des Rhein-Sieg-Kreises* (1992-3), pp. 7-46.

framework of his analysis. However, images showing the hand of God descending above the cross, for example in a full-page illumination in the *Prayerbook of Aelfwine*, an illustration in the Arundel Psalter, or an ivory panel now in the National Museum in Copenhagen, do survive from the early eleventh century, and they might have been part of the inspiration behind the design of this *Gnadenstuhl*.[17] These images testify to a 'trinitarianisation' of the crucifixion scene in the eleventh century, and a desire to indicate the simultaneous presence all three persons of the Trinity at the climax of the Passion. Whilst acknowledging the potential of including the *Dextera domini* in crucifixion scenes as a stimulus for the invention of the *Gnadenstuhl*, this chapter also suggests an alternative, but possibly related, context for understanding the origins of its iconography.

In addition to images of the Crucifixion with the *Dextera domini*, it has also been argued that the iconography of the *Gnadenstuhl* may have derived from a combination of images of Christ in Majesty and Christ on the cross.[18] This observation is dependant largely on a visual analysis of the individual elements of the *Gnadenstuhl*, and the observation that the image appears almost as a fusion of the *Majesta* and the Crucifixion, with the figure of the Father resembling Christ seated in the heavenly realms and the crucified Christ almost super-imposed over the lap of the Father. Herbert Kessler has referred to this process as a 'yoking together' of the two well-established iconographies.[19] However, few studies have gone beyond the acknowledgement of these visual similarities to explore how, when and why this may have taken place. In order to elucidate a richer explanation for the 'yoking together' of these images, this chapter will explore how the earliest images of the *Gnadenstuhl* seem to appear in spaces and places wherein the viewer is compelled to understand the coeval presence of the *Majestas Domini* and the Crucifixion, namely in the decorative programme of Anglo-Norman church interiors and imagery associated with the Canon of the Mass in sacramentaries and missals.

The *Gnadenstuhl* and Anglo-Norman Church Decoration

The Gnadenstuhl *in the Church of St Mary, Houghton-on-the-Hill, Norfolk*

[17] London, BL Cotton Titus D XXVII, f. 6v; London, BL MS Arundel 60, f. 12v; Copenhagen, Nationalmuseet, inv. No. D 13324.
[18] R. Ligteenberg, 'Over den Oosprung en de eerste beteekenis van den Genadestoel', *Collectanea Franciscana Nerlandica*, III/I, 1932, pp. 1-35; Braunfels, *Die Heilige Dreifaltigkeit* (Dusseldorf, 1955), p. 12; Boespflug and Zaluska, 'Le dogma trinitaire', pp 202-7; Tadeusz Dobrzeniecki, 'The Toruń Quinity in the National Museum in Warsaw', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 46, no. 3 (Sep., 1964), pp 380-388 (p. 385); H. L. Kessler, 'Turning a Blind Eye: Medieval Art and the Dynamics of Contemplation', *The Mind's Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages*, ed. J. F. Hamburger and A. M. Bouché (Princeton, 2006), pp. 413-39 (p. 432).
[19] Kessler, 'Turning a Blind Eye: Medieval Art and the Dynamics of Contemplation', p. 432.

The series of wall paintings in the church of St Mary at Houghton-on-the-Hill in Norfolk, which contain what is probably the earliest surviving example of a *Gnadenstuhl* in Western art, were only rediscovered in 1992. The church, which is situated in a remote part of the Norfolk countryside, west of the small village of North Pickenham, had fallen into ruin in the twentieth century. As pictures from the early 1990s show, by this point the church's roof had collapsed, its tower had become overrun with ivy and the windows were no longer glazed (figs. 2.22-2.24). Remarkably, despite the poor condition of the building, extensive remains of the wall paintings survived. Their discovery led to a major conservation project led by the Norfolk Archaeological Unit, English Heritage and the Wall Painting Department at the Courtauld Institute of Art, which aimed to preserve the church fabric as well as the extensive mural scheme.[20]

The remains of the early twelfth-century wall painting scheme in the Church of St Mary the Virgin in Houghton-on-the-Hill, Norfolk (figs. 2.2-2.4) decorate all four walls of the nave of this tiny but remarkable church.[21] The nave is the oldest surviving part of the church, and though the dating of these parts of the building has been difficult to determine, it is generally agreed that the nave was constructed in the later half of the eleventh century, probably around 1090.[22] This is due to the presence of long-and-short quoins still visible on the external walls and the double-splayed windows, both features being characteristic of churches built in stone in the first few decades following the Norman Conquest.[23] The large window with Decorated-style tracery in the east end of the north wall of the nave and the two altar niches inserted into the chancel wall probably added at some point in the fourteenth century. A tower was then added in the fifteenth century.[24] The current chancel is a later addition, built in the eighteenth century to replace the insecure medieval structure. The foundations of the earlier chancel still however survive, and indicate that it constructed at the same time as the late eleventh-century nave. This Romanesque structure had an

[20] For a full account of the conservation work see David S. Watt, *St Mary's Church, Houghton-on-the-Hill, Norfolk: Conservation Plan* (unpublished report for the Friends of St Mary's, Houghton-on-the-Hill, June 2001) and S. Cather and I. Kakoulli, *Houghton-on-the-Hill, Norfolk: Technical Examination of the Wall Paintings* (unpublished report, Conservation of Wall Painting, Courtauld Institute of Art, July, 2000).

[21] For the series of wall paintings see David Park and Stephen Heywood, 'Romanesque Wall Paintings Discovered in Norfolk', *Minerva*, vol. 8, no. 2 (1997), pp. 8-9; Watt, *St Mary's Church, Houghton-on-the-Hill, Norfolk: Conservation Plan*; Tobit Curteis, 'St Mary's Church, Houghton on the Hill, Norfolk: conservation of the wall paintings' (unpublished report, Tobit Curteis Associates, 2006); John Munns, 'The Cross at the Heart of the Trinity: An Anglo-Norman Development in Art and Theology', Envisioning Christ on the Cross: Ireland and the Early Medieval West, ed. Juliet Mullins et. al. (Dublin, 2013), pp. 318-352 and *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Norman England: Theology, Imagery, Devotion* (London, 2016), pp. 45-58.

[22] Watt, *St Mary's Church, Houghton-on-the-Hill, Norfolk: Conservation Plan*, pp. 14-15; Curteis, 'St Mary's Church, Houghton on the Hill', 2.0, 'The Building'.

[23] Watt, *St Mary's Church, Houghton-on-the-Hill, Norfolk: Conservation Plan*, pp. 15-16.

[24] Watt, *St Mary's Church, Houghton-on-the-Hill, Norfolk: Conservation Plan*, pp. 16-17; Curteis, 'St Mary's Church, Houghton on the Hill', 2.0, 'The Building'.

apsidal east end and was probably a rather long structure in comparison with the nave.[25] A west window and west doorway was added in the nineteenth century, but from this point on the church of St Mary entered a period of steady decline.

The image of the *Gnadenstuhl* forms the central part of the large Last Judgement painting on the east wall (fig. 2.5). The Trinity is displayed within a triple mandorla, which is itself framed by an additional square border. The right side of the *Gnadenstuhl* image is damaged, but enough remains of the left hand side of the painting to identify the positioning of the three persons (fig. 2.6). The Father is shown seated on a throne or stall, and is much larger than the figure of the Son, who is positioned in front of him on a cross that extends horizontally at a mid-way point across the Father's chest. The Father is shown in fairly elaborate, stylised drapery with ruched detailing and 'v'-folds, and a quatrefoil decorates the clothing on his knee. Instead of holding the cross, as is conventional in other representations of the *Gnadenstuhl*, the Father holds his right hand upwards above the horizontal beam of the cross (a gesture possibly echoed with his left hand, but now lost). The figure of Christ is damaged but his right hand and arm are still visible, stretching upwards towards the ends of the cross rather than following the horizontal line of the beam, giving the impression that his body hangs limply from the cross. The Holy Spirit is shown in the form of dove, flying upwards from between the Father's head and his right hand with its wings outstretched to the left and the right. The Father, Son and Holy Spirit are all shown with haloes. A curious scroll-like band runs across the centre of the entire scheme on the chancel wall, including though the middle of the Trinity's mandorla. It is possible that this scroll once contained, or was intended to contain, lettering or script, but examination under UV light and infa-red did not reveal anything of this kind.[26] The Trinity occupies the space at the very centre of the composition normally reserved for the figure of Christ, and in this way these three-figures assume the role of judge at the end of time. The raised hand of the Father imitates the gesture of Christ in judgement images, emphasising this role.

To the left of the *Gnadenstuhl* near the Father's feet, in the space between the triple mandorla and the outer square border, is a group of alert faces shown looking upwards towards the Father, Son and Spirit (fig. 2.7). These faces are all nimbed and they are arranged tightly together so that their haloes and faces slightly overlap one another. Their nimbed appearance suggests they are the elect in heaven, who have unique access to the vision of God. Outside of this square frame, other groups of figures are still visible to both

[25] Watt, *St Mary's Church, Houghton-on-the-Hill, Norfolk: Conservation Plan*, p. 15.
[26] Curteis, 'St Mary's Church, Houghton on the Hill', 3.1.1, 'East wall', n. 3

the left and right of the *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity. To the left (the Trinity's right) are three robed figures (fig. 2.6). The rightmost figure is the least damaged, and is shown with a halo and a staff. As in other contemporary judgement scenes, it is likely that these figures represent the elect on the right hand of God, as in the description of the Son of Man in Matthew 25.[27] The right side of the chancel wall painting is much more damaged, but sections of mural containing faces and haloes are just visible, suggesting that this opposing side of the painting also contained nimbed figures (fig. 2.8). Below this section are fragments of figures falling downward, including a figure with a crown, perhaps indicating that this part of the painting showed the damned falling to hell. The two scenes to either side of the *Gnadenstuhl* suggest that the painting may have shown a division of souls to the left and right. No demons or hell mouth survive, but this is a significantly damaged section of the mural. It is possible that a representation of hell would have been present in this space, as an indication of the fate of the damned during Judgement.

Directly below the *Gnadenstuhl* are a number of roundels containing the busts of haloed individuals (figs. 2.9-2.11). These figures are arranged horizontally in a rectangular frame that stretched across the entirety of the east wall (but both sections to the far left and right are now lost). Each of the haloed figures holds a scroll in both of their hands that hangs down towards the bottom of the roundel. As with the longer scroll above, the shorter bands that these individuals hold now appear blank, but they too might have contained text.[28] The figures in the roundels to the left of the centre are all robed with round faces and short, curled, hair that is parted in the centre. Their heads are turned slightly to their left as they gaze towards the roundel in the central part of the horizontal frame. In contrast to the turned faces of the other haloed beings, the figure in this central roundel looks directly out at the viewer. This individual is also robed and holds a scroll with upward arms, but in contrast to the angels, he is shown with dark hair and a nimbed halo, marking him as distinct from the beings in the roundels to the right. It has been suggested that this figure is intended as a representation of Christ, though it is unclear as to why Christ would be included in this section of painting, directly below an image of Christ crucified on the cross.[29]

The series of roundels that extend to the right are much more damaged, but the two closest to the central roundel give an idea of the content of this lost section of painting. Instead of angelic, haloed figures, these roundels contain two devilish-looking creatures. These figures

[27] Matthew 25:31-46.
[28] As with the larger scroll, UV and infra-red tests did not reveal any findings. See Curteis, 'St Mary's Church, Houghton on the Hill', 3.1.1, 'East wall', n. 4
[29] Curteis, 'St Mary's Church, Houghton on the Hill', 3.1.1, 'East wall'; Munns, 'The Cross at the Heart of the Trinity', p. 323.

also turn their heads to look at the figure of Christ, but to such an extent that they are shown in full profile, rather than the three-quarter profiles of the angelic beings. The figure to the left has dark crimson robes, a light-red face and head, a large exaggerated nose and tufts of hair that extend backwards from his skull. Like the angels he holds a scroll, but his elbows are drawn upwards in a pointed, exaggerated gesture. To his right, the other devilish figure bares his pointed teeth in a grimace and also holds a looping scroll. These two figures, which were presumably once part of a much more extensive scheme of similar demons in roundels, serve as a demonic parallel and inverse of the angelic figures to the left of the painting, mockingly imitating their gestures. This division of the horizontal frame also echoes the scheme above; the angelic figures are positioned below the nimbed figures of the elect, whilst the demonic creatures are shown closest to the figures presumably tumbling down to hell. The separation of saintly figures to the left and demonic to the right again suggests that the entire painting on the chancel wall is a depiction of the judgement and the division of souls at the end of time.

A final group of paintings below the band of saints and demons decorates the spaces between the doorways that lead into the chancel (figs. 2.12-2.17). The section on the left shows a well-preserved image of the Raising of the Dead. To the right of the scene, a large angel with extended wings blows a cone-shaped trumpet as numerous figures climb out of stone graves, many of them holding their long-fingered hands up in pleas. Another angel, now mostly obscured, stands to the left, also blowing a trumpet. The painting that would have occupied a similar space on the other side of the door to the chancel has mostly been lost, but a set of wings is still visible to the far left of the damaged scene. The wings are extended in an almost identical manner to the angel in the opposite image, meaning it is possible that this space also contained a similar depiction of the Raising of the Dead. The image of the Raising of the Dead to the left of the chancel arch (and possibly a similar image on the right side), complement the eschatological theme of judgement above.

The series of paintings on the other walls of the nave are also remarkable for their inventive narrative schemes. The mural on the north wall is formed of an upper and a lower section, which are each divided into smaller panels by red and white borders (fig. 2.18). Most of the scheme is now lost, but the best preserved of these panels is an image of God creating Eve from Adam's rib in the upper register (fig. 2.19). A tall, elongated figure of Christ dressed in long robes with a nimbed halo is shown pulling a similarly tall figure of Eve upwards from the figure of Adam, who crouches on the ground with his knees raised towards his chest. To the group's right is a tree with large leaves, around which winds the body of a snake. These scenes of creation and the tree of knowledge suggest that the other panels may once

have contained narrative scenes from the story of the fall and the book of Genesis. The only other remaining fragment in the lower register on the north wall would support this idea, as it may contain an image of Noah and the Ark.[30]

Murals also survive on the south wall (figs. 2.20-2.21). In the centre of the wall, a robed and bearded figure is shown reaching up to his right grasp the spokes of what appears to be a large wheel. It has been suggested that this may represent a Wheel of Fortune, which, if this identification were correct, would make it the earliest surviving example in medieval wall painting.[31] In contrast to the other walls, only a small amount of painting remains on the west wall: in the upper part of the scheme a devilish figure with his face shown in profile in a similar manner to the demons on the east wall judgement painting holds onto the leg of another figure.

In its entirety, the earliest painted decoration of St Mary's Church is formed of a series of complex scenes that combine predominantly biblical and eschatological imagery. The remains of a scene of creation and possibly Noah's Ark on the north wall would suggest that this section originally contained framed biblical scenes, possibly from the book of Genesis. Regrettably, much of the painting on the south and west walls is now lost, but the fragments of what could be a Wheel of Fortune may suggest the nave interior also contained didactic imagery. The most complete scene on the chancel wall, however, presents an elaborate, lively and unusual image of the Last Judgement. The Trinity, situated in the centre of the chancel wall, is framed as the collective judge at the end of time, dividing souls to the left and right. As the chapter will go on to explore, the eschatological focus of this scene provides an important context for understanding the origins of the *Gnadenstuhl.*

The Date and Style of the Houghton Paintings

Due to the low rate of survival of Anglo-Norman wall painting schemes like the one at Houghton, establishing a firm date based on a comparison of their style is often difficult. Traditionally, the paintings at Houghton have been dated to the late eleventh century due to the perceived stylistic affinities between the Houghton scheme and earlier, distinctly Anglo-

[30] As has been suggested by David Park and Tobit Curteis; see Curteis, 'St Mary's Church, Houghton on the Hill', 3.1.1, 'East wall'.
[31] As Curteis notes, the other early surviving wall painting of the Wheel of Fortune is in Rochester Cathedral and dates to the mid-thirteenth century: Curteis, 'St Mary's Church, Houghton on the Hill', 4.0, 'Iconography, Authorship and Patronage', n. 14.

Saxon, art.[32] As has been argued by John Munns, a fragment of wall painting found at Winchester dating from the tenth century, which shows the face of a man (possibly a saint) raising a pointed hand to his face, is particularly comparable with the face of the angel in the Last Judgement scene at Houghton (fig. 2.25).[33] Both figures have large, almond-shaped eyes with a bold central pupil and curved, thick eyebrows that are continuous with the outline of a long, rounded nose.[34] Munns also compares the Houghton paintings with the tenth-century Aethelstan Psalter, where figures are shown in a much bolder and fuller manner than the more elongated figures in later twelfth-century English wall painting schemes.[35] There are also compositional similarities with Houghton in the image of Christ in Majesty on folio 21r (fig. 2.26), where overlapping adoring heads surround the central figure of Christ. Another stylistic feature of the Houghton paintings said to be indicative of Houghton's relationship to 'Anglo-Saxon' rather than 'Anglo-Norman' art are the 'flipper-like', elongated hands and feet of the figures, which finds parallels in earlier eleventh-century manuscript illumination, and the quatrefoil design on God the Father's knee, a motif also current in Anglo-Saxon painting.[36] David Park and Stephen Heywood put specific emphasis on the quatrefoil as 'the most diagnostic stylistic feature' of the Houghton paintings and highly suggestive of their early date.[37]

However, each of these features continues to be used into the twelfth century, and cannot therefore be conclusive indications of Houghton's eleventh-century or 'Anglo-Saxon' style. The early twelfth-century murals in churches in the 'Lewes group' in Sussex, for example, or the wall paintings at Kempley in Gloucester completed slightly later, in around 1130-40, provide interesting comparisons with Houghton (figs. 2.28-2.36).[38] The figures in these paintings also have similar rounded faces with an accentuated, continuous line used for the

---

[32] Park and Heywood, 'Romanesque Wall Paintings Discovered in Norfolk', pp. 8-9. The conservation reports rely on their dating. Munns, *Cross and Culture*, p. 4; R. Rosewell, *Medieval Wall Paintings in English and Welsh Churches* (Woodbridge, 2008), pp. 9-10.

[33] Rosewell, *Medieval Wall Paintings*, p. 8, fig. 6.

[34] Munns, *Cross and Culture*, p. 49; Rosewell, *Medieval Wall Paintings*, pp. 8-10, fig. 6.

[35] Munns, *Cross and Culture*, p. 49; Athelstan Psalter, North-East Francia, 1st half of the 9th century (London, British Library, Cotton MS Galba A X VIII).

[36] Quatrefoils can be found in the late tenth-century Benedictional of St Aethelwold (London, BL Additional MS 49598) and the eleventh-century Tiberius Psalter (London, BL Cotton MS Tiberius C VI), as well as on several Anglo-Saxon coins. See Munns, *Cross and Culture*, p. 49; Park and Heywood, 'Romanesque Wall Paintings Discovered in Norfolk', pp. 8-9. For Anglo-Saxon coins with quatrefoils see A. Gannon, *The Iconography of Anglo-Saxon Coinage: Sixth to Eight Centuries* (Oxford, 2003), pp. 157-70 (pp. 164-5).

[37] Park and Heywood, 'Romanesque Wall Paintings Discovered in Norfolk', p. 8. This is also supported by Munns, *Cross and Culture*, p. 49.

[38] For the 'Lewes group' see Audrey Baker, 'Lewes Priory and the Early Group of Wall Paintings in Sussex', *Walpole Society* 31 (1942-3), pp. 1-44; E. W. Tristram, *English Medieval Wall Painting: The Twelfth Century* (Oxford, 1944); David Park, 'The "Lewes group" of paintings in Sussex', *Anglo-Norman Studies VI*, ed. R. A. Brown (Woodbridge, 1984), pp. 200-235; Richard D. H. Gem, 'The "Lewes group" of wall paintings: architectural considerations', *Anglo-Norman Studies VI*, pp. 236-7; C. R. Dodwell, *The Pictorial Arts of the West 800-1200* (New Haven, 1993), pp. 324-7.

eyebrows and nose, a technique comparable to the figures' faces at Houghton and in the tenth-century Winchester fragment. The similarity in facial characteristics across all three schemes is thus more indicative of the endurance of this particular technique from the tenth to the twelfth century, rather than evidence of an earlier hand at Houghton. Christ and the other figures in the paintings at Clayton in Sussex, completed in around c. 1100, also share the distinctive elongated 'flipper-like' feet of the figures at Houghton (fig. 2.28). The hands and feet of the figures in other early twelfth century schemes, such as those in Coombes Church in Sussex and St Botolph's Church in Hardham, are similarly elongated (figs. 2.29-2.31). Again, the continuous use of this technique beyond the Norman Conquest and into the twelfth century challenges the notion that Houghton's 'flipper-like' hands and feet are suggestive of its eleventh-century date. Furthermore, as Park and Heywood acknowledge, quatrefoils continue to be used as a decorative motif on clothing, and particularly the knees of seated figures, such as in a copy of Augustine's *De civitate Dei* made in Canterbury in around 1130.[39] The appearance of a quatrefoil in the Houghton murals is therefore not necessarily suggestive of their early date.

In addition to the influence of Anglo-Saxon style and imagery, it has also been suggested that the Houghton paintings reflect continental trends in painting that became popular in England following the Norman Conquest. Munns has argued that Houghton's bold, rather heavy style is more in line with these continental Romanesque murals, such as those at Saints Peter and Paul in Niederzell or St Martin de Vicq in the Centre-Val de Loire, than the sketchier and lighter Anglo-Saxon manuscript art.[40] This is supported by the style of the cross at the centre of the *Gnadenstuhl* image, which has splayed ends, a detail common in Ottonian metalwork produced in the tenth and eleventh centuries, such as on the cross of Lothar, made in c. 1000.[41] The triple mandorla that surrounds the Trinity is also reminiscent of Romanesque rather than Anglo-Saxon art, where it was more common to show Christ in a single mandorla with pointed ends.[42] These elements, Munns argues, suggest some knowledge and familiarity on behalf of the Houghton artists of continental trends in mural

[39] Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, England (Canterbury?), c. 1130 (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana MS Plut. 12. 17). Quatrefoils are depicted on the knee of the Virgin (f. 2v) and on the clothing of St Augustine (f. 3v). Park and Heywood, 'Romanesque Wall Paintings Discovered in Norfolk', p. 8.

[40] Munns, *Cross and Culture*, pp. 49-50.

[41] Cross of Lothar, Germany (Cologne?), c. 1000 (Aachen Cathedral Treasury). For the cross see Peter Lasko, *Ars Sacra: 800-1200*, 2nd ed. (Yale, 1994), p. 42 and 124. This design is also used in two tenth-century English manuscripts, the Sherborne Pontificale (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS Lat. 943, f. 4v) and the Arenberg Gospels (New York, Morgan Library MS 869, f. 9v) and in a crucifixion miniature on f. 52v of BL MS Arundel 60. Barbara C. Raw, *Anglo-Saxon Crucifixion Iconography and the Art of Monastic Revival* (Cambridge, 1991), p. 113 also compares the earlier two examples to Ottonian metalwork. See also Munns, *Cross and Culture*, p. 50.

[42] For example, in the chancel painting at St Andrew's Church, Nether Wallop, Hampshire, completed c. 1000. This painting is discussed in more detail below, pp. 96-97.

painting, which emerged after the first generation of artistic interaction in England post-Conquest. However, the exchange between continental and English artists and the influence of 'heavier' Romanesque styles, particularly in mural painting, continued to be felt into the twelfth century, as is evident in the 'Lewes group' of paintings and those at Kempley, which are also considered part of the group of paintings influenced by Romanesque styles that became popular following the Norman Conquest.[43] Any Ottonian or Romanesque influence perceivable in the Houghton murals is therefore equally suggestive of an early twelfth century date, rather than specifically showing that they were completed during the initial 'wave' of Anglo-Norman artistic activity in the first few decades after the Norman Conquest.

As well as stylistic considerations, the wall paintings at Houghton-on-the-Hill have also been dated to c. 1090 on the basis of their relationship to the wider church structure. As discussed above, the nave and chancel (now lost) were likely built in the years shortly following the Norman Conquest. Park and Heywood have argued that the painted scheme must be coeval with the original fabric of the nave walls 'as… would be expected' from the process of church building and decoration.[44] However, their assumption that churches were always painted directly after they were built is not supported by any evidence from other contemporary churches and is predicated purely on circumstantial evidence. It is equally possible that Houghton's painted decoration was completed a decade or so after the church had been built, perhaps because of financial restraints or the availability of artists. Without any firm evidence to support the idea that the painting was completed as part of the eleventh-century building programme, the date of the church's fabric cannot be used to determine the date of the wall painting scheme in the nave.

These estimations have therefore not conclusively established when the murals at Houghton-on-the-Hill were executed. A number of the features identified in the Houghton paintings as belonging to 'earlier' styles continued to be used into the twelfth century, and, in a number of cases, in early twelfth-century parish church murals. The 'Romanesque' qualities of the Houghton paintings could also be equally indicative of an early twelfth century date. Indeed, in addition to the features discussed above, several aspects of the early twelfth-century 'Lewes' paintings are comparable to Houghton. The style of the figures' drapery in both schemes also shows some parallels, notably in regards to the circular banding details used on the arms of clothing. This is particularly evident in the drapery

[43] David Park, 'Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Norman? Wall Paintings at Wareham and Other Sites in Southern England', in *Early Medieval Wall Painting and Painted Sculpture in England*, ed. S. Cather, D. Park and P. Williamson (Oxford, 1990), pp. 225-47.
[44] Park and Heywood, 'Romanesque Wall Paintings Discovered in Norfolk', pp. 8-9.

worn by the angelic figures in the roundels at Houghton and that of the twelve apostles at Kempley (figs. 2.35, 2.36). Furthermore, the figure of the *Majestas Domini* in the wall paintings at Clayton in Sussex, completed in around c. 1100, is shown in a strikingly similar position to the figure of the Father in the *Gnadenstuhl* at Houghton (fig. 2.28): in both cases, this central figures' feet are brought together at the ankles but point outwards in opposite directions, whilst the knees are positioned in an exaggerated 'V' shape and both hands raised upwards. Whilst these similarities do not demonstrate conclusively that the Houghton paintings were also completed in the early twelfth century, they do challenge the notion that the murals are specifically 'Anglo-Saxon' in their design and more in keeping with eleventh-century styles.

Instead of assuming a date of c. 1090, it is more likely that the Houghton *Gnadenstuhl* took form in the first decades of the twelfth century. The similarity in the Houghton paintings' style to early twelfth-century schemes such as the 'Lewes group', as well as previous problematic assumptions about the paintings' 'Anglo-Saxon' elements and their relationship to the construction of the church itself, all point to a date in the early twelfth century. However, whilst acknowledging that the Houghton paintings might have been completed slightly later than has previously been suggested, it is certain that they cannot have been completed later than the first quarter of the twelfth century. Wall dating to the later half of the twelfth century, such as the paintings in St Leonard's Church, Stowell, Gloucestershire, or the image of St Paul and the Viper in Canterbury Cathedral, probably completed c. 1150, show a marked difference is style to the Houghton paintings and 'Lewes' group.[45] Slightly shorter figures, with smaller hands and feet, prevail, and the 'V' folds of drapery is enhanced with sweeping circular motions that show the fabric to be clinging more closely to the bodies of the figures. This would therefore make the central image of the Trinity one of the earliest surviving examples of the *Gnadenstuhl*, and certainly the earliest example in wall painting. As the following section shows, the programme of the Houghton paintings also shares a number of interesting iconographic similarities with other early twelfth-century murals. In a number of both Romanesque and Anglo-Norman English church paintings, the central section of the chancel arch is decorated with a scene of the *Majestas Domini*. At Houghton, the influence of this imagery is evident in the central image of an enthroned God the Father, surrounded by a mandorla. It is Houghton's distinctive addition of the representations of Christ on the cross and the dove of the Holy Spirit, however, that set the series of paintings apart from other schemes. In the following section, an examination of the wider liturgical contexts in which these paintings appear will help to explain why the

[45] Rosewell, *Medieval Wall Paintings*, pp. 12-13; for the St Paul and Viper painting see John Morris, 'Wall Painting in St Anselm's Chapel in Canterbury Cathedral Church', *Archaeologia*, vol. 52 (1890), pp. 389-392.

artists and designers of the Houghton scheme chose to represent all three members of the Trinity on the chancel wall of this church.

Early Medieval Church Decoration and the Ceremony of the Mass

The image of Christ in Majesty, seated in the heavens and often surrounded by a mandorla, was, by the time of the completion of the Houghton paintings, a well-established motif in Western art. As well as finding currency on the tympana of Romanesque churches, from the sixth century onwards many images of Christ in Majesty adorned the eastern end of major continental churches as the central subject in the apse directly above the altar.[46] This image would have complemented the liturgical function of the space, which would predominantly have been used to conduct one of the most important rites in the Christian church, the ceremony of the mass. Whilst the mass championed Christ's death on the cross through the presentation of his body and blood in the bread and the wine on the altar, an image of Christ reigning in the heavens directly above would have offered an affirming testament to the promise of the resurrection. This eschatological focus would have been evoked in the Eucharistic prayers read during the mass, notably the 'Sanctus', which refers specifically to Christ's power and majesty in the heavens.[47]

Similarly, in smaller Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman churches, the decorated schemes located on the east end of the building, on the chancel wall and within the chancel itself, were also directly related to themes evoked during the mass. The earliest surviving example seen on the east end of a minor Anglo-Saxon church is the painting above the chancel arch at St Andrew's Church in Nether Wallop, Hampshire (fig. 2.27).[48] All that remains of what was probably a fairly extensive scene on the chancel arch are two angels either side of the very top of a pointed mandorla, the subject of which has since been erased by the insertion of the nineteenth-century chancel arch.[49] It has been suggested that the mandorla originally contained an image of *Majestas Domini*, surrounded by the evangelists.[50] This wall painting was made around the year c. 1000 and is similar to contemporary manuscript work, notable

[46] Notable examples include the apsidal paintings at Saint Peter and Saint Paul, Niederzell, Germany (early 12th century); Sant Climent de Taüll, Catalonia, Spain (12th century); Berzé-la-Ville, France (early 12th century).
[47] For the association between the high altar and apsidal paintings see Ursula Nilgen, 'Die Bilder über dem Altar: Triumph- und Apsisbogenprogramme in Rom und Mittelitalien und ihr Bezug zur Liturgie', *Kunst und Liturgie im Mittelalter: Akten des internationalen Kongresses der Bibliotheca Hertziana und des Nederlands Instituut te Rome, Rom, 28-30 September 1997*, ed. Nicolas Bock (2000), pp. 75-89.
[48] For this painting see Pamela Tudor-Craig, 'Nether Wallop Reconsidered', *Early Medieval Wall Painting and Painted Sculpture in England* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 89-104; Rosewell, *Medieval Wall*, pp. 8-9.
[49] Nikolaus Pevsner, *The Buildings of England: Hampshire and the Isle of Wight* (London, 1967), pp. 343-44.
[50] Rosewell, *Medieval Wall Paintings*, pp. 8-9.

in the sketchy, linear style of the angels' drapery.[51] The positioning of the angel to the left of the chancel arch, the most of the painting to survive, is also comparable to the angels that surround an image of the Trinity in a mandorla on f. 1r of the Harley Psalter, made in Christ Church, Canterbury in the first half of the eleventh century; in both cases, the angels are shown with their legs flung to one side as they fly towards the mandorla.[52] Regrettably, this is the only section of Anglo-Saxon painting to survive in the church, but it does attest to the early use of, what is in all probability, *Majestas Domini* imagery on the chancel arch.

Similar images are also present in slightly later schemes. Notwithstanding the paintings at Houghton-on-the-Hill, the earliest series of paintings in minor churches after Nether Wallop are those belonging to the so-called 'Lewes group' of paintings in Sussex, probably completed at the turn of the twelfth century and possibly connected to Lewes priory.[53] As at Nether Wallop, two churches, St John the Baptist at Clayton and Coombes Church, show Christ in Majesty flanked by two angels directly above the chancel arch (fig. 2.28-2.30). At St Botolph's Church in Hardham and St Martin's in Westmeston, an image of the Lamb of God is depicted in this position, again flanked by two angels (fig. 2.31).[54] Though these churches provide only a small and geographically narrow group of examples, their survival indicates that one of the most common images chosen for the chancel arch in eleventh and early twelfth century was that of God, whether shown 'in majesty' in a mandorla or as the Lamb of God, but always situated in heaven, as indicated by the flanking angels. Significantly, both of these eschatological images find parallels in the imagery used to illustrate the *Sanctus* prayer in contemporary decorated Missals and Sacramentaries. They are also similar to the scheme at Houghton, where the central section of the painting contains an image of God in judgement. As at Clayton and Coombes, the entire chancel scene is set during judgement at the end of time.

In the slightly later painting scheme in the church of St Mary's in Kempley in Gloucestershire (figs. 2.32-2.36), probably completed c. 1130, an eschatological image of Christ is situated in the chancel itself, on the rounded ceiling, rather than the chancel arch. Here, Christ is shown in majesty, positioned within a triple mandorla and surrounded by the four Evangelists and censing angels (fig. 2.34). Seated Apostles and two additional

[51] For example, the angelic figures are comparable to those in the *Liber Vitae* of Newminster and Hyde, produced in Winchester in around 1031 (London, BL MS Stowe 944, ff. 6v-7r) and the 'Edui' Psalter, made in Christ Church, Canterbury between 1012 and 1023 (London, BL Arundel 155, f. 9v).

[52] Harley Psalter, England (Canterbury), 1st half of the eleventh century (London, BL Harley MS 603), f. 1r.

[53] For the 'Lewes group', see above, p. 93, n. 254.

[54] The paintings on the chancel arch at St Martin's in Westmeston are now destroyed, but were recorded and published by C. H. Campion, 'Mural Paintings in Westmeston Church', *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 16 (Lewes, 1848), pp. 1-19, plate 1.

figures, possibly bishops, line the north and south chancel walls, gazing towards the scene of Christ in Majesty above them (figs. 2.35-2.36). In contrast, the chancel wall contains a non-figural hatched design in the section immediately over the chancel door (fig. 2.32). Two fragmentary figural scenes survive on the southern section of the chancel wall, the upper scene depicting the three Marys and the lower Saint John (fig. 2.33). It is likely that these images were mirrored on northern side of the chancel arch by complementary images, possibly another narrative image from the passion sequence and a depiction of the Virgin to mirror the figure of John, as in contemporary crucifixion scenes.[55] Indeed, the presence of both a hatched pattern in the centre of the painting and passion-themed images to either side suggest that the entire scheme was designed around a central image of the crucifixion. It has been suggested that the central section of the chancel wall was left intentionally without figural decoration so that a large sculptural cross could be installed, either during procession or permanently against the wall, to occupy this space.[56] The presence of the cross would have complemented the passion narratives on the upper section of the chancel wall, as well as the images of St John and the Virgin, who, once a sculptural cross was installed, would have been situated to the left and right of the bottom of the cross as in conventional depictions of this scene in other media. Though no examples of these roods survive in situ, there is good evidence for the presence of a sculptural representation of the crucifixion, whether in stone or wood, above the chancel arch of several major and minor Anglo-Saxon and early Norman churches.[57] The head and foot fragments of a twelfth-century wooden crucifix now in the British Museum but discovered in the north-east wall of the nave of All Hallows Church in South Cerney, Gloucestershire, also give an idea of their form and scale (fig. 2.37).[58] At Kempley, crucifixion imagery, in both sculptural and painted form, was thus presented in conjunction with eschatological scenes of Christ in Majesty and the elect in heaven displayed in the chancel. Moving from the nave to the chancel, the priest would have been reminded of both Christ's sacrificial death and his resurrected glory. Unlike the images of Christ in Majesty in the 'Lewes group', this vision of the resurrected Christ would have been less accessible to those without access to the chancel, namely the laity in the nave. Nevertheless, the programme in the east end at Kempley testifies to the presence of a meaningful narrative strategy in which the designers show both the crucified and the resurrected Christ across space and media in close

[55] Stephen Rickerby and David Park, 'A Romanesque "Visitatio Sepulchri" at Kempley', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 133, no. 1054 (Jan., 1991), pp. 27-31 (notably pp. 30-31).
[56] Rickerby and Park, 'A Romanesque "Visitatio Sepulchri" at Kempley', pp. 30-31; Munns, *Cross and Culture*, pp. 131-132.
[57] See Munns, *Cross and Culture*, p. 134, n. 128, for a list that includes: St Mary's Church, Bibury, Gloucester; St Mary's Church, Bitton; St Mary's Church, Halford, Warwickshire; St Laurence's, Bradford-Upon-Avon, Wiltshire; St Nicholas' Church, Old Shoreham, Sussex; St Mary's Church, Tanner Street, Winchester; St Peter's Church, Barton-on-Humber, Lincolnshire.
[58] London, BM museum number 1994, 1008.1-2; Rickerby and Park, 'A Romanesque "Visitatio Sepulchri" at Kempley', p. 31.

proximity to one another. Standing in front of the high altar in this twelfth-century English church, these representations of the dead and eternal Christ would have appeared to fuse together.

David Park has argued that roods may have been in place across the images of Christ in Majesty and the *Agnus Dei* in the churches in the 'Lewes group'.[59] If this were the case, then here, too, Christ's crucifixion would have been viewed in conjunction with eschatological imagery related to his subsequent, resurrected state in heaven. Even if a cross was not present in this location, it is very likely that these churches, like most, would have had some visual form of cross, either as a permanent fixture in another area of the church or as an independent object that could be processed.[60] Within these churches, then, both Christ's crucified body and his resurrected body in heaven were presented in visual form, perhaps in close spatial relation to one another whenever a celebrant stands in the nave and looks towards the high altar in the east end.

For the paintings on the chancel arches of St Andrew's Church at Nether Wallop and those in the 'Lewes group', their close proximity to the altar is indicative of their relationship to the ceremony of the mass. Evidence for the location of altars in later Anglo-Saxon parish churches, and thus the spaces used for conducting of the mass, is somewhat fragmentary, though excavations of these buildings have provided a general sense of their placement. They show that before the eleventh century, most churches had an altar at the east end of the nave, in the space directly in front of the chancel arch.[61] Though this practice likely continued into the eleventh century, evidence from post-Conquest church interiors suggests that, in some cases, altars began to be positioned just inside the chancel, close to the eastern side of the chancel arch. Then, from the thirteenth century on, altars were nearly always positioned at the east end of the chancel, often up against the east chancel wall.[62] It is unclear when these successive moves took place, and David Parsons warns against seeing a 'universal pattern' in which altars in English churches moved gradually eastwards from the

[59] Park, 'A Romanesque "Visitatio Sepulchri" at Kempley', p. 31.
[60] Examples of sculptural roods on the nave wall survive at St Mary's, Breamore, Hampshire or St Swithun's, Headbourne Worthy, Hampshire. See also Rickerby and Park, 'A Romanesque "Visitatio Sepulchri" at Kempley', p. 31 and A. Vallance, *English Church Screens* (London, 1936), pp. 16-26.
[61] Examples of this arrangement probably occurred in the pre-Conquest churches at Reculver in Kent, St Paul-in-the-Bail, Lincoln and Raunds in Northamptonshire. See H.M. Taylor, 'The Position of the Altar in Anglo-Saxon Churches', *Journal of the Society of Antiquaries* 53 (1973), pp. 52-8; David Parsons, '*Sacrarium*: Ablution Drains in Medieval Churches', *The Anglo-Saxon Church: Papers on History, Architecture and Archaeology in Honour of Dr H. M. Taylor* (London, 1986), pp. 105-20 (notably pp. 105-107); Helen Gittos, *Liturgy, Architecture and Sacred Places in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 2013), pp. 185-8; Munns, *Cross and Culture*, pp. 128-9.
[62] Much more detailed evidence survives for the location of altars in the later medieval period, notably from the accounts of Reformation churchwardens. See Parsons, '*Sacrarium*', p. 106 and Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c. 1400-c. 1580* (New Haven, 2005), pp. 113 and 473-4.

nave to the east wall of the chancel; it is much more likely that this practice varied from place to place.[63] It is perhaps more accurate to view this process as a 'lengthy period of transition… before the altar position became standardised against the east wall.'[64]

When the paintings at Nether Wallop and those in the 'Lewes group' were executed at the turn of the twelfth century, it is likely that the altar would have been positioned either just in front or just behind the chancel arch. This would mean that the mass would have been performed either directly below or directly behind the paintings on the chancel wall. For those viewing the mass from the nave, the paintings would have framed the priest's actions below, offering a striking visual commentary on the liturgical ceremony taking place.[65] Their imagery and iconographic scheme can thus be understood as a reflection of this spatial connection to the altar. Whilst Christ's crucified body was represented either symbolically by the altar and mass ceremony itself, or literally in a sculptural crucifix displayed on or above the altar, the painting on the chancel arch presented a depiction of Christ's resurrected body in heaven. Those viewing the ceremony would thus be simultaneously presented with a visual and/or symbolic representation of both the crucified and the resurrected Christ. Munns has argued that the presence of Christ in Majesty paintings at the east end of Anglo-Norman churches 'point[s] not to an either/or association of the altar (and so that which takes place upon it) with the crucifixion and resurrection but, in minor churches as well as major ones, to a number of more sophisticated attempts to combine the imagery of both, oftentimes as two sides of the same coin.'[66] When the discussion in this chapter turns to illuminated manuscripts and the origins of the *Gnadenstuhl*, the *Majestas Domini* and Crucifixion are also presented in direct relation to one another alongside the *Santus* and *Te igitur* prayers in missals and sacramentaries made from the tenth century on. On these objects and in these spaces, as Munns argues, 'the increased emphasis on the real human suffering of Christ on the cross… continued routinely to be contextualised by visions of resurrection and glory.'[67]

Though completed slightly earlier than the 'Lewes group' of paintings and those at Kempley, the Houghton mural on the chancel wall can be best understood in the context of these near-contemporary schemes, and specifically their desire to show both the crucified and resurrected body of Christ on or near the chancel wall. Several aspects of the

[63] Parsons, '*Sacrarium*', pp. 106-7.
[64] Ibid, p. 108.
[65] As Munns argues, the function of the chancel arch as a frame for the altar works in contrast to the later medieval division of the church space, where the chancel arch was often functioned as a physical barrier between the nave and the chancel. See Munns, *Cross and Culture*, p. 129.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Munns, *Cross and Culture*, p. 129.

Houghton paintings find parallels with these other early murals, suggesting, in some ways, the scheme was designed in accordance with the conventions for chancel wall decoration in the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries. The chancel wall painting at Houghton is therefore designed along similar principles to the later twelfth-century 'Lewes' schemes, and possibly the eleventh-century painting at Nether Wallop. The themes chosen to frame the wall directly above the altar, and thus to be visible to the laity in the nave during the performance of the mass, draw on ideas of the Last Judgement and the glory of God in the heavenly realms.[68] When compared solely to the painted interiors of these other parish churches, the major visual difference between the Houghton painting and these other schemes is the addition at Houghton of the cross with the crucified son, laid over that of the Father in judgement, and the dove of the Holy Spirit, shown flying to the left. These aspects are certainly significant alterations to the more conventional image of Christ in Majesty, and altar both the visual appearance and theological ramifications of the scene. Nevertheless, the presence of a painted cross at the centre of this image is perhaps more comprehensible in the context of the wider, non-painted decoration schemes of these churches. As has been discussed, most churches would have owned some kind of sculptural crucifix, whether in wood or stone. Remaining polychromy suggests that these crosses may even have hung at the east end of the church, above the altar and by the chancel wall. That Houghton contains a painted example of such a cross in this space may therefore be consistent with the wider decorative schemes of parish churches in this period.

Furthermore, as in the interior spaces of these other Anglo-Norman churches, the painting at Houghton also combines both crucifixion and eschatological imagery around the site of the altar. This is achieved in a slightly different manner to the 'Lewes', Kempley and Nether Wallop examples, as at Houghton the figure seated at the centre of the mandorla is that of the Father, rather than the Son.[69] However, this arrangement would still have

[68] As discussed earlier in the chapter, though the chancel at Houghton was rebuilt in the eighteenth century, surviving masonry and antiquarian descriptions show the original eleventh-century church to have consisted of a nave and a slightly narrower, though relatively long, apsidal chancel. The nave and the chancel are coeval in date, both built in the first phase of building in around c. 1090. There is no surviving evidence in the fabric of the church itself that indicates where an original altar may have been placed, and as the two altar niches in the chancel wall are later, possibly fourteenth-century additions, they do not provide an indication for the eleventh-century placement of the altar. However, comparable evidence from post-Conquest churches would suggest that at the turn of the twelfth century when the church of St Mary at Houghton-on-the-Hill was built and the wall paintings in the interior of were completed, it is most likely that the altar was located either at the east end of the nave, directly in front of the chancel arch, or just inside the chancel. See Watt, *St Mary's Church, Houghton-on-the-Hill, Norfolk: Conservation Plan*, p. 15.

[69] At Clayton, the central figure is almost certainly intended as a representation of Christ, as he is shown with a bare torso and raising his hands to display his wounds. In the other remaining painted schemes at Coombes and Nether Wallop this central part is badly damaged or has been completely removed, meaning it is difficult to know definitively whether the figure was a representation of

communicated a similar message to the paintings with Christ as the central figure. God, whether he is represented through the person of the Son or the Father, is seated in the heavens as ruler and judge over mankind. His supremacy and power is unrivalled, and yet he offered himself in human form on the cross for humankind, an event central to the entire performance of the mass. Indeed, as the next section shows, the text of the mass itself celebrates these two contrasting representations of God as both ruler and crucified. The complementary images of God in Majesty and Christ on the cross are therefore entirely appropriate for the space that they adorn.

It is remarkable that one of the earliest examples of a *Gnadenstuhl* appears as part of a mural scheme probably completed at the turn of the twelfth century in a tiny, remote parish church in Norfolk. These rather humble begins are surprising considering this image became the most common Trinitarian iconography in medieval Western Europe. However, the use of a *Gnadenstuhl* in this context is best understood in relation to the wider decorative programmes of contemporary Anglo-Norman parish churches, and the desire to show the crucified and resurrected body of Christ in a location central to the performance of the mass. The painting at Houghton presents an ultimate fusion of these two concepts in the combined depiction of Father in judgement and the crucified Son, and a transformation of these two previously independent images into a representation of the Trinity in the addition of the dove of the Holy Spirit. The Houghton mural may not have been the earliest point at which this visual 'fusion' occurred; as we will go on to see, similar developments were also taking place in contemporary manuscript illumination, specifically in relation to the illustration of the Canon of the Mass. Nevertheless, the painting at Houghton-on-the-Hill is an important early witness to the use of the *Gnadenstuhl* iconography across diverse media and specifically in contexts deeply connected to the celebration of the Eucharist.

The *Gnadenstuhl* and the Illustration of the Canon of the Mass

After the wall painting at Houghton-on-the-Hill, the next earliest extant *Gnadenstuhl* image appears in a decorated missal known as the Cambrai Missal, made in Northern France in c. 1120 (figs. 2.38-2.40).[70] The full-page illumination of the *Gnadenstuhl* is positioned at the beginning of the *Te igitur*, one of the prayers read by the priest during the Canon of the Mass (fig. 2.40). From the turn of the ninth century, illustrated manuscripts containing the Canon of the Mass frequently introduce the *Te igitur* prayer with an image of the crucifixion.

Christ. However, the predominance of images of Christ in Majesty within a mandorla from this period would suggest that it is Christ too in these paintings.

[70] Cambrai Missal, Cambrai, c. 1120 (Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipal, MS 234), f. 2r. For this manuscript, see below, p. 106, n. 295.

From the tenth century on, the preceding prayer, the *Sanctus*, was often illustrated with an image of the *Majestas Domini*. The image accompanying *Sanctus* prayer commonly occupies the page preceding the beginning of the *Te igitur*, so that in a number of sacramentaries and missals, the images of the *Majestas Domini* and the Crucifixion are positioned across the double page spread of the manuscript, appearing adjacent to each other when the book is open. The celebrant reading from these books would thus have been presented with a simultaneous depiction of the resurrected and crucified body of God during a crucial moment in the mass ceremony when the themes of resurrection and crucifixion were also being invoked in the words of the *Sanctus* and *Te igitur* prayers. The close proximity of the respective images of the *Majestas* and the Crucifixion on the pages of these mass books also provides an important context for understanding where the 'fusion' of these two images, and the creation of the *Gnadenstuhl*, may have occurred.

The final part of this chapter investigates the relationship between the illustration of the Canon of the Mass and the iconography of the *Gnadenstuhl*. It begins with a visual analysis of the *Gnadenstuhl* illumination in the Cambrai Missal, the earliest example of the iconography to survive in a mass book.[71] This image is set within the context of mass book illustration from the turn of the ninth century and the earliest illustrated example of a mass text in the Gellone Sacramentary, up to the early twelfth century and the first appearance of a *Gnadenstuhl* alongside the *Te igitur*. This section establishes how the prayers of the *Sanctus* and *Te igitur* came to be associated with the respective images of Christ in Majesty and the Crucifixion. The section concludes with an examination of some of the other early examples of the *Gnadenstuhl* from the early twelfth century, exploring how these images are related to themes evoked during the ceremony of the mass.

The Cambrai Missal

The Cambrai Missal was made around 1120 for use in the region of Cambrai.[72] It is a relatively small book, measuring 235mm in height and 152mm in width. It shows considerable signs of wear, particularly at the beginning of the book in the section for the mass, where the pages are quite dirty and ragged at the corners. The texts for the Canon of the Mass, Preface and daily offices are followed by the communion of Saints, a series of

[71] Boespflug and Zaluska, 'Le dogma trinitaire', p. 207; Gertrude Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, vol. II (1972), pp. 122-4.

[72] Cambrai Missal, Cambrai, c. 1120 (Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipal, MS 234). See descriptions in the Cambrai Bibliothèque Municipale catalogues: André Le Glay, *Catalogue descriptif et raisonné des manuscrits de la bibliothèque municipale de Cambrai* (Cambrai, 1831), p. 38, no. 224; Auguste Molinier, *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèque Publiques de France, Tome XVII, Cambrai* (Paris, 1891), p. 77, no. 234. The manuscript was previously number 224 in the Cambrai Library, and is catalogued as such by Le Glay.

Votive Masses, and prayers for visiting the sick, such as the extreme unction. Although the manuscript only has three large illuminations, these are executed with sumptuous blue, red and green pigments and gold leaf, suggesting that the book was a fairly expensive production.

The mass book's three large illuminations are positioned before three of the prayers that make up the canon of the mass. The first large initial on f. 1r (fig. 2.38) begins the *Per omnia*, the prayer read before the preface to the canon.[73] The initial consists of an elaborately illuminated 'P' executed in gold leaf and laced throughout with winding green and red vines. A green dragon and red lion are shown entangled in the vines in the centre of the large 'P', biting and clawing at the foliage. The text of the *Per omnia* is executed in red, blue and green pigments in a clear and careful hand below the initial 'P'. The illustration of the *Per omnia* in the Cambrai Missal is consistent with the decoration of other contemporary missals, which also frequently illuminate the 'P' of this prayer with foliage and animal motifs.

The *Vere dignum* or Common Preface follows the *Per omnia* on f. 1v, and is also paired with an illumination (fig. 2.39). However, instead of forming the initial beginning the mass text this image is positioned independently in the top half of the page above the main section of the written prayer. The image has a round gilded frame, which encircles two standing angels. The angels are shown almost mid-flight, with extended wings that stretch out beyond the border and swaying bodies that lean gently against the curved frame. With both hands the angels hold an additional circular gilded frame containing an image of the haloed Lamb of God raising a cruciform staff with one hoof. The angelic imagery in the initial echoes the themes of the prayer below, which describes how the 'angels praise thy [the Lord's majesty, the dominions adore it and the powers are in awe.'[74] The *Vere dignum* is followed immediately in the text by the *Sanctus*, which again refers to the angelic praise in heaven by repeating the call of 'holy, holy, holy' (*Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus*) sung by the seraphim in Isaiah's vision of heaven.[75] The relationship of the Lamb of God to the accompanying text is slightly more obscure, as it is not until later in the performance of the mass that the *Agnus Dei* is invoked. However, in addition to looking forward to this moment, the depiction of the Lamb in the company of two angels also refers to the description of the enthroned Lamb in Revelation, who is surrounded by adoring angels and

[73] 'Per omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen.' Hilary Carpenter O. P., *The Dominican Missal in Latin and English*, Revised Edition (Oxford, 1948), p. 24.
[74] 'Per quem majestatem tuam laudant angeli adorant dominationes tremunt potestates; caeli caelorumque virtutes, ac beata seraphim, socia exsultatione concelebrant.' H. Carpenter, *The Dominican Missal in Latin and English, Revised Edition* (Oxford, 1948), p. 24. The version of the *Vere dignum* in the Cambrai Missal is for general use on days without specified feasts and masses.
[75] 'Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth. Pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua: Hosanna in excelsis'; Isaiah 6:3. Carpenter, *The Dominican Missal*, p. 24.

saints.[76] The illumination thus draws on the heavenly imagery in visionary book of Revelation as a complement to the similarly heavenly, visionary Isaiah text referenced in the accompanying *Sanctus* prayer. In this way, the Cambrai Missal is similar to the decoration of the *Sanctus* in other sacramentaries and missals from the tenth century on, where celestial imagery is also employed to evoke these themes in the prayer. However, as discussed further below, it was often more common to illustrate this part of the mass book an image of the *Majestas Domini* rather than the *Agnus Dei*.

The *Vere dignum* and *Sanctus* are followed on f. 2r with the *Te igitur* (fig. 2.40). This section of the mass text is accompanied by the largest illumination in the Missal, a full-page image of the *Gnadenstuhl*. The illumination fills the space between the ruled frames of the page, offering a visually striking preface to the first four words of the mass text that run along the lower border (*Te igitur clementissime pater*). The three persons of the Father, Son and Spirit are positioned within a large, gilded mandorla with pointed ends that extend to the uppermost and lowermost parts of the frame. The Father, the largest of the three figures, is bearded but youthful, with shoulder-length hair and a cruciform halo. He sits atop a cushioned throne, looking out at the viewer and extending his arms outwards to hold the cross on which the Son is shown crucified. The horizontal beam of the cross is shown with sawn-off ends, which, along with its green colour, suggests it is intended as a living cross or *arbor vitae*.[77] Christ hangs limply on the cross, his eyes closed and his head bowed to the right. He has long hair that falls in curls over his shoulders and a plain halo. The Holy Spirit, shown the form of a dove, flies to towards the left of the frame, its outstretched wings connecting the mouths of the Father and the Son. This detail visually unites the three separate persons of the Trinity, thus drawing on the Trinitarian concept that the three persons are one and indivisible. It is also often noted that this image may relate to the concept of the *filioque*, and the idea that both God the Father and God the Son begot the Holy Spirit.[78] Like the Father, the dove is shown with a red and gold cruciform halo.

The scene is set within a heavenly, apocalyptic context by the addition of the tetramorph. Each of the evangelists is depicted in their symbolic forms in the four corners of the frame. With the exception of John the eagle, each evangelist is shown holding a book as an

[76] Revelation 5.
[77] For the tree of life see Romuald Bauerreiß, *Arbor Vitae: der "Lebensbaum" und seine Verwengdung in Liturgie, Kunst un Brauchtum des Abendlandes* (Munich, 1938); Evelin Wetter, 'Arbor vitae and Corpus Christi: An Example of Chasuble Iconography from Late-Medieval Central Europe in the Context of the Mass', *Prague and Bohemia: Medieval Art, Architecture and Cultural Exchange in Central Europe*, ed. Zoë Opacic (Leeds, 2009), pp. 199-214; Pippa Salonius, 'Arbor Jesse – Lignum vitae: The Tree of Jesse, the Tree of Life, and the Mendicants in Late Medieval Orvieto', *The Tree: Symbol, Allegory and Mnemonic Device in Medieval Art and Thought*, ed. Pippa Salonius and Andrea Worm (Turnhout, 2004), pp. 213-242.
[78] Boespflug and Zaluska, 'Le dogma trinitaire', p. 207.

indication of their authorship of the gospels. John's eagle clutches instead at a golden cylinder, from which a long, plain scroll unfolds. This heavenly context complements the illustration of the angels and the Lamb on the opposing folio, as well as the text of the *Vere dignum* and *Sanctus*. The composition of this image also recalls depictions of the *Majestas Domini*, where the figure of God is shown in a mandorla and surrounded by the symbolic representations of the evangelists.[79] As in the Cambrai miniature, images of the *Majestas* also show God seated, often on a throne or semi-circular arch, and looking directly out at the viewer. He is commonly shown raising one or both hands in judgement, though the Cambrai *Gnadenstuhl* instead shows the Father holding onto the cross with the crucified Son.

Though the Cambrai Missal is the first extant book to show an image of the *Gnadenstuhl* alongside the *Te igitur*, each of the elements that make its decoration scheme – an image of the crucified Christ, God shown in majesty alongside the four evangelists, a depiction of heavenly angels – all find precedents in the schemes of earlier decorated sacramentaries and missals containing the Canon of the Mass. From the ninth to the twelfth century, these decorative schemes would become increasingly standardised, until it became relatively customary to illustrate the prayer of the *Sanctus* with an image of the *Majestas Domini* and then represent the Crucifixion with the *Te igitur* prayer.[80] The standardisation of these schemes provided the context for the development of the *Gnadenstuhl*, which was formed of a fusion of the Crucifixion and the *Majestas*. Before discussing this process of standardisation, however, it is necessary to examine the development of the mass text itself, as well as the theological ramifications of its wording, which, to a large extent, drive its subsequent illustration.

The Canon of the Mass: Development and Illustration

The earliest reference to the formal celebration of the Eucharist in the form of the mass dates from the fourth century, though mentions of the mass ceremony become much more frequent from the fifth century on.[81] However, it was not until the time of Gregory the Great's papacy (r. 590-604) at the turn of the seventh century that the liturgy and the mass

[79] Interesting examples contemporary with the Cambrai Missal can be found in Bamberg, Staatliche Bibliothek, MS Lit. 2, f. 10v (Sacramentary of Bishop Ellenhard von Freising, Freising (?), before 1056); London, BL Additional MS 28106, f. 136r (Stavelot Bible, Netherland (Stavelot), c. 1094-7); London, BL MS Egerton 608, f. 1v (Gospels, Germany, 2nd quarter of the 11th century).
[80] This is discussed in more detail below, pp. 108-124.
[81] Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, rev. and trans., William Storey and Niels Rasmussen (Washington, 1986), pp. 32-7.

were formalised and introduced in the Frankish kingdoms and beyond.[82] The structure of the 'Roman' mass under Gregory changed little throughout the Middle Ages.[83] The ceremony began with an Antiphon, before the singing of the Kyrie, the Gloria, and the Collect. Then followed the reading of the Epistle, the singing of the Gradual and the Alleluia, and a reading from the Gospels. The Offertory Antiphon was performed after the Gospel reading, along with the preparation of the offerings on the altar, which were consecrated with the prayer of the second Oration, also known as the *secreta*. The Preface and *Sanctus* then introduced the Canon of the Mass – discussed in more detail below – which was followed by the Our Father, the *Agnus Dei* and the Communion Antiphon. The mass as a whole was brought to a close by the singing of the post-communion oration.[84] In order to conduct a complete mass ceremony, the celebrant would have had to use an antiphonal (for the various antiphons), a sacramentary and later a missal (for the prayers and Canon of the Mass), an epistolary or lectionary (for the reading of the epistle), and a book of the Gospels (for the Gospel reading).[85] The missals and sacramentaries discussed in this chapter would therefore have been one of several texts used during the performance of this rite.

The Canon, performed mid-way through the mass, was an integrated part of the ceremony since at least the fourth century, when it is first referenced by Ambrose (c.340-397) in his *De Sacramentis*.[86] As with the mass ceremony as a whole, the Canon was standardised under Pope Gregory and remained a stable text throughout the Middle Ages.[87] Though the term 'Canon of the mass' strictly refers to the prayers from the *Te igitur* onwards, the preceding prayers – the Dialogue of introduction, preface and *Sanctus* – are integral to the reading of the canon, and it is with these that most sacramentaries and missals begin. The introduction is short, comprising of a statement on the eternal nature of God, and a call to the

[82] Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 61-2.
[83] Eric Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Madeleine Beaumont (Minnesota, 1998), pp. 19-20.
[84] This process is outlined in Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books*, p. 19.
[85] Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books*, pp. 19-20.
[86] Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, ed. Otto Faller, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera Pars VII: Explanatio symboli. De sacramentis. De Mysteriis. De Paenitentia. De Excessu fratris. De Obitu Valentiniani . De Obitu Theodosii.* (Vienna, 1955); J. H. Srawley, 'The "De Sacramentis": A Work of St Ambrose', *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 44 (1943), pp. 199-200.
[87] The structure of the Canon of the Mass is outlined in Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books*, pp. 22-3: 'Dialogue of introduction (*Per omnia secula seculorum, Dominus vobiscum*); Common preface (*Vere dignum*); Singing of the *Sanctus;* Prayer of intercession (*Te igitur*); Prayer for the living (*Memento*); Prayer of intercession with the saints (*Communicantes*, in which the Virgin, the twelve apostles, and the twelve Roman martyrs are always mentioned); Prayer for the acceptance of the offering (*Hanc igitur* and *Quam oblationem*); Story of the institution of the Eucharist (*Qui pridie, Unde et memores*); anamnesis; Prayer for sanctification (*Supra quae, Supplices*); Prayer for fellowship with the saints (*Momento* of the dead, *Nobis quoque*); Concluding prayers (*Per quem haec Omnia, Pater noster, Libera nos*).'

congregation to be thankful and lift their hearts. The common preface that follows is longer and more explicitly about the eternity and heavenly majesty of God. It reads:

> It is truly meet and just, right and salutary, that we should always and in all places give thanks to thee, O holy Lord, Father almighty, eternal God through Christ our Lord. Through whom the angels praise thy majesty the dominations adore it and the powers are in awe; the heavens and the virtues of heaven and the blessed seraphim celebrate it with united joy. With these we pray thee join our voices also, while we say with lowly praise:[88]

The preface thus specifically addresses God the Father, who is said to be adored by the angels, seraphim and dominions in heaven. This imagery recalls a passage from the Book of Isaiah in which Isaiah sees a glorious vision of 'the Lord sitting upon a throne high and elevated' (*Dominum sedentem super solium excelsum et elevatum*), surrounded by worshipping seraphim.[89] It is these seraphim to which the common preface refers, and the song that they are described as singing in the Isaiah passage is the prayer that the priest calls to 'join our voices also' and 'say with lowly praise' (*Cum quibus et nostras voces ut admitti jubeas deprecamur, supplici confessione dicentes*). This prayer, the *Sanctus*, is formed of the angels' words in Isaiah:

> Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God of hosts. Heaven and earth are full of thy glory: Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest.[90]

The heavenly imagery invoked in these two prayers is reflected in the images associated with this part of the text. From the ninth century on, illuminations in sacramentaries and missals accompanying the *Sanctus* would often show God enthroned within a mandorla in heaven, flanked by angels.[91] This imagery responds both to the prayer itself and the passage in Isaiah to which it refers. The themes of these two prayers may also explain why similar heavenly imagery often adorned the chancel walls in English parish churches, in the space where these prayers would have been read aloud.

---

[88] Vere dignum et justum est, aequum et salutare, nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere, Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens, aeterne Deus, per Christum Dominum nostrum. Per quem majestatem tuam laudant angeli adorant dominationes tremunt potestates; caeli caelorumque virtutes, ac beata seraphim, socia exsultatione concelebrant. Cum quibus et nostras voces ut admitti jubeas deprecamur, supplici confessione dicentes: Carpenter, *The Dominican Missal in Latin and English*, p. 24.

[89] Isaiah 6:1-3: 'In anno quo mortuus est rex Ozias, vidi Dominum sedentem super solium excelsum et elevatum; et ea quae sub ipso erant replebant templum. Seraphim stabant super illud: sex alae uni, et sex alae alteri; duabus velabant faciem ejus, et duabus velabant pedes ejus, et duabus volabant. Et clamabant alter ad alterum, et dicebant: Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus, Deus exercituum; plena est omnis terra gloria ejus.'

[90] Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth. Pleni sunt caeli et terra gloria tua: Hosanna in excelsis. Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini. Hosanna in excelsis. Carpenter, *The Dominican Missal in Latin and English*, p. 24.

[91] This development is discussed below, pp. 108-124.

The most important prayer in the Canon, and the height of the mass ceremony, was the reading of the *Te igitur*, which immediately followed the *Sanctus*. It was at this point that the priest, bowing over the altar, would bless the bread and the wine with the sign of the cross whilst reading the prayer (indicated by the crosses in the passage below). In contrast to the heavenly majesty of the Father referred to in the preceding Preface and *Sanctus*, the *Te igitur* looks instead to Christ's sacrifice. The priest states:

> We therefore humbly pray and beseech thee, most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ thy Son our Lord; that thou wouldst deign to accept and bless these + gifts, these + offerings, these + holy and unspotted sacrifices: which in the first place we offer thee for thy holy catholic church; deign to grant her peace, to protect, unite and govern her throughout the whole world: together with thy servant our Pope, N. , and our bishop, N. , and all orthodox believers and worshippers of the catholic and apostolic faith.[92]

Here, the prayer is still addressed to the Father: it is to him that the priest asks to bless the bread and wine on the altar, and to grant peace to the holy Catholic Church. However, in referring to both Christ and the 'holy and unspotted sacrifices' (*sancta sacrificia illibata*) on the altar before the priest, the *Te igitur* also specifically addresses Christ's crucifixion and sacrifice on the cross. These themes are further elaborated throughout the rest of the Canon of the mass, but this is the first point in the canon to draw specific attention to Christ's death on the cross. As is discussed, this prayer therefore becomes intimately linked with the image of the crucifixion.

Until the twelfth century, the prayers that made up the Canon of the Mass were all read from the sacramentary. As well as these texts, it was also common for the sacramentary to contain a calendar, the mass formularies (i.e. the Temporal, Sanctoral, Common Mass of Saints and Votive Masses) and *Ordines*, for rituals such as baptism, funerals and acts of penance. The earliest surviving illustrated sacramentaries date from the eighth century, though the decoration schemes of these books are all non-figural; the figural decoration of Sacramentaries occurs only from the turn of the ninth century on.[93] However, from the eleventh century, the use of sacramentaries began to decline in favour of missals.[94] A missal

---

[92] Te igitur, clementissime Pater, per Jesum Christum Filium tuum Dominum nostrum, supplices rogamus, ac petimus, uti accepta habeas, et benedicas haec + dona, haec + munera, haec + sancta sacrificia illibata: in primis quae tibi offerimus pro ecclesia tua sancta catholica; quam pacificare, custodire, adunare, et regere digneris toto orbe terrarum: una cum Papa nostro N. , et antistite nostro N. , et omnibus orthodoxis, atque catholicae et apostolicae fidei cultoribus. Carpenter, *The Dominican Missal in Latin and English*, pp. 24-5.
[93] Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books*, pp. 31-2.
[94] Ibid.

not only contained the orations (prayers) of the mass, but also the chanted parts and the readings. Notably, however, throughout this period of transition the imagery associated with the *Sanctus* and the *Te igitur* remained fairly stable, as both prayers continued to be illustrated with the respective images of the *Majestas Domini* and the Crucifixion. The pairing of these two images in sacramentaries and missals suggest one context in which, from of a fusion of these scenes, the *Gnadenstuhl* may have developed.

Illustrating the Canon of the Mass in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries

The Gellone Sacramentary, made in either Meaux or Cambrai in c. 790-c. 804, is the earliest surviving sacramentary with figural illumination (fig. 2.41).[95] It is also the first manuscript to show an image of the crucifixion at the opening to the *Te igitur* prayer. The Sacramentary is richly decorated throughout with lively figures and animals, but also contains larger, more prominent illustrations, including the image of the crucifixion on f. 143v. Positioned slightly to the left of the page, and occupying almost half of the height of the folio, the image is a striking introduction to the mass prayer. The figure of Christ, shown with short curling hair and a trimmed, pointed beard, gazes out at the viewer from two large almond eyes with heavy lids. His body is positioned in an upright manner on the cross, with his arms flung wide and his long extended fingers just touching the very ends of the horizontal beam. Blood, painted in a bright orange pigment, drips from the nails in his hands and feet but gushes forcefully from his side, spilling out onto the blank area of parchment to the right of the cross. The cross itself is coloured deep blue, with a bright orange border and bursts of orange and white dots surrounding the figure of Christ. The monogram 'IHS XPS' is inscribed in white and orange letters on the upper arm. Above the cross, two angels fly in a downward motion, their arms raised towards Christ's head. They wear yellow tunics and have green, feather-like wings decorated with black and white peacock eyes.[96] Though this initial clearly represents Christ at the point of his crucifixion, his open, alert eyes and the presence of the angels at either side of the cross also suggest that this image is simultaneously looking forward to Christ's resurrection and future state in heaven. In this

[95] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS Latin 12048, f. 143v. For the Gellone Sacramentary and its production see Jean Deshusses, 'La sacramentaire de Gellone dans son contexte historique', *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 75 (1961), pp. 193-210, who argues that the book was made for Bishop Hildoard of Cambrai (790-816). See also C. R. Baldwin, 'The scriptorium of the Sacramentary of Gellone (Paris, Bib. Nat. MS Latin 12048)', *Scriptorium*, 25 (1971), pp. 3-17 and 'The scribes of the Sacramentary of Gellone', *Scriptorium*, 27 (1973), pp. 16-20; Chazelle, *The Crucified* God, pp. 89-93.

[96] As noted by Celia Chazelle, the composition of the crucifixion recalls many motifs in earlier western and Byzantine art, but is notably very similar to the fresco in the apse of Santa Maria Antiqua in Rome, commissioned in the eighth century by Pope John VII, which also shows Christ with short curling hair, a small beard and open eyes and surrounded by four angels. See Chazelle, *The Crucified God*, p. 88.

way, the Gellone Sacramentary combines both crucifixion and resurrection motifs in one image.

In the Gellone Sacramentary, the blue cross on which Christ is shown crucified forms the first letter 'T' of the *Te igitur* prayer. This ingenious solution to illustrating the beginning of the text is a feature that also appears in countless later *Te igitur* images. However, unlike some illustrated mass texts, in the Gellone Sacramentary it is only the text of the *Te igitur* that is illustrated; the preceding *Vere dignum* and *Sanctus* are introduced by a simple coloured initial. Nevertheless, as Celia Chazelle has pointed out, the Gellone crucifixion image does make reference to the themes of the previous prayers in the addition of the two angels descending above the cross. Rather than separating the prayers with two distinct illustrations, the image in the Gellone Sacramentary 'binds these texts together', both visually in the integration of the angel's bodies with the *Sanctus* text above, and thematically in the inclusion of angels in a scene of the crucifixion.[97]

Though the illustration of the *Te igitur* prayer with an image of the crucifixion would, from the eleventh century on, become a relatively common motif, the illustrative programmes of Sacramentaries made in the later half of the ninth century were far more diversified. As Rudolph Suntrup's extensive study of these manuscripts has shown, early decorated Sacramentaries contain anything from simple interlace designs to narrative episodes from the life of Christ and liturgical scenes at the opening to the canon prayers.[98] However, in a luxuriously decorated but fragmentary Sacramentary probably made in the court of Charles the Bald (823-877) in c. 869-70, the sumptuous illuminations echo similar devotional themes to those explored in the Gellone Sacramentary, and anticipate the types of images that would later become a more standard iconographic programme.[99] Whilst the *Sanctus* is illustrated with two images of Christ in Majesty adored by hosts of angels and saints in heaven, the following *Te igitur* prayer shows Christ crucified on a blue cross between the sun and the moon (figs. 2.42-2.44).[100] The first of the *Sanctus* images occurs on the folio

---

[97] Ibid, p. 91.

[98] For example a sacramentary made in Tours, c. 850 (Autun, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 19) or the Drogo Sacramentary, Metz, middle of the ninth century (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS Latin 9428). See Rudolph Suntrup, 'Te-igitur Initialen und Kanonbilder in Mittelalterlichen Sakramentarhandschriften', *Text und Bild: Aspekte des Zusammenwirkens zweier Künster in Mittelaltar and früher Neuzeit*, ed. Christel Meier and Uwe Ruberg (Weisbaden, 1981), pp. 278-382.

[99] Sacramentary of Charles the Bald, West Francia, c. 869-870 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Latin 1141).

[100] The manuscript only contains the Incipit (ff. 1-2r), the common preface (*Per omnia* and *Vere dignum*, ff. 3v-4v), the *Sanctus* (f. 6r), the *Te igitur* (ff. 6v-7r), the Commemoration of the Living (ff. 7r-9r). the Commemoration of the Dead (ff. 9r-9v), the 'Pater noster' (ff. 9v-10r), and the 'Libera nos', incomplete (f. 10r). The manuscript also contains three other full-page miniatures; an image of a prince being crowned by the hand of God (f. 2v); author portrait of Gregory the Great (f. 3r); and golden decorate initials at the beginning of the *Vere dignum*. For the Sacramentary see R. G. Calkins,

immediately following the end of the common preface (fig. 2.42), and the call of the priest to pray with the seraphim and 'join our voices also, as we say with lowly praise' (*Cum quibus et nostras voces ut admitti jubeas deprecamur, supplici confessione dicentes*). Christ, framed within a multi-coloured mandorla in the upper part of the miniature, is shown seated on a gold, blue and green orb that is very similar in appearance to the orb on which the two Lords sit in the illustration of Psalm 109 in the Utrecht Psalter. A jewelled book is balanced on his left knee, whilst in his right hand Christ raises up a small, golden host. The four evangelists are positioned above and below Christ, peering round his mandorla, whilst the remaining space in the rectangular miniature is divided into three sections, each of which contains groups of standing angels all gazing up at Christ and a six-winged seraph positioned directly below the mandorla.

An additional heavenly scene, spread across folios 5v-6r, immediately follows this image of Christ and the angels (fig. 2.43). Together, the two full-page illuminations images show groups of figures, including angels, apostles, martyrs and monks raising their hands towards an image of Christ in majesty. Each of these figures stares across at the miniature to their left on f. 6r. Here, Christ is depicted in an almost identical manner to the image on f. 5r; shown inside a mandorla and seated on a globe-like circle with green, blue and gold bands, he holds a book and raises aloft a gold, glowing host. He is surrounded by four figures, two six-winged seraphim that hover to Christ's left and right and the figures of Adam and Eve, who lie at his feet. Below these figures are the words of the *Sanctus*.

Together, these three images offer a clear visual interpretation of the words of the Common Preface and the *Sanctus*, placing the prayers within the context of a heavenly realm in which Christ rules in majesty surrounded by angels and saints. The images of Christ in these heavenly scenes provide an interesting comparison to the crucified Christ in the following *Te igitur* prayer on f. 6v (fig. 2.44). Though he is shown in an upright manner, with his eyes open, Christ's naked torso and the blood dripping from his hands, side and feet stand in marked contrast to the figures in majesty clothed in elaborate gold and blue garments. Nevertheless, Christ's death is still rendered as a triumphant act in the depiction of a curled snake below his feet, representing the devil that he has defeated on the cross.

Unlike the Gellone Sacramentary, the Sacramentary made in the court of Charles the Bald divides scenes of the heavenly realms and the Crucifixion over several consecutive folios. Nevertheless, throughout the section of the manuscript containing the *Sanctus* and *Te igitur*

Illuminated Books of the Middle Ages (Ithaca, 1983), pp. 161-93 and Rosamond McKitterick, *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 333-6.

prayers, both Christ's crucified state and the promise of his resurrection are presented as the mass text unfolds. The imagery used in this Sacramentary is thus testament to the iconographic programme developing around these important mass texts. Into the eleventh century, the same texts come to be decorated with more standardised imagery that nevertheless draws on the similar themes: the *Sanctus* with a celestial image of the *Majestas Domini* and the *Te igitur* with the Crucifixion. The appearance of a *Gnadenstuhl* alongside the *Te igitur* prayer in a twelfth-century Missal, as well as on the walls of a church in which these mass prayers would have been read aloud, gives credence to the theory that it was in the context of the mass, and perhaps specifically in relation to the images that conventionally accompanied the *Sanctus* and *Te igitur*, that this extraordinary iconography developed.

Illustrating the Canon of the Mass at the Turn of the Eleventh Century

At the end of the tenth and the turn of the eleventh century, the illustration of the Canon of the Mass became more standardised. In particular, it became increasingly common to introduce the *Te igitur* with an image of the Crucifixion. Late tenth- and early eleventh-century manuscripts with this motif survive in significant numbers from Germany, France and England.[101] Typically, these illuminations either show Christ alone on the cross, or, in more elaborate versions, with the Virgin and John to either side and the son and the moon above. The illuminations are either integrated with the mass text itself, functioning as elaborate initials, or as stand-alone miniatures. It is also in this period that the preceding prayer, the *Sanctus*, begins also to be illustrated with an image of the *Majestas Domini*. Though this is less common than the practice of illuminating just the *Te igitur* with an image of the crucifixion, several manuscripts made over the course of the late tenth and eleventh centuries in France, Germany and in England give a sense as to the fairly wide proliferation of this type of decorative programme. It will be argued that this standardised decorative programme was integral to the invention of the *Gnadenstuhl*, which was formed from a combining of the *Majestas Domini* and the Crucifixion, possibly as a result of the close proximity of these two images in the pages of missals and sacramentaries.

In a manuscript known as the Fulda Sacramentary, which was compiled in a monastery at Corvey in the last third of the tenth century, the canon of the mass is given visual prominence in the decoration of all four folios containing the first parts of the mass text.[102] On each of the folios, the text is surmounted on a deep purple painted frame with a green border. Whilst the first letters of the *Per omnia* and *Vere dignum* are decorated with vines and

[101] For a full list see Suntrup, 'Te igitur initialen', pp. 330-366.
[102] Fulda Sacramentary, Corvey, last third of the tenth century (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm 10077).

floral patterns, the texts of the *Sanctus* and *Te igitur* have more extensive figural illustrations (fig. 2.45). Folio 11v contains both the end of the *Vere dignum* and the beginning of the *Sanctus*. In the centre of the page, at the point where the *Sanctus* prayer begins, is an image of Christ seated on a throne within a rounded mandorla. The mandorla's background is executed entirely in gold leaf, as is Christ's cruciform halo. Christ himself is youthful in appearance, with short hair that falls to his shoulders. He raises his right hand up in a pointing gesture whilst clutching a golden globe in his left. A pair of angels stands to either side of the mandorla, raising their hands in praise towards Christ. Directly below the angels, a pair of seraphim with six blue and gold wings hovers, gazing towards one another with their arms outstretched.

The illumination on the directly opposing folio marks the beginning of the *Te igitur*. Unlike the previous folios, the miniature contains an additional diamond-shaped border inside the rectangular frame, which connects four roundels positioned on all four sides of the image. The upper roundel contains an image of the *Dextera domini*, the lower an image of a monk raising his hands upwards, and the roundels to the left and right depict Mary and John. An elaborate gold crucifix, with large decorative terminations reminiscent of Ottonian processional crosses, descends directly down below the roundel containing the hand of God.[103] Christ, who, as in the illumination on the previous folio, is depicted as youthful with shoulder-length hair and cruciform halo, hangs from the golden cross, his eyes open but his head hanging slightly to his right. Unusually, he is shown wearing a full purple tunic that covers his torso. His hands and feet are attached to the cross with small nails, but no blood is shown at these points or on his side. The crucifix forms the 'T' beginning the *Te igitur*, whilst the words of the prayer are positioned to either side of Christ's body.

As in the Sacramentary from the court of Charles the Bald, the illuminations in the Fulda Sacramentary reflect the themes of the prayers that they illustrate; the angels singing heavenly praises to Christ perform the worship described in the *Sanctus*, whilst the image of the crucifixion invokes the text's mention of Christ's sacrifice, as well as the sign of the cross made repeatedly by the priest during the reading the of the prayer. In showing the hand of God descending above the cross, the *Te igitur* initial also reflects the idea, outlined in the prayer text, that the priest's prayers and offerings are presented to the Father through Christ his son. It is also significant that this is one of the earliest illuminated crucifixions in which the hand of God descends above Christ. This may provide further evidence for the importance the *Te igitur* and its associated imagery in the invention of the iconography of

[103] For example, the Cross of Mathilda (c. 1051-4) or Cross of Theophanu (c. 1040-5), both in the Treasury in Essen Cathedral.

the *Gnadenstuhl*, as it shows a conscious decision to include a representation of God the Father at the crucifixion. As Hildburgh's study has argued, the introduction of the *Dextera domini* above the cross could have laid the foundations for the later elaboration of this idea in the depiction of the entire body of the Father supporting the cross.[104]

The rich decoration of the Fulda Sacramentary is typical of books produced in the imperial scriptorium at Corvey in the tenth century.[105] Since the ninth century, the monastery had been an important centre for learning and for manuscript production, and surviving books attributed to Corvey show the centre to have had a particular specialism in highly decorated gospel books and figural drawing. The scriptorium produced books both for the monastery's own use and for external centres in the Saxon kingdom, such as Fulda, where the Sacramentary now at Munich was intended, as well as nunneries at places such as Essen and Gandersheim which were connected to the Saxon ruling dynasties.[106] As Henry Mayr-Harting has shown, through these connections the artists at Corvey would have been 'ideally placed to benefit from the visual stimuli which the enriched culture of Otto I's court had to offer'.[107] This courtly influence is particularly evident in the use of textile-like decoration in Corvey manuscripts, which echo the rich fabrics known to have belonged to the Ottonian court. The pigment choice, in which deep purple, green and gold predominate, also mirrors the new pigments available to artists within these dynastic circles.[108] Due to these stylistic connections, it is likely that the Fulda Sacramentary's iconographic programme is also derived from ideas circulating in the closely connected monastic and courtly artistic centres of tenth-century Saxony.

Two manuscripts made in the eleventh century show this pairing of the *Majestas Domini* and Crucifixion to have endured both in artistic circles connected to the Ottonian court, as well wider afield. In an elaborately decorated book known as the Sacramentary of Bishop Ellenhard von Freising (r. 1052-1078), both the style and iconographic programme of the decoration scheme shares a number of interesting similarities with the Fulda

---

[104] Hildburgh, 'A Medieval Bronze Pectoral Cross', pp. 79-102.
[105] For the scriptorium at Corvey see Henry Mayr-Harting, *Ottonian Book Illumination: An Historical Study* (London, 1999), pp. 159-174, particularly pp. 162-172 for the Corvey gospel books and drawings.
[106] For the connections between Corvey and the Ottonian court see Florentine Mütherich, 'Ottonian Art: Changing Aspects', *Romanesque and Gothic Art: Studies in Western Art, Acts of the 20th International Congress of the History of Art* (Princeton, 1963), pp. 27-39 (p. 38). See also Mayr-Harting, *Ottonian Book Illumination*, pp. 166-8 and Rosamond McKitterick, 'Continuity and Innovation in Tenth-Century Ottonian Culture', *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Margaret Gibson* (London, 1991), pp. 21-2. For a comparative study of the contemporary manuscripts being produced at Fulda see Eric Palazzo, *Le Sacramentaries de Fulda: étude sur l'iconographie et la liturgie à l'époque ottoniene* (Paris, 1990).
[107] Mayr-Harting, *Ottonian Book Illumination*, p. 166.
[108] Ibid.

Sacramentary.[109] The style of the handwriting suggests that the Sacramentary was produced in Freising in southern Germany, and almost certainly before 1056 as the death of Henry III is recorded by a different and later hand on the page containing the list of names to be read out during the Commemoration of the Dead (f. 13v).[110] The book's titular affiliation to Bishop Ellenhard relates to the depiction of the bishop on the first full-page illumination on f. 2v, in which he is shown kneeling in front of an image of Christ, Mary and a bearded saint who is possibly St Andrew. The border surrounding the kneeling figure contains the inscription: 'Christ remember your servant Ellenhard' (*Christe recorderis Ellenhardi famulantis*). This visual and written reference to the bishop, along with the palaeographic evidence for the book's production in Freising, suggests that it was almost certainly made for use by the bishop himself.[111]

The Canon text follows the full-page illumination containing the kneeling Bishop Ellenhard and a sparsely decorated Calendar. The *Per omnia* prayer is simply introduced by a golden letter 'P', but the folios containing the *Vere dignum*, *Sanctus* and the beginning of the *Te igitur* all contain more elaborate figural decoration (figs. 2.46, 2.47). Like the Fulda Sacramentary, this highly decorated portion of the manuscript is concentrated over four consecutive folios (ff. 9v-11r). The first two folios from this section (ff. 9v-10r, fig. 2.46) contain the 'Dignum' and *Sanctus* as one continuous body of text, which is framed on both folios by a golden border. Again, as with the Fulda Sacramentary, the space inside the frame is coloured a deep purple, whilst the text is executed in gold. The left, right and upper borders of each frame each contain a series of three roundels: on f. 9v, to haloed angels raise their hands towards the text in the roundels on the left and right, whilst the roundel on the upper border, labelled '*Agnus Dei*', shows an image of the Lamb of God with a cruciform halo raising a staff with its hoof. On the opposing folio, the left and right borders also contain roundels with angels, this time holding golden cruciform staffs, whilst the upper roundel, labelled '*Dexteri Dominus*', shows the hand of God surmounted on a cruciform halo descending from a gold and white banner. Though the hand of God is not positioned descending above the crucifix, as in the Fulda Sacramentary, the association of this iconography with the text of the canon of the mass again suggests that this is an important context for understanding the origins of the *Gnadenstuhl*.

The following page (f. 10v, fig. 2.47) contains no text from the mass prayer. Instead, the folio is occupied solely by a full-page illumination of Christ in Majesty. A red and blue

[109] Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek Msc. Lit. 2. For this manuscript see Friedrich Leitshuh and Hans Fischer, *Katalogue der Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Bamberg*, vol. 1 (Bamberg, 1897), pp. 138-9 and Suntrup, 'Te igitur-initialen', p. 332, no. 13.
[110] Leitshuh and Fischer, *Katalogue der Handschriften*, p. 138.
[111] Suntrup, 'Te igitur-initialen', p. 332, no. 13.

foliate border frames the image and the space inside the border is coloured entirely in gold leaf. A youthful Christ, with short, shoulder-length hair, a short beard and a cruciform halo, sits atop an orange semi-circular ring inside a green mandorla. Christ holds a book in his left hand and raises his right hand in benediction. Curiously, behind Christ's right hand is a thin cross executed in orange paint. As this appears in an image positioned just before the text of the *Te igitur*, it may reference the blessing in the shape of a cross performed by the priest whilst reading aloud this part of the mass text. Surrounding Christ in the four corners of the framed image are the four evangelists, shown holding scrolls.

On the opposing folio (f. 11r, fig. 2.47) is an image of the crucifixion framed within a similar red and blue floral border. Christ, shown crucified on a large golden cross framed with a red border, is flanked on either side by the Virgin and John, who both have their hands raised towards their faces as a sign of anguish. In the upper part of the image to the left and right of the cross are personifications of the son and the moon within roundels labelled '*Sol*' and '*Luna*', who are also shown raising part of their garment to their face in sadness. In the lower part of the image, two roundels to the left and right labelled '*Terra*' and '*Mare*', represent personifications of the earth and sea as two nude figures wrestling with green, serpent-like beasts. The beginning of the *Te igitur* prayer is inscribed in gold around the border of the illumination.

The Sacramentary of Bishop Ellenhard von Freising is the earliest extant manuscript to abstract the image of Christ in Majesty from the text of the *Sanctus* and present it as a stand-alone illumination occupying a full page. In contrast to previous examples, this presents the figure of Christ in Majesty as a similar size to the Christ on the cross in the opposing folio. The enlargement of the Christ in Majesty figure in this context is significant in understanding the possible origins behind the invention of the *Gnadenstuhl*. In conventional *Gnadenstuhl* iconography, the Father is always shown as larger than, or a similar size to, Christ, so that he can be shown holding Christ's cross. If the *Gnadenstuhl* was produced as a result of the fusion of the images that illustrated the *Sanctus* and the *Te igitur*, then the presence of a large, domineering figure of Christ in Majesty, who could be transformed into an image of God the Father holding the Son on the cross, makes this process much more likely.

The Red Book of Darley

Most tenth and eleventh-century manuscripts in which the images of Christ in Majesty and the Crucifixion are paired alongside the *Sanctus* and *Te igitur* prayers are of continental origin

and design. However, one example of this design in a Missal produced in England in the eleventh century may be indicative of the contemporaneous use of this decorative scheme in insular art.[112] The Red Book of Darley, so-called after the sixteenth-century inscription on the final pages, is comprised of two volumes: the first, on pages 1 to 26, contains the principle copy of the prose dialogues of Solomon and Saturn, dating from the mid-tenth century; the second, on pages 27 to 586, contains an eleventh-century missal.[113] The missal section includes a Calendar, Paschal and Easter Tables, the Mass text itself, masses for a number of different saints, rites and blessings for various ceremonies such as marriage and baptism, an Office for the Dead and Offices for Triduum and Easter Sunday. This section of the manuscript can be dated to around 1061, as the Paschal Tables correspond to the years 1061–1098.[114]

The eleventh-century mass text in volume two is the only section of the manuscript to contain figural illustrations. The *Per omnia* on page 51 is introduced by a large, red and green 'P', decorated with plaited motifs and animal heads. The following page contains the *Vere dignum* and *Sanctus* prayers, and is accompanied by an illustration of Christ in Majesty (p. 52; fig. 2.48). Christ is seated within a pointed, green mandorla that is held by two angels with large, outstretched wings. He raises his right hand in a blessing and holds a closed book balanced on his knee with his left hand. The first several words of the *Vere dignum* run down the inside of the mandorla, whilst the rest of the prayer continues on the ruled lines at the bottom of the page. The text is completed in alternating red, green and black lines. The unusual arrangement makes the prayer quite difficult to read and is perhaps designed to encourage diligent and careful reading on behalf of the manuscript's reader-viewer. The

---

[112] 'The Red Book of Darley', southern England (Winchester or Sherborne?), c. 1061 (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 422).

[113] The inscription on the final page reads: 'The rede boke of darleye in the peake in darbyshire'. For the manuscript see M. R. James, *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College*, vol. II (Cambridge, 1912), pp. 315-322 (p. 135); N. R. Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* ,vol. II (Oxford, 1957), pp. 119-21 (no. 70); Christopher Hohler, 'The Red Book of Darley', *Nordiskt Kollokvium I Latinsk Liturgiforskning* 2 (Stockholm, 1972), pp. 39-47; M. Budny, *Insular, Anglo-Saxon and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge: An Illustrated Catalogue*, 2 vols (Kalamazoo, 1997), II, pp. 645-66; Helen Gittos, 'Is There Any Evidence for the Liturgy of Parish Church in Late Anglo-Saxon England? The Red Book of Darley and the Status of Old English', *Pastoral Care in Late Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. F. Tinti (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 63-82 and Richard W. Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 94-100. The images in this manuscript are briefly discussed by Richard Gameson, *The Role of Art in the Late Anglo-Saxon Church* (Oxford, 1995), pp. 232-3 and more extensively by Barbara C. Raw*, Anglo-Saxon Crucifixion Iconography and the Art of the Monastic Revival* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 89 and 151-5.

[114] The final quire in the volume (pp. 571-586) was added in the twelfth century, and contains various lections completed in two twelfth-century hands. A mass for St Helen and the Last Gospel of the mass, again completed in two twelfth century hands, has also been added into the original volume on pages 49-50. One of these hands also completed a Latin prayer of excommunication on page 14 of the first volume, meaning that the two volumes must have been bound together by at least the twelfth century. See James, *Catalogue of Manuscripts*, pp. 315-322; Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts*, pp. 120-1; Gittos, 'Is There Any Evidence', p. 67.

integration of the image with the text also compels the viewer to consider the image alongside *Sanctus*, and to draw direct parallels between the prayer's themes and the *Majestas Domini*.

On the opposing page, illustrating the *Te igitur*, is a scene of the crucifixion (p. 53, fig. 2.48). The large cross, which is depicted as a green 'living cross', with hewn stumps and branches, forms the first letter 'T' of the prayer. Christ's body extends almost to the end of the cross' beams, and blood gushes from his side. The Virgin stands to Christ's right, one hand raised in a blessing towards him and the other clutching at a piece of her garment near her face in a sign of anguish. Between the Virgin and the cross, a green plant unfurls from the ground, another sign of the life-giving power of the crucifixion. Above and to the left of the cross, the dove of the Holy Spirit flies down towards Christ's head, holding a laurel wreath in its beak. Above and to the right of the cross, God the Father's hand extends from the clouds in a gesture of blessing towards Christ.

The illustrations of Christ in Majesty and the Crucifixion in the Red Book of Darley are fully integrated with the mass text, indicating that they are contemporary with the completion of this section of the manuscript. Indeed, their style is consistent with its mid eleventh-century dating. The figures have rounded faces, almond-shaped eyes and small, thinly drawn mouths, as well as their large hands with long fingers and flipper-like feet. These features all find parallels in English manuscript art from the early to mid eleventh century, and these aspects, as well as the style of drapery and positioning of seated figures compares well to figures in the 'Eadui' or 'Arundel' Psalter, or the 'Winchester Quinity' drawing in the *Prayerbook of Aelfwine*.[115] The images in the Red Book of Darley are not completed with as sumptuous pigments as these other contemporary examples, with green and red predominating, perhaps suggesting that the book was not intended for someone of Aelfwine's status.[116] Nevertheless, their stylistic affinity to contemporary works produced in Canterbury and Winchester points to a southern English context for the book's production.[117] Moreover, the Calendar contains reference to St Wulfsige, bishop of Sherborne c. 993-1002, venerated at Sherborne Abbey, whilst the missal proper contains a votive mass for St Swithun, who was venerated at the Old Minster at Winchester. Grimbald (820-901) is also the only saint to be capitalised in the Litany (p. 380), again suggesting a

[115] For example, the image of a seated monk in the 'Edui' or Arundel Psalter, England (Canterbury, Christ Church), between 1012 and 1023 (London, BL MS Arundel 155), f. 10r or the Father and Son in the *Prayerbookof Aelfwine,* England (Winchester, New Minster), c. 1030-40 (London, BL Cotton MS Titus D XXVI+D XXVII), ff. 19v, 75v.
[116] This is discussed in more depth below, pp. 121-122.
[117] Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts*, p. 121.

connection to Winchester.[118] Though these features do not point conclusively to the book's use in one specific house, they do imply that it was made in southern England, as opposed to Derbyshire, where the manuscript was held by at least the sixteenth century.[119] The southern English style of the eleventh-century illustrations is thus consistent with the textual indications for the location of the book's production.

The textual content of the missal section of the Red Book of Darley is also suggestive of the book's original purpose. Though the offices and masses are not always complete, sometimes containing only the incipit of the gospel or epistle, it is still likely that the manuscript allowed a priest to 'perform these services on one's own if necessary'.[120] Furthermore, the book also contains one of the most extensive and complete collections of occasional offices from before the Conquest, which include the rites for marriage, baptism and burial.[121] Together with the main offices and masses, these texts would have allowed a single priest to carry out all their parish duties. The textual components of Darley suggest that the book was designed for a 'practical' and 'pastoral' priest or monk that travelled around parish communities conducting masses and offices when and where appropriate.[122] This idea is supported by the fairly frequent use of Old English throughout the eleventh century sections of the manuscript.[123] Although most prayers themselves are in Latin, some rubrics and the rites for baptism and the visitation of the sick contain instructions or even spoken sections in the vernacular.[124] The use of vernacular in these contexts has often been assumed to be reflective of the poor Latin of parish priests or monks, but, as Helen Gittos points out, it is perhaps more likely indicative of 'the high status accorded to Old English in the late pre-Conquest period', as well as the desire expressed by individuals such as Bede, Aethelwold and Aelfric that priests and communities understood the word of God, whether that be in Latin or the vernacular.[125]

So few 'manuals' or manuscripts with the daily and occasional offices for travelling parish priests survive from Anglo-Saxon England that it is difficult to know how typical Darley is of its kind. The loss of material has particular ramifications for understanding the presence

---

[118] Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England*, p. 95.
[119] Ker, *Catalogue of Manuscripts*, p. 121.
[120] Gittos, 'Is There Any Evidence', p. 69.
[121] Ibid, pp. 69-70.
[122] Hohler, 'Red Book of Darley', p. 44; Gittos, 'Is There Any Evidence', pp. 69-70.
[123] The main mass and office sections contain occasional headings and rubrics in Old English, but the most extensive use of the vernacular is the in the section containing the occasional offices, which all contain Old English rubrics indicating the situation in which the prayer should be used. This is discussed in depth by Gittos 'Is There Any Evidence', pp. 69-78.
[124] The baptism rite contains instructions in Old English, to be read to the godparents, whilst in the rite for the visitation of the sick, the priest addresses the sick person, and the person responds, in the vernacular. See Gittos, 'Is There Any Evidence', pp. 74 and 78.
[125] Gittos, 'Is There Any Evidence', p. 82.

of the illustrations in Darley, and how usual it would have been for such a book to be decorated. Comparisons with high status contemporary manuscripts show the Darley illustrations to have been completed without the finest pigments; yet the illustrations are certainly not crudely executed, and their quality is masked by damage to the images, particularly to that of Christ in Majesty. Furthermore, the images show a fairly sophisticated, or at least unusual, approach to the subject matter, particularly in relation to the Crucifixion illustration. It was not entirely unusual in this period to show the hand of God descending above the cross as a sign of the Father's blessing, but Darley is unique in an English context for showing the dove descending with a laurel wreath in its beak.[126] This image also appears on the earlier Cross of Lothar, made c. 1000, but here the Father's hand holds the laurel wreath with the dove enclosed inside.[127] The inclusion of the dove in the Darley image, along with the hand of the Father, makes a pointed and fairly complex theological statement about the presence of the Trinity at the Crucifixion, a point discussed in more detail below. The unusual inclusion of the flowering vegetation next to the cross is also visually indicative of theological concepts related to the life-giving powers of the cross and the new life offered to those involved in the mass ceremony. The images in the Red Book of Darley are therefore certainly not standard or customary designs; their form and function has been carefully thought out in relation to the text that they illustrate. Their content, as well as their style, speaks of someone with an awareness of current trends in English art and theology, despite perhaps not being produced for use by individuals or institutions of a higher status. Though a comparison with similar books, had they survived, would yield a more decisive interpretation of the images' uniqueness, and what this can tell us about Darley's intended use and function, the quality of the book's production in comparison with the images' reference to relatively sophisticated theological concepts ties in well with the idea presented by Gittos and Christopher Hohler that the book was made for active use by a parish priest or monk. It was thus not a high-end product, but still compiled with reference to material being produced for monks, possibly in Winchester and/or Sherborne, as indicated by the saints listed in the calendar.[128] It is perhaps here that the artist that completed these illustrations would have encountered similar visual subjects.

An incredibly rare, if not unique, survival, the Red Book of Darley is an important witness to the use in English-produced art of the paired images of Christ in Majesty and the Crucifixion at the *Sanctus* and *Te igitur* prayers, a scheme which the remaining evidence would suggest was otherwise only used on the continent. Furthermore, compared to many

---

[126] Raw, *Anglo-Saxon Crucifixion Iconography*, p. 153.
[127] Cross of Lothar, Germany (Cologne?), c. 1000 (Aachen Cathedral Treasury). For the cross see Peter Lasko, *Ars Sacra: 800-1200*, 2nd ed. (Yale, 1994), p. 42 and 124.
[128] Discussed above, pp. 120.

of the earlier or contemporary missals and sacramentaries in which this imagery is used, the Red Book of Darley is unusual for being a less ostentatious production. Books such as the Sacramentary of Charles the Bald, the Fulda Sacramentary and the Sacramentary of Bishop Ellenhard von Freising were made either for use by a member of the royal court or a very wealthy, influential member of the church. They were also produced by some of the finest artists of the period, often working in connection with the court. Darley, on the other hand, seems likely to have been used by a parish priest or travelling monk with a connection to an important southern English monastic centre. Regrettably, the loss of similar types of books from this period means that it is difficult to evaluate the uniqueness of Darley's illustrative programme not only within an English context but also in comparison to material produced on the continent. It is possible that this imagery appeared in much more modest missals and sacramentaries made on the continent and in England in the tenth and eleventh centuries, which have now been lost. However, in either case, what Darley's images do show is that, certainly in England by the mid-eleventh century, the practice of pairing the *Sanctus* and *Te igitur* prayers with images of Christ in Majesty and the Crucifixion existed outside of courtly or elite monastic circles. These images would have been available to a travelling monk or priest, and perhaps also to communities that they served.[129]

The Visual Culture of the Canon of the Mass

By the end of the eleventh century, conventions for illustrating the canon of the mass were beginning to emerge. By far the most common of these was the illustration of the *Te igitur* prayer with an image of the crucifixion, often in the place of the initial 'T', a motif that became popular in both continental and insular art.[130] However, in a number of cases, the prayer preceding the *Te igitur*, the *Sanctus*, was also illustrated with an image of the *Majestas Domini*. Like the Crucifixion, the *Majestas Domini* reflected sentiments in the mass text itself, as the *Sanctus* and Common Preface called on those present at the mass ceremony to join with the angels in praising the Father who was seated in majesty in the heavens. Due perhaps to these close correlations between the image of the *Majestas* and the text of the *Sanctus*, this decorative scheme becomes increasingly common in illustrated sacramentaries and missals made during the twelfth century.[131]

[129] The size of the book would however suggest it could only have been seen by one or two people at a time, as it measures 190 x 130mm. See Budny, *Insular, Anglo-Saxon and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art*, pp. 645-66.
[130] Suntrup, 'Te igitur-initialen', pp. 289-303.
[131] For a list of these books see Suntrup, 'Te igitur-initialen', pp. 289-303.

The close proximity of these two images in the pages of eleventh- and twelfth-century missals and sacramentaries provides an important context for understanding the appearance of a *Gnadenstuhl* alongside the same texts in the early twelfth-century Cambrai Missal. This connection might have instigated the process of imaginative fusion or, to borrow again from Kessler, the 'yoking together' of two potent iconographies to create a singular new vision of the Godhead. The eleventh-century visual culture associated with the ceremony of the mass thus could have influenced the iconographic invention of the *Gnadenstuhl*. This idea is supported by the mass text itself, and particularly the prayer of the *Te igitur*, which specifically designates God the Father as reigning in the heavens, and offers thanks to him for the sacrifice of his Son. Significantly, these ideas are present visually in the image of the *Gnadenstuhl*: the Father, shown seated in majesty in the heavens, offers his Son on the cross as a sacrifice for mankind.

The appearance of an early *Gnadenstuhl* on the chancel wall of a parish church would also suggest that it was in the context of the visual milieu related to the ceremony of the mass that this image may have developed. Mass books and the eastern spaces of churches in the eleventh century appeared to share a similar visual culture. Though, as with travelling service books for monks and priests, the decorative schemes of early medieval parish churches in England have very low rates of survival, from the limited evidence remaining it appears that both painted schemes and non-painted decoration principally located towards the east end of the church were often directly related to themes evoked during the mass. Indeed, the imagery employed in these spaces mirrors the decoration of contemporary sacramentaries and missals, with eschatological scenes of the resurrected Christ juxtaposed with those of the Crucifixion. The pairing of these two image types in the eastern spaces of eleventh-century English parish churches points to the diffusion of images and ideas between service books and the very walls of the churches in which these books were used. It also suggests two related contexts in which the *Gnadenstuhl* may have developed.

As so much of the eleventh- and twelfth-century visual culture connected to the performance of the mass has been lost, it is not possible to establish conclusively that it was out of this context that the image of the *Gnadenstuhl* developed. Furthermore, it is also difficult to know in which locale or medium this 'invention' took place. It is unlikely that the design of this new and inventive Trinitarian image originated at the site of the earliest extant *Gnadenstuhl* at Houghton-on-the-Hill. The relatively remote geographical location of Houghton, and its status as a small church that was likely designed to serve the local community, would suggest that this particular place was not at the forefront of artistic invention in the late eleventh century. It is also unusual that such a new design be 'worked

out' or invented on a monumental scale, due to practical considerations of cost and the difficulty of designing a 'new' image over such a large space. Due to the visually related culture of mass books and contemporary chancel wall paintings, it is perhaps more likely that the *Gnadenstuhl* developed as a stand alone image within the context of manuscript illumination related to the Canon of the Mass, and, as with images of Christ in Majesty and the Crucifixion, was deemed appropriate for the decoration of chancel walls, above the altar where the mass was performed, to help the congregation to imagine the unimagineable.

The *Gnadenstuhl* in the Twelfth Century

Two other early examples of the *Gnadenstuhl* made shortly after the Cambrai Missal illumination, a panel in the so-called Anagogical Window in the c. 1140s ambulatory glass of the abbey church of Saint-Denis, just north of Paris, and a metal engraving on a portable altar made in Hildesheim in Germany in c. 1160-70, also suggest that the iconography's origins were closely associated with the ceremony of the mass. Moreover, both of these examples show that, even by the twelfth century, the iconography of the *Gnadenstuhl* started to appear on a variety of different objects in centres of ecclesiastical power. As the conclusion of this chapter demonstrates, this anticipates the *Gnadenstuhl's* rise in popularity over the course of the later Middle Ages and its use across a remarkably wide range of different media throughout Western Europe.

Abbot Suger's 'Anagogical Window'

Around twenty years after the design of the *Gnadenstuhl* in the Cambrai Missal, an image of the Father holding the Son on the cross appeared in one of the roundels in the 'Anagogical Windows' in the choir ambulatory of Saint-Denis (figs. 2.49-2.50), rebuilt during the abbacy of Suger (c. 1081-1151).[132] The so-called 'Aminadab panel' is one of only two surviving twelfth-century panels from the window, and though it was restored in the mid-twentieth century the majority of the glass in the panel is original; only the lower torso and upper legs of Christ, part of the Father's cloak, the bottom panel of the cart and small sections from the Evangelist symbols have been replaced with nineteenth-century glass.[133] In a design reminiscent of the Cambrai Missal, the Aminadab panel consists of a central image of the

[132] For this window see Louis Grodecki, *Les Vitraux de Saint-Denis: Étude sur le Vitrail au XII Siècle* (Paris, 1976), p. 99-102, figs. 122-34; Jacqueline A. Frank, 'The Quadrige Aminadab medallion in the "anagogical" window at the royal abbey of Saint-Denis', *Gazette des beaux-arts*, vol. 133 (1999), pp. 219-234; Conrad Rudolph, 'Inventing the Exegetical Stained-Glass Window: Suger, Hugh and a New Elite Art', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 93 (2011), pp. 399-422.

[133] Grodecki, *Les Vitraux de Saint-Denis*, p. 99; see fig. 122, p. 200 for a detailed diagram of the restoration work on the Aminadab panel.

Father and Son surrounded by the symbols of the four evangelists. However, in a highly unusual alteration to the conventional representation of the Father simply holding the Son on the cross, in the Saint-Denis window the large figure of the Father places the cross with the crucified figure of Christ onto a cart with four wheels. The box-like cart is decorated with foliage and appears to be made of a golden-like material. Inscriptions run vertically across the scene: to the left of the figures of Christ and God the Father are the words *Federis ex arca cruce / xpi sistitur ara* and to the right, *Federe maiori vult ibi vita / mori* ('From the Ark of the Covenant is established the altar of Christ/ There, by a greater covenant, life wishes to die'). Below the cart is the inscription *Quadrige Aminadab*.[134]

The biblical account in the book of 2 Samuel describes the Quadriga as the vessel used to transport the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem.[135] The Ark of the Covenant itself was used as an altar to conduct offerings to God, and is mentioned in the New Testament as a representation of the 'Old Covenant' between God and his people: in his Epistle to the Hebrews, Paul explains how the former tabernacle used for sacrifice by priests has been replaced by the 'greater and more perfect tabernacle' (*per amplius et perfectius tabernaculum*) of Christ, through his sacrifice on the cross.[136] This idea is supported by the inscription on either side of the cart in the window, which is also recorded in Suger's own account of the work completed at St Denis.[137] The inscription also indicates that the image of the golden, wheeled box should be interpreted as this Quadriga, containing the Ark of the Covenant. The Father's gesture, in which he is shown placing the crucified Christ on the Quadriga, is thus intended as a visualisation of the idea that the Old Covenant had been replaced by God's sacrifice and offering of his Son on the altar, which established a New Covenant.

The complex theology behind the design of Quadriga of Aminadab panel was thought by Emile Mâle to be the rationale that inspired the creation of the Throne of Mercy iconography. He saw the 'new' iconography as an example of the innovative and pioneering artistic work commissioned under Abbot Suger during the rebuilding of the abbey in mid-twelfth century, and even credited the invention of this form to Suger himself.[138] While Mâle was right to identify this particular example as highly innovative and unusual, the later discovery of the Cambrai illustration, as well as the paintings at Houghton, have shown decisively that Suger was not the inventor of this iconography. In showing the Father and

---

[134] Inscriptions transcribed by Grodecki, *Les Vitraux de Saint-Denis*, p. 100.
[135] 2 Samuel 6:1-7.
[136] Hebrews 9:11: 'Christus autem assistens pontifex futurorum bonorum, per amplius et perfectius tabernaculum, non manufactum, id est, non hujus creationis.'
[137] Abbot Suger, 'On What Was Done Under His Administration', in *Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of St Denis and Its Art Treasures*, ed. and trans. Erwin Panofsky, 2nd edn. (Princeton, 1979), pp. 74-5.
[138] Mâle, *Religious Art in France*, p. 183.

Son surrounded by the four evangelists, the design does show an association particularly to Cambrai and also to the heavenly judgement scene at Houghton, but the inclusion of the Quadriga and the distinctive alteration of the Father's gesture to show him placing the cross on the cart are unique amongst extant examples of the *Gnadenstuhl* from the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Indeed, this specific formulation is not found again in *Gnadenstuhl* imagery until the sixteenth century, when Peter Dell the Elder employs a similar design on a 1548 wooden relief.[139] Furthermore, the roundel does not contain any visual reference to the Holy Spirit, and unlike the other earlier examples does not show a dove flying between the Father and Son. A reason for this may be that the design of the window was intended to closely invoke the biblical account of the ark and its interpretation in Hebrews, which refer predominantly to the sacrifices of the Father and the Son.

Though in the addition of the Quadriga the anagogical window in St-Denis shows considerable variation from other extant contemporary *Gnadenstuhl* images, the inclusion of this element in the glass design still demonstrates an association with the mass and thus a thematic connection to earlier examples. Notably, the Father's gesture of offering prefigures the priest's actions during the mass ceremony: just as God offers Christ as a sacrifice on the altar of the ark of the covenant, so the priest offers the sacrificial bread and wine to the faithful on the altar in the church. Christ's physical crucified body shown on the altar in the St-Denis panel is replaced both symbolically and literally on the church altar by the bread and the wine, and as the faithful receive these sacraments they enter into the New Covenant established by the Father in the offering up of his Son. However, in situating the *Gnadenstuhl*, at this point still a rather 'new' design, within this Old Testament analogy, the St-Denis panel demonstrates how the iconography was an adaptable image that could be incorporated into diverse contexts by the mid-twelfth century.

The Hildesheim Altar

Another twelfth-century example of the *Gnadenstuhl* that shows a close connection to the ceremony of the mass and also considerable innovation in its design can be found on one of the engraved metal plates on the Hildesheim Altar, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum.[140] This portable altar was probably made in Hildesheim in Lower Saxony for Hildesheim Cathedral, as an image St Godehard, the bishop of Hildesheim from 1022-1038, appears as one of a series of saints that surround the oblong slab of porphyry on the face of

[139] For this relief see above, pp. 83-84. See also Kress, 'A Relief by Peter Dell', pp. 181-194.
[140] Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. 10-1873; for the Hildesheim Altar see P. Williamson, *The Medieval Treasury* (London, 1986), pp. 114-5.

the altar (fig. 2.51).[141] From the tenth century Hildesheim had been an important centre for metalwork but the mid-twelfth century saw an increase in metal production, due to both improvements in mining and metalsmithing techniques and the patronage of a number of wealthy patrons.[142] Costly and elaborate works such as Godehard's Shrine and the Epiphanius Shrine, made in Hildesheim for the Cathedral in c. 1130-40 and lavished with gold, silver and rock crystal, give an idea as to the rich context in which the Hildesheim Altar would have been made.[143] The Hildesheim workshop also produced many portable altars, a number of which are still held in the Cathedral Treasury.[144] Like the Hildesheim Altar in the Victoria and Albert Museum, these altars contain elements made of costly materials such as marble, gold, porphyry and ivory and are decorated elaborately with figures of saints and biblical scenes.

The portable altar in the Victoria and Albert Museum was probably made slightly later than the Godehard and Epiphanius Shrines, in around c. 1160-80.[145] It measures 229mm by 380mm and is constructed predominantly of porphyry, framed by wood. The altar is decorated on both sides with engraved plates of gilt copper. On the top face, the copper plates are positioned around the edge of the altar, so that a central rectangular section of the porphyry remains visible. The upper and lower plates contain images of saints framed within rounded, semi-circular banners inscribed with their names. The central semi-circle on the top plate contains an image of Christ with a nimbed halo, raising one hand in blessing and holding an open book in the other, whilst the central semi-circle on the lower plate contains a crowned, plain haloed figure of Mary holding both hands open. Saintly figures are also depicted in square frames in the plates to the left and the right of the porphyry square, and in the four corners are scenes of the Nativity, the Crucifixion, the Three Marys at the Tomb and the Ascension.

---

[141] For St Godehard's cult in the twelfth century see Esther-Luisa Schuster, *Kunst und Kanonisation: Visuelle Strategien der Kultvermittlung für ottonische Bischöfe in Köln und Hildesheim im 12. Jahrhundert* (Regensburg, 2016). See also, Martina Giese, Gerhard Lutz and Harald Wolter-Von Dem Kneseeck, 'Hildesheim: Centre of Medieval Art', *Medieval Treasures from Hildesheim*, ed. Peter Barnet, Michael Brandt and Gerhard Lutz (New York, 2013), pp. 3-20 (pp. 15-17).

[142] Giese, Lutz and Wolter-Von Dem Kneseeck, 'Hildesheim: Centre of Medieval Art', pp. 16-18.

[143] Godehard's Shrine and Epiphanius Shrine, both in Hildesheim Cathedral Treasury.

[144] For example, Portable Altar, Hildesheim, c. 1000 (Domm-Museum Hildesheim, DS 26), *Medieval Treasures from Hildesheim*, cat. no. 9, p. 47; Portable Altar, Hildesheim, early twelfth century (Domm-Museum Hildesheim, DS 21), *Medieval Treasures from Hildesheim*, cat. no. 16, p. 61; Portable Altar, Hildesheim, last quarter of the twelfth century (Domm-Museum Hildesheim, DS 24), *Medieval Treasures from Hildesheim*, cat. no. 29, p. 84. There is also an elaborately decorated portable altar from Hildesheim dating from the end of the twelfth century in the British Museum (London, BM, museum no. 1902, 0625.1). For this altar see Maickel van Belleghem and Lloyd de Beer, 'The Construction and Conservation History of the Hildesheim Portable Altar', *Matter of Faith: An Interdisciplinary Study of Relics* (London, 2014), pp. 126-136.

[145] Hildburgh, 'A Medieval Bronze Pectoral Cross', p. 83 and Munns, *Cross and Culture*, p. 49, n. 6, both date the altar to around 1130, but a later date is now more widely accepted. See Williamson, *The Medieval Treasury,* pp. 114-5.

The base of the altar is completely covered by one large piece of engraved copper, which has at its centre the image of the *Gnadenstuhl.* Unlike the examples already considered, the altar engraving is unique in showing just the head, shoulders and arms of the Father, rather than his full body. The Father's head, which is framed by a large, plain halo, appears almost super-imposed over the upper beam of the cross, which extends towards the top of the frame. His arms, which reach under the vertical beam of the cross to hold it upwards, are only just visible. To the left and right of the Father's head are anthropomorphic representations of the son and the moon as faces, which are shown resting within hammock-like semi-circular rings. Whilst the anthropomorphic sun looks down towards the *Gnadenstuhl*, the figure of the moon is shown sleeping. They evoke the celestial bodies that were eclipsed at the time of Christ's death.

The representation of the Father on the Hildesheim altar is unusual in the context of twelfth-century *Gnadenstuhl* iconography, which otherwise show his full body. By just showing the Father's upper torso, he appears half-hidden, half-visible, in a way that is perhaps evocative of the idea that, despite not physically present at the moment of the crucifixion, the Father still played a vital role in the sacrificial act of offering up the Son to be crucified. It is also possible that the decision to show only half the body of the Father was driven by the constricted space on the metal plate. The engraved design has been executed as a horizontal piece, so that the vertical shape of the cross is set into the narrowest part of the rectangular plate. To show the entire body of the Father behind the cross would have required making the cross, and Christ's body on it, considerably smaller. To ensure the cross was still prominent on the plate design, the artist perhaps chose instead to 'shrink' the depiction of the Father. The meaning of this slightly reduced *Gnadenstuhl* would likely still have been evident to the later-twelfth century audience, as the iconography had been known for half a century and was gaining in popularity. The Father's torso thus perhaps functions as 'short-hand' for his entire body, calling on the viewer to picture the 'full' design of the *Gnadenstuhl.*

The figure of the Son is almost as large as that of the Father. He is shown with his arms spread wide in a gentle curve across the horizontal beam of the cross, whilst his body is slightly contorted to the right. Though his head hangs slightly to the left, Christ's eyes remain open, so that he appears to be alive on the cross. The third person of the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, is shown in the form of a dove just above Christ's head, flying down from the mouth of the Father. This in some ways echoes the positioning of the dove in the Cambrai Missal, though instead of flying to the left and touching the lips of the Father and

Son with outstretched wings, the dove in the Hildesheim altar unites the two persons of the Trinity with the downward motion of its entire body.

The central *Gnadenstuhl* is flanked on either side by two pairs of saintly figures, who are identified through their attributes and inscriptions that run in a vertical banner above their heads. St Boniface and St Paul stand to the left, whilst St Peter and St Pancras are positioned to the right. At the feet of the cross are the busts two additional saints, St Simplicius and St Faustinus, who are depicted within circular frames and are also identifiable through inscriptions that run above their heads. The saints and *Gnadenstuhl* are enclosed within a series of three rectangular borders, which are decorated with geometric patterns and an inscription that records the relics supposedly contained within the altar.[146]

From the early Middle Ages, those 'converting' communities that did not have a church building had used portable altars as a means to conduct the mass in a variety of places outside of the church, from the battlefield to the homes of the dying, during pilgrimage and.[147] As Eric Palazzo has argued, portable altars were often conceptualised as symbolic of the church itself, a 'marker of the sacred within the infinite space of the world' and a physical reminder of the 'real' presence of the 'itinerant church'.[148] This concept is reflected in their imagery, which is often directly related to the decoration of church buildings, as well as the mass ceremony itself. Portable altars frequently feature images of the Crucifixion, the four evangelists, the Apostles and figures of various saints, which are sometimes related to the place in which the altar was made and consecrated, as in the Hildesheim altar.[149] Though the only surviving example of its kind, the *Gnadenstuhl* imagery on the Hildesheim altar is thus entirely fitting both with the liturgical and symbolic function of the portable altar. The image of the Father offering the Son on the cross directly echoes the words spoken by the priest during the ceremony of the mass, and reflects similar imagery in contemporary church decoration. That an object so central to the performance of the mass

---

146 'C(ON)TINENTUR. HIC. EOR(um). RELIQIE. QUOR(um) IMAGINES. SVP. L(apidem). INFRA. SCULPTE. ST. ET S EOR(um). LAURENTII. KYLIANI. GEORGII. OSWALDI. SEBASTIANI. MARURITII, THEBEORUM. MARTYRM. DIONISII. GREGORII. NICOLAI. MARTINI. LUCIE TE CLE XI MIL(ia). V(irgines).' For the inclusion of relics in portable altars see Cynthia Hahn, *Strange Beauty: Issues in the Making and Meaning of Reliquaries, 400-1204* (Pennsylvania, 2012), pp. 97-8, 119-120.

147 M. Budde, *Altare Portatile: Kompendium der Tragaltäre des Mittelalters, 600-1600* (Munich, 1998); Eric Palazzo, '*Missarum Sollemnia*: Eucharistic Rituals in the Middle Ages', trans. John H. Arnold, *The Oxford Handbook of Christianity*, ed. John H. Arnold, pp. 238-253 (pp. 242-3).

148 Palazzo, '*Missarum Sollemnia*', p. 243.

149 For example, a portable altar and reliquary from Lower Saxony, made c. 1190-1200 (London, BM, museum number 1902,0625.1), with the four evanglists engraved in gilt copper and ivories of the crucifixion and saints; a portable altar from Germany, c. 1200 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. 4524:2-1858), with an enamel of the crucifixion, representations of the Church and Synagoga, and, round the side, the twelve apostles.

is imbued with this imagery is also another indication of the influential relationship of Eucharistic visual culture to the development of the *Gnadenstuhl*.

Conclusion to Chapter Two

Though the earliest surviving examples of the *Gnadenstuhl* appear across a variety of media, from wall painting to stained glass, manuscript illumination and metalwork, and scattered across churches in Norfolk, Cambrai, Paris, and Hildesheim, the connection of each of these early images to the ceremony of the mass provides a common context for understanding the possible origins of the iconography. Over the course of the ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries, imagery related to this important liturgical rite brought together two iconic images that, it has been argued, went on to form the central components of the *Gnadenstuhl*: the *Majestas Domini* and the Crucifixion. These two images emerged alongside the climactic prayers of the *Sanctus* and *Te Igitur* in numerous missals and sacramentaries. The juxtaposition of these two images in these books, as well as in the space surrounding the altar on which the mass would have been performed, is suggestive of two possible contexts in which the 'fusion' of these images could have occurred. Though the loss of so much material has obscured the intricacies of this process, and makes important questions, such as where and when this iconography first appeared, impossible to answer, the association between several of the earliest *Gnadenstuhls* and Eucharistic imagery and practice suggests that this context is vital for understanding the origins of this iconography.

As the final part of this chapter has shown, by the end of the twelfth century the *Gnadenstuhl* had begun to be used outside of the visual milieu related to the prayers of the *Sanctus* and *Te igitur*, on objects related to the mass more widely, and in prestigious ecclesiastical locale such as in the stained glass at Saint-Denis and the Mosan metalwork of the Hildesheim portable altar. However, as with the iconography of the Seated Trinity, it wasn't until the turn of the thirteenth century on that the *Gnadenstuhl* started to appear frequently as a representation of the triune God. This period witnessed a major turning point in western Trinitarian thought following nearly a century of turbulence, which culminated with the promulgation of an 'orthodox' definition of the Trinity at Lateran IV in 1215. As the following chapter explores, though the flowering of this imagery in the thirteenth century is undoubtedly due to a combination of factors, the stabilisation in Trinitarian doctrine laid an important foundation for the parallel standardisation of the Seated and *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities.

Chapter Three: Trinitarian Controversies in the Twelfth Century

Introduction

During the late eleventh and early twelfth century, a number of leading theologians were accused of heresy on the basis of their Trinitarian doctrine. The first, Roscelin of Compiègne (c. 1050-c. 1125), was charged with tritheism at the Council of Soissons in 1092.[1] Peter Abelard (1079-1142), a student of Roscelin, was notoriously condemned for his work on the Trinity initially at the Council of Soissons in 1121 and again at the Council of Sens in 1140/1.[2] Gilbert of Poitiers (after 1085-1154) was accused of heresy on account of his writings on the Trinity at the Council of Rheims in 1148[3], and finally, at the very beginning of the thirteenth century, Joachim of Fiore's (c. 1135-1202) Trinitarian doctrine was condemned in favour of that of Peter Lombard (c. 1096-1160) at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215.[4] All of these cases were high profile events, which saw the involvement of figures such as Anselm (1033/4-1109), Bernard of Clairvaux (1090-1153) and John of Salisbury (c. 1120-1180). The accusations brought against these theologians reveal a concern and even reactionary response to the changing nature of theological and philosophical study in the twelfth century.[5] With the exception of the condemnation of Joachim of Fiore in 1215, the charges all took issue with these scholars' application of logic and philosophy to Scripture and more traditional ideas about the Trinity, which, it was argued, led to a gross misinterpretation of Trinitarian doctrine. Thus, though the

---

[1] For Roscelin's philosophical work see Eiker-Henner W. Kluge, 'Roscelin and the Medieval Problem of Universals', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, vol. 14, no. 4 (1976), pp. 405-414; Constant J. Mews, 'Nominalism and Theology Before Abelard: New Light on Roscelin of Compiègne', *Vivarium*, vol. 30, no. 1 (1992); Augustine Thompson, 'The Debate on Universals Before Peter Abelard', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, vol. 33, no. 3 (1995), pp. 409-429.

[2] The scholarship on Peter Abelard is extensive, but for an overview of his life see M. T. Clanchy, *Abelard: A Medieval Life* (Oxford, 1997). For the Council of Sense see Constant J. Mews, 'The Council of Sens (1141): Abelard, Bernard and the Fear of Social Upheaval', *Speculum*, vol. 77, no. 2, (Apr., 2002), pp. 342-382. For the influence of his philosophy see Luscombe, *The School of Peter Lombard: The Influence of Abelard's Thought in the Early Scholastic Period* (Cambridge, 2008).

[3] For a detailed outline of Gilbert's academic career, see Nikolas M. Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers* (Toronto, 1966), pp. 3-6 and Theresa Gross-Diaz, *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers: From Lectio Divina to the Lecture Room* (London, 1996). For Gilbert's trial see Clare Monagle, 'The Trial of Ideas: Two Tellings of the Trial of Gilbert of Poitiers', *Viator*, vol. 35 (2004), pp. 113-130. N. M. Häring, 'The Case of Gilbert de la Porrée, bishop of Poitiers (1142-1154), *Medieval Studies*, 13 (1951), pp. 1-40; L. O. Nielsen, *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century* (Leiden, 1982), p. 30. For a discussion of Gilbert's approach to the subject of the Trinity see Colish, *Studies in Scholasticism* (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 231-2.

[4] Constant J. Mews and Clare Monagle, 'Peter Lombard, Joachim of Fiore and the Fourth Lateran Council', *Medioevo: Revista di Storia Della Filosofia Medievale*, 35 (2010).

[5] G. R. Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology: The Beginnings of Theology as an Academic Discipline* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980); M. L. Colish, 'Systematic theology and theological renewal in the twelfth century', in *Studies in Scholasticism*, ed. M. L. Colish (Aldershot, 2006); Constant J. Mews and Clare Monagle, 'Peter Lombard, Joachim of Fiore and the Fourth Lateran Council', *Medioevo: Revista di Storia Della Filosofia Medievale*, 35 (2010).

accusations were concerned with doctrinal issues, they also challenged the methodological approaches of theologians working within what has been termed a 'new', 'professionalised' theology.[6]

However, towards the end of the twelfth century, and into the beginning of the thirteenth, attitudes towards the application of logic and dialectic to the subject of the Trinity began to change dramatically. This change culminated in the endorsement of Peter Lombard's doctrine on the Trinity, which made use of logical methods, over that of Joachim of Fiore at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. The Council's opening statement, an endorsement of Peter Lombard's work, established a 'new' definition of Trinitarian orthodoxy.[7] This doctrinal statement, which was papal approved and widely disseminated, championed a 'logical', scholastic interpretation of the triune nature of God. It also ushered in a period of relative stability in the development of Trinitarian theology. Though thirteenth-century philosophers and theologians such as Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), John Duns Scotus (c. 1266-1308) and William of Ockham (c. 1287-1347) often fiercely debated Trinitarian issues, they did not face the same opposition or accusations of heresy as their twelfth-century counterparts.[8]

This chapter will consider each of the twelfth-century Trinitarian trials in turn, in order to assess the nature of the accusations brought against Roscelin, Abelard, Gilbert and Joachim. As the final section of the chapter will show, the theological intricacies of these debates, and their subsequent resolution, were vital to the standardisation and spread of the iconography of the Seated and *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities. In order to explore the relationship between these trials and trends in Trinitarian iconography in enough depth, this chapter takes a necessarily different approach to chapters one, two, four and five; it considers a primarily theological and documentary body of evidence, and focuses on the twelfth-

---

[6] M. L. Colish, 'Systematic theology and theological renewal in the twelfth century', in *Studies in Scholasticism*, ed. M. L. Colish (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 141-2; G. R. Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology*, p. 45.

[7] 'Firmiter credimus et simpliciter confitemur quod unus solus est verus Deus æternus et immensus omnipotens incommutabilis incomprehensibilis et ineffabilis Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus tres quidem personæ sed una essentia substantia seu natura simplex omnino. Pater a nullo Filius autem a solo Patre ac Spiritus Sanctus ab utroque pariter absque initio semper et fine. Pater generans Filius nascens et Spiritus Sanctus procedens consubstantiales et coæquales coomnipotentes et coæterni unum universorum principium creator omnium invisibilium et visibilium spiritualium et corporalium qui sua omnipotenti virtute simul ab initio temporis utramque de nihilo condidit creaturam spiritualem et corporalem… Hæc sancta Trinitas secundum communem essentiam individua et secundum personales proprietates discrete', ed. G. Alberigo et al., *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta: Editio Critica, vol II: The General Councils of Latin Christendom, Part 1: From Constantinople IV to Pavia-Siena (869-1424)* (Turnhout, 2013), pp. 206-47. Discussed in more detail below, pp. 124-38.

[8] For Trinitarian theology from the time of Aquinas see Russel L. Friedman, *Medieval Trinitarian Thought From Aquinas to Ockham* (Cambridge, 2010); see also Giles Emery, *The Trinitarian Theology of Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford, 2007).

century context and controversy of the trials, relating these issues to visual material. It shows how fluctuating debates an intellectual understanding of the Trinitarian God changed the wider cultural and artistic landscape of Western Europe. The conclusion of this chapter returns to a focus on the visual representation of the Trinity, demonstrating the widespread popularity of the Seated and *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities after 1215.

The discussion of each trial will demonstrate the range of accusations that were levelled against each theologian accused of heresy, which, though ultimately concerned with the Trinity and the methods associated with the study of this subject, were never identical. The diversity in the types of complaints brought against Roscelin, Abelard, Gilbert and Joachim shows the precarious and contentious state of Trinitarian debate in the twelfth century. As has been demonstrated in the previous two chapters, by the early twelfth century both the Seated Trinity and the *Gnadenstuhl* were known and used in Western European art, concurrently with these divisive Trinitarian debates. However, though the loss of material has meant the popularity of these iconographies cannot be determined exactly, the material that does survive suggests that both of these image types were still used in limited circles in this period. It was only at the beginning of the thirteenth century that the Seated and *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities began to be used frequently across media and in much more varied contexts. It will be suggested that one of the many factors that led to an increase in the use of these iconographies was the stabilisation in Trinitarian doctrine brought about by the opening statement issued at the Fourth Lateran Council.

In order to explore this relationship between heresy, orthodoxy and image making in the lead up to the Council, the discussion will focus on one case study in which these elements were crystallised: an initial used to illustrate the commentary to Psalm 109 in a manuscript of Gilbert of Poitier's Commentary on the Psalms, made in south-west Germany and dating to around c. 1170.[9] It is argued that the Trinitarian image, which is used alongside a text by a theologian put on trial for heresy, functioned as a defence for the orthodox nature of the work, legitimising what may have been seen as 'heretical' doctrine. However, whilst this example may demonstrate the potential of images as methods for defending orthodoxy in the twelfth-century when tensions related to Trinitarian theology were at their most extreme, the stability offered by Lateran IV meant that, in the thirteenth century, the same relationship between images and heresy is not as evident. Artists appear to have enjoyed more freedom when it came to representing the Trinity. Not only did more conventional representation of the Trinity become more common but, as is explored in more depth in chapters four and five, even the more 'unusual' representations of the Trinity to appear in

[9] Fulda Hessische Landesbibliothek ms Aa51, f. 65. See below, pp. 152-158.

this period do not seem to have been considered heretical or unorthodox, underlining the consensus on Trinitarian theology brought about by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. In order to contextualise the 'unusual' nature of the images discussed in chapters four and five, this chapter will conclude with a comparative survey of the use and function of the Seated and *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities in the thirteenth century and beyond.

Establishing a 'New' Theology

The condemnation of the Trinitarian doctrines espoused by Roscelin, Abelard, and Gilbert occurred during a paradigmatic shift in twelfth-century scholasticism. Methods traditionally associated with philosophy were becoming increasingly incorporated into the discipline of theology, prompting the emergence of what has been termed a 'professionalised' theology, a 'new discipline' which combined methods of analysis from the arts – notably dialectic, grammar and philosophy – with the study of the Bible.[10] This new approach to theology was heavily influenced by Greek philosophical work that had arrived in the West at the end of the eleventh century, and an increasing availability of translations in particular of the works of Aristotle (384-322 BC), but also authors such as Cicero (106-43 BC), Boethius (477-524) and Arabic scholars such as Avicenna (980-1037) and Averroes (1126-1198), gave twelfth-century scholars new linguistic and methodological tools with which to approach matters of theology.[11]

Methods from these works of 'secular *philosophia*' were characterised by an approach that favoured abstract ideas and methods of analysis, which, from incorporation into the discipline of theology, developed a method of theological reasoning increasingly referred to as '*Speculatio*'.[12] The incorporation of these methods and techniques into the study of theology marked a significant departure from earlier theological approaches, which typically regarded philosophy and the arts as separate and secondary disciplines to the more advanced study of theology. The techniques and methods of philosophy were often seen as the 'handmaidens' of theology, designed to support and enhance the study of Scripture but always subordinate to it.[13] To incorporate the two disciplines completely, and to use

[10] M. L. Colish, 'Systematic theology and theological renewal in the twelfth century', in *Studies in Scholasticism*, ed. M. L. Colish (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), pp. 141-2; G. R. Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology*, p. 45.
[11] For a general overview of the use of these texts in the twelfth century see R. N. Swanson, *The Twelfth Century Renaissance* (Manchester, 1999), pp. 50-55.
[12] G. R. Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology*, p. 38 and p. 99.
[13] G. R. Evans, *Philosophy and Theology in the Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 1993), p. 16.

philosophical methods to test and establish theological truths, was often seen as challenging to the faith.[14]

As will be discussed, the theoretical concepts used by a number of authors in these scholarly works were exerted in an effort to explain the Trinity in logical terms. In particular, the concept of 'universals', ultimately derived from Plato (428/7-424/3 BC) and Aristotle but also discussed by Boethius, was found to be particularly applicable to discussing the three-in-one nature of God. The theory held that, in contrast terms used to describe an individual, the words used to describe the common nature of a group of individuals, such as 'man' or 'dog' could be understood as a 'universal'.[15] Though this idea was applied in a variety of ways to the concept of the Trinity, it was generally held that the three individuals of the Trinity, the Father Son and Holy Spirit, were united through their universal nature of being God. This universal nature was often termed the 'essence' (*essentia*).[16] As will be shown, the application of these 'pagan' philosophical ideas to the one of the most central doctrines of the Church was met with considerable contention.

Roscelin, Anselm and the Council of Soissons (1092)

Roscelin of Compiègne is known primarily from the account of his trial at Soissons in 1092, where he was condemned for his logical approach to the Trinity.[17] He was born in Brittany in around 1050 and died after 1120.[18] Roscelin's position on the concept of universals, and the influence of this position on his ideas about the Trinity, invited intense criticism from his contemporaries, including St Anselm and his own student, Peter Abelard.[19] It is, however, primarily through these critical accounts of Roscelin's work that we have any sense of his doctrine, as, apart from one brief letter addressed to Abelard, no authored

[14] Evans, *Philosophy and Theology*, p. 13.
[15] Christopher J. Martin, 'The Development of Logic in the Twelfth Century', *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 129-145 presents a summary of these concepts and their application.
[16] This term is discussed below, pp. 138-139.
[17] The most extensive work on Roscelin's philosophy is Eiker-Henner W. Kluge, 'Roscelin and the Medieval Problem of Universals', *Journal of the History of Philosophy* vol. 14, no. 4 (1976), pp. 405-414. See also C. J. Mews, 'Nominalism and Theology Before Abelard: New Light on Rosclin of Compiègne', *Vivarium* vol. 30, no. 1 (1992), pp. 4-33, who explores the philosophical context for Roscelin's views in more depth.
[18] Heinrich Fichtenau, *Heretics and Scholars in the High Middle Ages 1000-1200*, trans. Denise A. Kaiser (Pennsylvania 1998), p. 293.
[19] As Kluge, 'Roscelin and the Medieval Problem', states, 'there are few figures in the history of philosophy who have been as bitterly attacked and whose doctrines have invited as much calumny and condemnation as Roscelin of Compiègne' (p. 405). For Abelard's criticism of Roscelin see Mews, 'Nominalism and Theology Before Abelard', p. 7.

account of his philosophy has survived.[20] Roscelin's 'true' Trinitarian doctrine and beliefs are therefore difficult to determine.[21] Two accounts by his contemporaries, the first by Anselm, who firmly opposed Roscelin's Trinitarian views in *De incarnatione verbi*, and the second by Otto of Freising, who considered Roscelin to be the first person that established the *sententia vocum*, or nominalist approach, has meant that his reputation has become either that of the heretical theologian or the father of nominalism who prefigured 'modern philosophy'.[22] Though it is unlikely that he is either[23], his nominalist approach to the subject of the Trinity provoked enough controversy to warrant his condemnation at the Council of Soissons in 1092, as well as Anselm's publication of *De incarnatione verbi* in 1093, which was a direct response to what he perceived to be Roscelin's interpretation of the Trinity.[24] It is primarily through Anselm's *De incarnatione verbi* that we have an idea of Roscelin's position on the Trinity and the accusations brought against him at Soissons in 1092.

Though Anselm's work provides the most comprehensive account of Roscelin's doctrine, Anselm himself did not have the opportunity to consult Roscelin's work, only hearing about his views on the Trinity through a monk called John, an advisor to Bishop Fulco of Beauvais.[25] Upon hearing this, Anselm states that he began to compose a letter in response, but withheld from finishing it, as he heard that Roscelin was to be brought before the Council.[26] He then hears a report that, after the Council, Roscelin has persisted in his views, and only retracted his writings on the Trinity for fear of being killed, meaning Anselm is

---

[20] The letter is preserved in a twelfth-century manuscript from Benediktbeuern Abbey, now Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek MS Clm 4643, ff. 93v-99r, ed. in J. A. Schmeller, *Abhandlungen der philosophisch-philologisch Klasse der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Munich, 1849), pp. 187-210; see Mews, 'Nominalism and Theology Before Abelard, p. 7, n. 13.

[21] Mews, 'Nominalism and Theology Before Abelard, p. 6.

[22] Ibid, pp. 4-5.

[23] As Thompson points out, Otto of Friesing, apparently contradicting himself, also states that Roscelin received training in nominalism from his teacher John the Sophist. Thompson's article provides an overview on the historiography that has viewed Roscelin in these categorical terms: see Augustine Thompson, 'The Debate on Universals Before Peter Abelard', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 1995, vol. 33 (3), pp. 409-429 (p. 419).

[24] Anselm, *De incarnatione verbi*, ed. F. S. Schmitt, *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archepiscopi opera Omnia*, 6 vols. (Edinburgh, 1946-1961) II (1948), pp. 1-36; trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson, *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury* (Minneapolis, 2000), pp. 265-294; Mews, 'Nominalism and Theology Before Abelard', pp. 5-6.

[25] Mews, 'Nominalism and Theology Before Abelard', p. 6

[26] Anselm, *De incarnatione verbi*, I: 'Quod cum ad me perlatum esset, incepi contra hunc errorem quandam epistolem, quam parte quadam edite perficere contempsi, credens non ea opus esse, quoniam et ille contra quem fiebat, in concilio a venerabili archiepiscopo Remensi Rainaldo collecto errorem suum abiuraverat, et nullus videbatur qui eum errare ignoraret.' ('When this [Roselin's] error was brought to my attention, I began a letter against it. However, I thought it not worth completing, even though a part of it had been written. For since he against whom it was being written had abjured his error in the council called by Rainald, venerable archbishop of Rheims, and since there did not seem to be anyone who was unaware that this man had been mistaken, I thought there to be no need for it.'), ed. Schmitt, *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis,* p. 4, trans. Hopkins and Richardson, *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm*, p. 265.

compelled to finish his letter, which becomes *De incarnatione verbi*.[27] The report from the monk John seems to be the only information Anselm has access to about Roscelin's views, for he focuses his entire discussion around this passage, repeating it later on in the work.[28]

In this letter, Anselm repeats John's report of Roscelin's arguments:

> "If," says he [Roscelin], " in God the three persons are only one thing—and are not three things, each one [existing] separately in itself (as do three angels or three souls) and, yet, [existing] in such way that they are wholly the same in will and in power—then the Father and the Holy Spirit were incarnate with the Son."[29]

This rather convoluted report of Roscelin's position on Trinitarian theology is best understood in relation to Roscelin's nominalist views. As Kluge has shown, as a nominalist, Roscelin believed universals were not realities in and of themselves, but simply linguistic terms, or *flactus vocis*.[30] Universals, Roscelin believed, are simply words, rather than metaphysical realities. This had a direct influence on his understanding of the Trinity, as, if universals were not truly 'things' (*res*), then the idea that the three Persons of the Trinity were united or 'one' through the universal 'essence' could not be substantiated. As Kluge summarises, Roscelin believed that the three persons of the Trinity must be distinct substances, as these were the only things that were a metaphysical reality; universals were not.[31]

This view is reflected in the statement recorded by Anselm above. Roscelin is arguing, purportedly, that the Trinity can either be one, united 'thing' (*res*), or three, individual 'things': if universals do not exist, it is a metaphysical impossibility for three individual persons of the Trinity to exist as one being, united through their universal 'essence' (*essentia*). Thus, if the Trinity is truly one, each of the persons of the Trinity must logically be

---

[27] Anselm, *De incarnatione verbi*, I: '… audivi praefatae novitatis auctorem in sua perseverantem sententia dicere se non ob aliud abiurasse quod dicebat, nisi quia a populo interfici timebat. Hac igitur causa quidam fratres me preci bus suis coegerunt, ut solverum quaestionem qua ipse sic erat irretitus.' ('… I heard that the author of the above-mentioned novelty was persisting in his opinion and was saying that he had abjured his earlier statements only because he was afraid of being killed by the people. For this reason, then, certain brothers petitioned me, urging that I solve the problem.'), ed. Schmitt, *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis*, pp. 4-5, trans. Hopkins and Richardson, *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm*, p. 266.

[28] Anselm, *De incarnatione verbi*, II, ed. Schmitt, *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis*, pp. 10, 12.

[29] Anselm, *De incarnatione verbi*, I: 'Si inquit in deo tres personae sunt una tantum res et non sunt tres res [unaquaeque] per se [seperatim], sicut tres angeli aut tres animae, ita tame nut voluntate et potentia omnino sint idem: ergo pater et spiritus sanctus cum filio est incarnatus', ed. Schmitt, *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis*, p. 4, trans. Hopkins and Richardson, *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm*, p. 270.

[30] Kluge, 'Roscelin and the Medieval Problem of Universals', p. 406.

[31] Ibid, p. 406-7.

identical to one another, to the extent that the Father must be incarnate with the Son and Spirit. In response to Roscelin's claims, Anselm presents the realist view of the divine essence: the essence of God, or, to use Anselm's term the 'Divine nature' (*Divinae naturae*), is a universal concept that unites the three persons.[32] It is a reality that exists 'always and everywhere that never and nowhere does anything exist without its presence'.[33] In Anselm's view, the individual persons of the Trinity are united through their commonality – the fact that they are all God – and divided in their relation to one another – their distinguishing property:

> For we believe that each of the persons is that which is common to both and that which is proper to Himself. For the person of the Father is both God (to be God is common to him with the Son) and Father (to be Father is His distinguishing property). Similarly, the person of the Son is both God (to be God is common to Him with the Father) and Son (this person alone is called Son). In the case of these two persons, therefore, one thing is common, viz., to be God, and two things are proper, viz., to be Father and to be Son.[34]

It is thus Anselm and Roscelin's contradictory views on the concept of universals that determines their respective doctrine on the Trinity. To Anselm, and to those at the Council of Soissons, Roscelin's denial of the reality of the 'divine nature' amounted, in their opinion, to a denial of the unity of God and even to the suggestion that the Trinity was comprised of three separate individuals. Regardless of the severe condemnations by his contemporaries, however, as Kluge has pointed out, Roscelin's theories on nominalism were hugely influential, and were to have a considerable affect on the work of later philosophers, particularly Abelard and William of Ockham.[35] That Abelard was also to be accused of heresy on similar grounds to Roscelin is indicative of these influences.[36] In addition to his ideas on the Trinity, the mechanisms of Roscelin's trial in 1092 were also to have a significant impact on the intellectual landscape of twelfth-century Europe. Subsequent trials in which theologians were accused of heresy because of their ideas about the Trinity focus,

---

[32] Anselm, *De incarnatione verbi*, VII ed. Schmitt, *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis*, p. 22.

[33] Anselm, *De incarnatione verbi*, VII: 'Divinae uitque naturae est sic semper et ubique esse, ut nihil umquam aut alicubi sit sine eius praesentia.' ed. Schmitt, *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis*, p. 22, trans. Hopkins and Richardson, *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm*, p. 280.

[34] Anselm, *De incarnatione verbi*, II: 'Nam unamquamque personam credimus esse hoc quod commune est ambobus , et esse hoc quod proprium est sibi. Persona enim patris et deus est, quod commune est illi cum filio, et pater est, quod eius proprium est. Similiter persona filii et deus est, quod commune est illi cum patre, et filius est, quod non nisi de hac sola persona dicitur. In his igitur duabus personis unum est commune, id est deus, et duo propria , quae sunt pater et filius.' ed. Schmitt, *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis*, p. 11, trans. Hopkins and Richardson, *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm*, p. 271.

[35] Kluge, 'Roscelin and the Medieval Problem of Universals', p. 413.

[36] Ibid: 'However much Abelard may have inveighed against his erstwhile teacher, his own logico-metaphysical doctrines are a direct outcome of the latter's speculations and bear the unmistakable mark of his influence.'

as with Roscelin's, on issues of method and approach. They show a reticence on behalf of 'orthodox' churchmen to embrace 'new' philosophical ideas entertained by scholars such as Peter Abelard and Gilbert of Poitiers.

Peter Abelard, the Council of Soissons (1121) and the Council of Sens (1140/1)

The dynamism of Peter Abelard's life and work has attracted considerable scholarly literature and debate. Whilst his *Historia Calamitatum* and the letters between him and Héloïse (c. 1000-1164) are celebrated as some of the most valuable accounts of life in the twelfth century,[37] Abelard's philosophical work, and his importance in the development of the field of logic in the early scholastic period, has been well documented.[38] Often central to discussions of Abelard's theology are his two trials at Soissons and Sens, in which he was brought to account for his supposedly heretical views on the Trinity. The accusations leveled against Abelard reveal the reticence still held by 'orthodox' churchmen for the incorporation of logic and dialectic to the study of theology. Like Roscelin, Abelard was condemned for his Platonic approach to the concept of 'universals'; but it was also his use of linguistics, which led to his purportedly 'heretical' suggestion that the Trinity could be understood by the individual persons' characteristics, that invited specific criticism at both Soissons and Sens.

The first set of accusations brought against Abelard at the Council of Soissons in 1121 were in response to his work *Theologia "Summi boni"*, which he later revised in two further works, the *Theologia Christiana* and *Theologia Scholarium*.[39] The *Theologia "Summi boni"* was written in

[37] For the letters of Abelard and Heloise see Constant J. Mews, *The Lost Love Letters of Heloise and Abelard: Perceptions of Dialogue in Twelfth-Century France* (New York, 1999). There is considerable debate about the 'authenticity' of these sources. For this debate see John F. Benton and Fiorella Prosperetti Ercoli, 'The Style of the *Historia Calamitatum*: A Preliminary Test of the Authenticity of the Correspondence attributed to Abelard and Heloise', *Viator* 6 (1975), pp. 59-86; Peter Dronke, *Abelard and Heloise in Medieval Testimonies* (Glasgow, 1976); C. S. Jaeger, 'The Prologue to the *Historia Calamitatum* and the "Authenticity Question"' in *Euphorion: Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte*, vol. 74 (Heidelberg, 1980), pp. 1-15. See also C. D Ferguson, *The Emergence of Medieval Biography: Guibert de Nogent, Peter Abelard and Giraldus Cambrensis as Alienated Autobiographers* (1982); D. A. Fraioli, 'Heloise's First Letter as a Response to the "Historia" Calamitatum', *Mediaevistik* 19 (2016), pp. 119-142.

[38] The most significant studies to discuss Abelard's philosophical works include David Luscombe, *The School of Peter Abelard: The Influence of Abelard's Thought in the Early Scholastic Period* (Cambridge, 1969); John Marebon, *The Philosophy of Peter Abelard* (Cambridge, 1997); Constant J. Mews, *Abelard and His Legacy* (Aldershot, 2001). For Abelard's life more generally see M. T. Clanchy, *Abelard: A Medieval Life* (Oxford, 1997). For the historiography on Abelard's philosophy see Marenbon, 'The Rediscovery of Peter Abelard's Philosophy', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 44, 3 (2006), pp. 331-351.

[39] For the relationship between these two works see Constant J. Mews, 'The Development of the *Theologia* of Peter Abelard' in *Petrus Abaelardus 1079-1142: Person, Werk und Wirkung* ed. Jean Jolivet, David Luscombe and Lambert Marie de Rijk (Trier, 1980), pp. 183-198 and 'Peter Abelard's

the years 1119-20 when Abelard was at St-Denis, and dealt primarily with the application of logic and dialectic to the subject of the Trinity. As Constant J. Mews states, the additional purpose of the treatise, as indicated by Abelard in a letter to the bishop of Paris in around 1120, was also to contest the claims put forward by Roscelin that the Trinity was comprised of three separate persons, and establish himself as a 'worthy successor to Anselm of Canterbury'.[40]

The Trinitarian views for which Abelard is brought to trial are presented in the opening statement of the *Theologia "Summi boni"*. In this passage, Abelard outlines the distinctive element of his philosophy, the idea that each of the three persons of the Trinity can be understood as individual from one another by their characteristics or 'distinguishing qualities':

> Christ the Lord, who is the wisdom of God incarnate, has diligently distinguished the perfection of the highest good, which is God, by describing it with three names… He called the divine substance 'the Father', 'the Son' and 'the Holy Spirit', for three causes. He called it 'the Father' in accordance with that unique power of His majesty which is omnipotence, by which he can effect whatever He wills as nothing is able to resist Him. The same divine substance he said is 'the Son', in accordance with the distinction of His wisdom, by which he can truly judge and discern all things so that nothing can lie hidden by which He is deceived. He likewise called that substance 'the Holy Spirit' in accordance with the grace of His goodness… This is therefore how God is three persons, that is, 'the Father', 'the Son' and 'the Holy Spirit'. And so we may say the divine substance is powerful, wise and good; indeed, it even is power itself, wisdom itself and goodness itself.[41]

Abelard thus assigns each of the three persons a quality – the Father 'power' (*potentiam*), the Son 'wisdom' (*sapien*) and the Holy Spirit 'goodness' (*benignitatis*) – whilst maintaining that each of these qualities are not just present in the 'divine substance' (*diuinam substantiam*), but that the divine substance is these three things. In Abelard's view, the three qualities inherent

---

Theologia Christiana and Theologia Scholarium re-examined', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et medieval*, 52 (1985), pp. 109-158; Marebon, *The Philosophy of Peter Abelard*, pp. 48-64.

[40] Constant J. Mews, 'The Trinity', *Abelard and Heloise*, pp. 101-2

[41] Peter Abelard, *Theologia Summi boni*: 'Summi boni perfectionem quod deus est, ipsa dei sapientia incarnate Christus dominus describendo tribus nominibus diligenter distinxit… Patrem quidem secundum illam unicam majestatis suae potentiam, quae est omnipotentia, qua scilicet efficerepotest quicquid uult, cum nihil ei resistere queat; filium autem eandem divinam substantiam dixit secundum proprie sapien tiae discretionem, qua videlicet cuncta ueracita diiudicare ac discernere potest, ut nihil eam laterepossit quo decipiatur; spiritum sanctum etiam uocauit ipsam secundum benignitatis suae gratiam… Tale est ergo deum esse tres personas, hoc est patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum, ac si dicamus divinam substantiam esse potentem, sapientem, benignam, immo etiam esse ipsam potentiam, ipsam sapientiam, ipsam benignitatem', ed. E. M. Buytaert and C. J. Mews, *Petri Abaelardi opera theologica III: theologia "summi boni", Theologia "scholorium"*, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 13 (1987) , pp. 86-7, lines 4-6, 7-17, 21-4, trans. M. T. Clanchy, *Abelard: A Medieval Life* (Oxford, 1997), p. 270.

in the divine substance are not 'realities', or things (*res*), but they have an objective existence as different 'properties' or names (*nominibus*) of the divine substance.[42]

The assigning of characteristics to the different persons of the Trinity was not an altogether new concept, and had been explored previously by both Hugh of St-Victor (c. 1096-1141) and William of Champeaux (c. 1070-1121).[43] However, these characteristics had been predominantly used to explain the actions of God during creation; Abelard used them to explain the very nature of God.[44] This was the controversial aspect of his theology, and the issue identified as heretical at both of his trials. Significantly, in assigning each person a property, it was argued that Abelard was emphasising the differences of the three Persons to too great a degree. Abelard's *Historia Calamitatum* is the only full account of his trial at Soissons, and though rather dramatic, the later changes he is forced to make to his work suggest that the doctrinal issues he records as being brought before him at the Council are probably accurate.[45] Abelard accuses two students of Anselm, Alberic of Rheims (c. 1085-1141) and Lotulphe the Lombard, as 'stirring up' the archbishop of Rheims against him by claiming that Abelard's *Theologia* was written to 'prove the existence of three gods,' thus initiating Abelard's trial at the Council.[46] In addition to these doctrinal issues, as Abelard records in the *Historia*, the Council's concern is also that 'I [Abelard] had presumed to read it in public without the approval either of the Roman pontiff or of the church, and that, furthermore, I had given it to many to be transcribed.'[47] The trial was thus concerned not only with the details of Abelard's philosophy but also its papal approval and dissemination.

---

[42] Peter Dronke, *A History of Twelfth-Century Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 221.

[43] Dominique Poirel has argued that Abelard's allocation of three qualities to the Trinity may have drawn on Hugh of St-Victor's work *De tribus diebus*: see Poirel, *Livre de la nature et débat trinitaire au XIIe siècle: Le "De tribus diebus" de Hugues de St-Victor* (Turnhout, 2002), pp. 32-7; see also *Clanchy*, Abelard, p. 270; Constant J. Mews, 'The Trinity', *Abelard and Heloise*, pp. 103-4.

[44] In doing so, Abelard relied heavily on the 'pagan' philosophers, particularly Plato. For a discussion of Abelard's use of Platonic philosophy see Marenbon, *The Philosophy of Peter Abelard*, pp. 56-58 and 'The Platonisms of Peter Abelard', *Aristotelian Logic, Platonism and the Context of Early Medieval Philosophy in the West* (Aldershot, 2000), pp. 109-129.

[45] Abelard, *Historia Calamitatum*, IX-XI, ed. J. Monfrin, *Abelard: Historia Calamitatum, Texte critique avec une introduction* (Paris, 1959), pp. 80-98, trans. Henry Adam Bellows, *The Story of My Misfortunes: The Autobiography of Peter Abelard* (New York, 1972), pp. 36-51. The trial is briefly mentioned by Otto of Friesing, *Gesta Frederici*, 69, 27-43, ed. G. Waitz and B. von Simson (Leipzig, 1912); Constant J. Mews, 'The Trinity', *Abelard and Heloise*, pp. 121-2.

[46] Abelard, *Historia Calamitatum*, IX. Otto of Friesing reports the opposite, that Abelard was accused of Sabellianism as he had claimed that the Father and the Son were the same, but, as Mews has demonstrated, the sympathy Otto of Friesing shows for Roscelin, who had accused Abelard of the same heresy, and the corrections Abelard makes to his revised *Theologia Christiana* suggest that Abelard's account is the more accurate. See Mews, 'The Trinity', pp. 121-2.

[47] Abelard, *Historia Calamitatum*, IX: 'Dicebant enim ad dampnationem libelli satis hoc esse debere quod nec romani pontificis nec Ecclesie auctoritate eum commendatum legere publice presumpseram, atque ad transcribendum jam pluribus eum ipse prestitissem…', ed. Monfrin, *Abelard: Historia Calamitatum*, p. 87, trans. Bellows, *The Story of My Misfortunes*, pp. 42-3.

The Council of Soissons took place in the presence of both Rodolphe, Archbishop of Rheims 1106-1124, and Cono of Palestrina (d. 1122), a papal legate who had been heavily involved in the Gregorian Reforms.[48] Abelard's book was condemned without enquiry. He describes how 'they [did] compel me with my own hand to cast that memorable book of mine into the flames', and return to St-Denis with instruction not to teach.[49] However, as M. T. Clanchy has shown, there is no recorded order at the Council of Soissons to burn all of Abelard's books, and it is likely Abelard had another copy of his *Theologia* from which he produced his more extended works, the *Theologia Christiana* and *Theologia Scholarium*.[50]

Abelard's trial at Soissons did not have a completely damaging affect on Abelard's career, and he continued to produce theological works and teach in Paris. He established a school near Nogent-sur-Sein initially named the Trinity in defiance of the trial at Soissons, but later changed to Paraclete in reflection of his work on the Holy Spirit.[51] However, his works were to come under attack again, twenty years later at the Council of Sens in 1140 or 1141.[52] This time, Abelard's main accuser was Bernard of Clairveaux, who had been informed by William of St-Thierry (c. 1085-1148) of Abelard's potentially heretical writings on the Trinity in the *Theologia Scholarium*, which he had written as a development of his ideas in the *Theologia "Summi boni"*.[53] In response, Bernard composed a letter to Pope Innocent II (r. 1130-1143), in which he informed the Pope that Abelard was a danger to the church, and attached a list of nineteen accusations of heresy, reputedly based on Abelard's works.[54] Bernard also confronted Abelard with the list during the trial, though Abelard maintained that Bernard had purposefully and repeatedly misrepresented his work.[55] Bernard's main concern with Abelard's Trinitarian theology was that Abelard has argued for 'degrees in the Trinity of God'.[56] Bernard states:

---

[48] Peter Abelard, *Historia Calamitatum*, IX; Marenbon, *The Philosophy of Peter Abelard*, pp. 16-17.
[49] Peter Abelard, *Historia Calamitatum*, Chapter IX, '… et sine ullo discussionis examine meipsum compulerunt propria manu librum memoratum meum in ignem proicere…', ed. Monfrin, *Abelard: Historia Calamitatum*, p. 87, trans. Bellows, *The Story of My Misfortunes*, p. 44.
[50] Clanchy, *Abelard: A Medieval Life*, p. 305.
[51] Marenbon, *The Philosophy of Peter Abelard*, pp. 19-26.
[52] Constant J. Mews has recently re-assessed the dating of the Council of Sens, which has been traditionally been thought to take place in 1140, but from a revaluation of the evidence probably took place in 1141; see Constant J. Mews, 'The Council of Sens (1141): Abelard, Bernard and the Fear of Social Upheaval', *Speculum*, vol. 77, no. 2, (Apr., 2002), pp. 342-382.
[53] Mews, 'The Council of Sens (1141), p. 364.
[54] Ibid, p. 367.
[55] Peter Abelard, *Historia Calamitatum*, Chapter XII: 'The two [Norbert of Prémontré and Bernard of Clairvaux] ran hither and yon preaching and shamelessly slandering me and every way they could'; 'Hii predicando per mundum discurrentes et me impudenter quantum poterant corrodentes…', ed. Monfrin, *Abelard: Historia Calamitatum*, p. 97, trans. Bellows, *The Story of My Misfortunes*, p. 59.
[56] Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter against Abelard, addressed by Bernard to Innocent II*, ed. Ailbe J. Luddy (Dublin, 1947), pp. 58-94 (p. 60).

> For he teaches that God the Father is the fullness of power, God the Son is a certain kind of power, and that God the Holy Ghost is no power at all. According to him, the Son stands in the same relation to the Father as *a kind of power* to power simply, as a species is to a genus, as informed matter to matter indeterminate, as man to animal, as a copper seal to copper in general.[57]

Again, as with Abelard's first trial at Soissons, Bernard's objections were in regard to Abelard's assigning of characteristics to the different persons of the Trinity. As Bernard explains, Abelard has defined these distinctions using the linguistic terminology traditionally reserved to explain things in nature and the world, not God. In doing so, he emphasised to too great a degree the differences in the three persons, disregarding their unity.

Edward Little and David Luscombe's assessments of the nineteen statements on the 'heresies' of Abelard have shown that the extent to which they accurately represent Abelard's work varies, and that particularly in relation to the Trinity the statements are fairly unrepresentative.[58] Furthermore, Bernard had, the night before the trial, met with the members of the council in order to persuade them of the heretical nature of these nineteen statements.[59] During the Council itself, instead of engaging with Bernard on the issues he had raised, all sources record how Abelard did not defend himself but simply appealed to the Pope and to Rome.[60] It is very likely that Abelard knew that Bernard had previously attempted to convinced the Council of his guilt, and, in addition to the misleading nature of Bernard's nineteen statements, may have perceived an appeal to Rome to be his only option.[61] However, Bernard also appealed to the Pope, and, on the orders of Innocent II in a letter issued on July 16, 1141, Abelard was convicted of heresy and required to burn his work and cease teaching and writing.[62] Following the trial, Abelard had been persuaded by Peter the Venerable to stay at the abbey of Cluny for his safety, where he died in around 1142-3.[63]

The reasons for Abelard's condemnation at the Council of Sens have been fiercely debated, with the role of Bernard in Abelard's conviction in particular inviting question. David Luscombe argued that it was Bernard's objections to Abelard's dialectical approach to the

---

[57] Ibid.
[58] E. Little, *Bernard of Clairveaux: Studies Presented to Dom. J. Leclercq* (London, 1973), pp. 59-61; Luscombe, *The School of Peter Lombard: The Influence of Abelard's Thought in the Early Scholastic Period* (Cambridge, 2008), pp. 115-42.
[59] Clanchy, *Abelard: A Medieval Life*, pp. 308-9 discusses the different perspectives offered by contemporary sources on this meeting.
[60] Mews, 'The Council of Sens (1141)', p. 369.
[61] Clanchy, *Abelard: A Medieval Life*, p. 312.
[62] Ibid, p. 318.
[63] David Luscombe, *Peter Abelard* (Oxford, 2002), p. 17.

topic of the Trinity that led to his trial at Sens.[64] On the other hand, Michael Clanchy has pointed to the political reasons for Bernard's accusations, arguing that they were out of fear of Abelard's influence in Rome.[65] More recently, Mews' work has done much to suggest other high-profile figures that would have supported the condemnation of Abelard on the basis of a concern over his influence. As Mews shows, Arnold of Brescia, who rebelled against the Church and pope in Italy, arrived in Paris in c. 1139 after being expelled from Italy, and established a connection with Abelard.[66] It was feared in circles beyond Bernard's that the combined forces of Arnold and Abelard would threaten to 'spread a radical version of Abelard's teaching', entailing a 'radical overthrow of social and religious tradition.'[67] Mews sees Abelard's trial in respect to these wider issues of dissent and authority, and argues that, on these more political grounds, his condemnation would have been widely supported by other church authorities, as well as the pope and the king of France Louis VII, who attended the trial.[68] As R. I. Moore has shown, Abelard's trial occurred amidst wider tensions in twelfth-century France regarding the threat of heresy and other 'suspect' groups, which resulted in the imposition of new structures of authority by the Church.[69]

The political dimensions of Abelard's trial are revealing. They show the extent to which theologians in the twelfth century were dependent on important churchmen like Bernard of Clairvaux to determine their orthodoxy. For Roscelin, Abelard and Gilbert of Poitiers, discussed below, the political and ecclesiastical structures under which they were working fundamentally opposed their approach to the study of theology and their 'heretical' status was contingent on the definition of orthodoxy supplied by influential churchmen connected to the papacy. As we shall see, the changes in the papal landscape towards the end of the twelfth century, and into the beginning of the thirteenth, ushered in a new consensus in regards to the types of theology (and theologians) considered heretical or orthodox.

Gilbert of Poitiers and the Council of Rheims (1148)

Gilbert of Poitiers, also known as Gilbert de la Porée, or Gilbertus Porretanus, was born in Poitiers in around 1080.[70] After completing his initial studies in Poitiers, Gilbert studied in Chartres, and then moved to Laon, where he was the pupil of Anselm and his brother

[64] Luscombe, *Peter Abelard*, p. 16.
[65] Clanchy, *Abelard: A Medieval Life*, pp. 314-7.
[66] Mews, 'The Council of Sens (1141)', p. 346.
[67] Ibid, p. 380.
[68] Ibid, pp. 379-80.
[69] R. I. Moore, *The First European Revolution, c. 970-1215* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 124-5.
[70] For a detailed outline of Gilbert's academic career, see Nikolas M. Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers* (Toronto, 1966), pp. 3-6 and Theresa Gross-Diaz, *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers: From Lectio Divina to the Lecture Room* (London, 1996), pp. 1-24.

Ralph. It was probably at Laon that Gilbert wrote one of his most well known works, his Commentary on the Psalms, as a colophon in one of the manuscripts of Gilbert's Commentary that states Gilbert 'recited' (*recitavit*) the work in front of Anselm.[71] Gilbert's career is then undocumented until his move back to Chartres in 1124, where he became chancellor in 1126.[72] During this time, until his appointment as bishop of Poitiers in 1141 or 1142, it is likely that Gilbert taught, either at Chartres, Paris, or both, as evidenced by the account of one of his most well-known students, John of Salisbury.[73]

In 1148, during his episcopacy at Poitiers, Gilbert was called before the Council of Rheims in response to accusations of heresy. Bernard of Clairvaux, who had heard of Gilbert's 'erroneous' interpretation of the Trinity in his commentary on Boethius' *De trinitate* from a report of two of Gilbert's archdeacons, brought the accusations to the Council.[74] Otto of Freising (c. 1114-1158) records these statements in his *Gesta Friderici*, outlining the four principles reasons for Bernard's attack on Gilbert:

> That the divine essence is not God; that the properties of the persons are not the persons themselves; that persons, in the theological sense, are not predicated in any proposition; that the divine nature did not become flesh.[75]

Bernard's objections relate to Gilbert's inherently grammatical approach to the Trinity. Gilbert had argued in his Commentary on Boethius' *De Trinitate* that the Trinity could be explained in relation to the grammatical rules that determined a noun's substance and quality: a noun could be defined by both the 'thing' itself, its substance (*id quod est*, that which it is), but also by the things that shape the 'thing' itself, its qualities (*id quo est*, that by which it is).[76] Applying grammarian logic to the Trinity, Gilbert held that God was comprised of the three persons, each a substance, and a quality that united these three, a singular divine essence. For Bernard, this interpretation suggested that the divine essence

---

[71] This must also have been before Anselm's death in 1117. The colophon is recorded in Oxford, Baliol College MS 36, f. 145v: 'Explicit glosatura magistri Giliberti Porretani super psalterium quam ipse recitavit coram suo magistro Anselmo causa emendationis'. See Gross-Diaz, *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers*, p. 7, n. 22; p. 34.

[72] Gross-Diaz, *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers*, p. 9, pp. 13-4.

[73] The evidence for Gilbert's teaching locations is discussed by Gross-Diaz, *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers*, pp. 13-22.

[74] Clare Monagle, 'The Trial of Ideas: Two Tellings of the Trial of Gilbert of Poitiers', *Viator*, 2004, vol. 35, pp. 113-130 (p. 113). On Gilbert's commentary on Boethius' *De trinitate* see Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers*.

[75] Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I Imperatoris*: 'Quod videlicet assereret divinam essentiam non esse Deum. Quod proprietates personarum non essent ipsae personae. Quod theologicae personae in nulla predicarentur propositione. Quod divina natura non esset incarnata'. ed. G. Waitz and B. von Simson, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum*, 3rd edn. (Hannover and Leipzig, 1912), p. 75, trans. Monagle, 'The Trial of Ideas', p. 113.

[76] For a discussion of Gilbert's approach to the subject of the Trinity see Colish, *Studies in Scholasticism*, (Aldershot, 2006), pp. 231-2.

was merely a quality, not truly God, and that the persons' properties, or qualities, were not related to their substance, or the persons themselves.

Three surviving accounts by John of Salisbury, Otto of Freising and Geoffrey of Auxerre (c. 1120-c. 1188) record the details of Gilbert's trial.[77] As Clare Monagle has demonstrated in her assessment of these sources, whist the authors present Gilbert as a rational intellectual, their representation of Bernard is conversely as an aggressive attacker of Gilbert.[78] Significantly, John of Salisbury records that Bernard held a meeting before the trial took place to gather support and draft a document that challenged Gilbert's theology on the Trinity, as he had orchestrated at Peter Abelard's trial at the Council of Sens in 1140/1.[79] John describes the Council's outrage at Bernard's calling of an earlier meeting, who saw it as an attempt to undermine the authority of the cardinals, citing this as the reason for the Council's ultimate objection to Bernard's accusation of heresy against Gilbert.[80] In the end, no formal condemnation was brought against Gilbert, and, unlike Abelard, his Commentary on Boethius' *De Trinitate* was not destroyed.[81] Pope Eugene III (r. 1145-1153), however, ordered Gilbert to make some corrections to his work.[82] Despite Gilbert's triumph in his trial, Bernard had succeeded in maligning his reputation.

---

[77] John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, chs. VIII-XI, ed. and trans. Marjorie Chibnall, *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury* (London, 1956, repr. 1986), pp. 15-25; Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I Imperatoris*, ed. G. Waitz and B. von Simson, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum*, 3rd edn. (Hannover and Leipzig, 1912), pp. 24-37; Geoffrey of Auxerre, *Error(es) Gilleberti Pictauensis espiscopi* and *Libellus contra capitula Gisleberti episcopi Pictauensis*, ed. N. M. Häring, 'Geoffrey of Auxerre: Writings Against Gilbert of Poitiers', *Analecta Cisteriensia*, 22 (1966), pp. 3-83 (pp. 31-68); for the trial see N. M. Häring, 'The Case of Gilbert de la Porrée, bishop of Poitiers (1142-1154), *Medieval Studies*, 13 (1951), pp. 1-40; L. O. Nielsen, *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century* (Leiden, 1982), p. 30; Monagle, 'The Trial of Ideas', pp. 113-130.

[78] Monagle, 'The Trial of Ideas', pp. 118-123.

[79] John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, XIII: 'Before the abbot of Clairvaux met Gilbert publicly in court he sent asking all the leading churchmen, those who were distinguished by their learning or sanctity or office, to meet him privately in his lodging.' (*Sed antequam ipsum prefatus abbas in audientia publica conueniret, venerabiles viri qui oppinione litterarum et auctoritate religionis vel officii ceteris preminebant, petitione ipsius in eius hospicio convenerunt*), ed. and trans. Chibnall, *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury*, p. 17; for a comparison of Gilbert's trial with Peter Abelard's, see Monagle, 'The Trial of Ideas', pp. 122-3.

[80] John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, IX: 'When the news came to the hearing of the cardinals they were very wrath with the abbot and those who had assembled at his request: they agreed among themselves to support the cause of the bishop of Poitiers, saying that the abbot had attacked master Peter in exectly the same way…' (*Quod cum ad cardinalium audientiam pervenisset, supra modum idignati sunt adversus abbatem et illos qui prece eius convenerant: condixerunt ergo fovere causam domini Pictavensis, dicentes quod/ abbas arte simili magistrum Petrum aggressus erat…*) ed. and trans. Chibnall*, The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury*, p. 19; Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici I Imperatoris* 1.60.85; for an extended discussion of the Council's for their objection of Bernard's accusations, see Monagle, 'The Trial of Ideas', pp. 123-5.

[81] John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, IX-XI, ed. and trans. Chibnall, *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury*, pp. 19-25.

[82] John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, XI, ed. and trans. Chibnall, *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury*, pp. 23-25; Otto of Freising *Gesta Friderici I Imperatoris,* ed. G. Waitz and B. von Simson, pp. 32-33.

The ambiguous end to Gilbert's trial is evident in the reception of Gilbert's work after his death in 1154. As N. M. Häring and Laura Cleaver have shown, Gilbert was remembered conversely as both a heretic and as a 'brilliant thinker and teacher'.[83] A remarkable number of epitaphs praising Gilbert's life and work survive, and Gilbert's burial in the church of Saint-Hilaire in Poitiers, inside an elaborately decorated tomb, no longer extant, is indicative of the respect and prestige he earned in his hometown.[84] Furthermore, a significant number of manuscripts containing Gilbert's work survive from the late twelfth century, suggesting that they continued to be copied and used.[85] However, accounts of Gilbert's trial in surviving chronicles from the late twelfth century present a much more varied opinion of Gilbert: whilst some protest Gilbert's innocence at his trial, others support Bernard's condemnation of his work.[86] His reputation as a writer and teacher is similarly mixed. John of Salisbury and William of Tyre (c. 1130-1186) both praise Gilbert as one of the most renowned scholars of his time, whilst Walter of St Victor (d. c. 1180) lists him among the four heretical 'labyrinths' with Peter Abelard, Peter Lombard and Peter of Poitiers (c. 1130-c. 1215), accusing all four of being 'poisoned on the spirit of Aristotle'.[87]

In response to these questions on the orthodoxy of Gilbert's theology, a level of caution can be detected in extant manuscripts containing his work. Häring's work on Gilbert's commentary on Boethius' *De trinitate* has revealed a number of manuscripts that contain notes and annotations warning the reader of the potentially heretical nature of the text. A number of notes read '*Non sic antiqui et magni philosophi*', '*Extranee, quamuis subtiliter*', or '*Extranee ualde a textu*', whilst others warn against the potential of Sabellianism in Gilbert's work.[88] In contrast, some manuscripts use images to legitimise the potentially heretical nature of Gilbert's text. As Laura Cleaver has argued, in response to these continued debates over Gilbert's orthodoxy, a number of high-quality manuscripts of Gilbert's work were produced in order to legitimise Gilbert's theology and 'promote the value of the

[83] Laura Cleaver, 'Heretic or hero? Posthumous Representations of Gilbert of Poitiers in texts and images before 1200', *Word and Image*, 26:3 (2010), pp. 285-296 (p. 285). See also Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers*, pp. 10-13.
[84] Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers*, p. 11; Cleaver, 'Heretic or hero?', pp. 285-6.
[85] Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers*, p. 14 provides a list of the surviving manuscripts of Gilbert's Commentary on Boethius, pp. 16-34, and Theresa Gross-Diaz *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers*, pp. 160-180 provides a list of the manuscripts of Gilbert's Psalms Commentary. Unfortunately, neither of these lists includes Fulda Hessische Landesbibliothek ms Aa51.
[86] Cleaver, 'Heretic or hero?', p. 287.
[87] Walter of St Victor, *Le Contra quatuor labyrinthos Franciae de Gauthier de Saint-Victor*, ed. P. Glorieux, 'Le Contra quatuor labyrinthos Franciae de Gauthier de Saint-Victor, Édition critique', *Archives d'histoire et littéraire du moyen âge*, vol. 19 (1952), pp. 187-335 (p. 201).
[88] Häring, *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers*, pp. 40-1.

master and his ideas.'[89] Through their very form, these lavish manuscript productions suggest that Gilbert is an important figure, worthy of the status implied by a heavily illuminated text. Three of these manuscripts also contain images of the author himself.[90] In the majority of these representations, Gilbert is shown as an authoritative figure, presiding over students and actively engaged in the composition of his work. As Cleaver argues, these images present Gilbert as 'a man of the church, who could speak with authority on the nature of God', reinforcing his reputation as an orthodox theologian.[91]

Many late twelfth-century copies of Gilbert's work thus include images that serve to both illustrate and legitimise Gilbert's ideas. This strategy is apparent in one particular copy of his Commentary on the Psalms produced in southwest Germany in the last quarter of the twelfth century.[92] Here, instead of any 'portrait' of Gilbert himself composing the Psalms, we find an image of the Trinity is depicted in the initial 'D' beginning Psalm 109, glossed with Gilbert's commentary, which serves as on orthodox statement on the Trinity (figs. 3.1, 3.1a). Shown alongside a depiction of David harping, this Trinitarian initial offers a literal interpretation of the Psalm that ties the doctrine of the Trinity firmly to the words of Psalm 109. In doing so, the image explicitly connects Gilbert's exegesis to King David's words, eliminating any allusion to the problematic Trinitarian ideas for which Bernard condemned Gilbert. Thus, the interrelationship between text and image in the Fulda Commentary effectively clarifies and authorizes Gilbert's interpretation, which is outlined by the scribe underneath the initial alongside the Psalm.

Manuscript evidence shows that Gilbert's Commentary on the Psalms was remarkably popular, and travelled quickly through Europe. Though the largest number of manuscripts were produced in northeastern France, mid-twelfth-century copies survive from a far afield as Austria, Italy, the north of England and Spain.[93] The earliest of these manuscripts date from the early 1140s, though Gross-Diaz has argued for a much earlier date for Gilbert's composition of the Psalms Commentary, before Anselm's death in 1117 and whilst Gilbert was still at Laon.[94] It is probable, however, that the Commentary wasn't published until

[89] Cleaver, 'Heretic or hero?', p. 287.
[90] Valenciennes Bibliothèque Municipale MS 197, ff. 4v-5r, f. 7r, f. 9r, f. 36v; Basel Universitätbibliothek MS O. II. 24, f. 14r, f. 92v; Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine MS 656, f. 5r.
[91] Cleaver, 'Heretic or hero?', p. 294.
[92] Gilbert of Poitiers, *Commentary on the Psalms*, Southwest Germany, third quarter of the twelfth century (Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek ms aa51). For a description of the manuscript see Regina Hausmann, *Die theologischen Handschriften der Hessischen Landesbibliothek Fulda bis zum Jahr 1600: Codices Bonifatiani 1-3, Aa 1-145a* (Wiesbaden, 1992), pp. 117-8.
[93] Gross-Diaz, *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers*, p. 28.
[94] For a discussion of the debates surrounding the date of the Commentary's composition see Gross-Diaz, *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers*, pp. 27-35.

Gilbert began his teaching career at Chartres and Paris in the 1130s, explaining why most of the earliest extant manuscripts date from the 1140s and 50s.[95]

As both Christopher De Hamel and Gross-Diaz have shown, the manuscripts containing Gilbert's commentary typically take one of two forms.[96] The simplest layout of the commentary consists of two columns per page, with the text presented in a continuous prose that integrates the words of the Psalm with Gilbert's commentary. In the majority of manuscripts however, the Psalm text is laid out in a large script on the inside column of the page, whilst Gilbert's commentary is positioned on a much wider, outside column. As Gross-Diaz has argued, this particular format, in which the Psalm text is shown in its entirety alongside the commentary, is likely designed for non-monastic students, who may not have known the Psalms by heart.[97]

The manuscript of Gilbert's Psalms Commentary in the Fulda Hessische Landesbibliothek uses the second of these two formats, showing Gilbert's commentary in a much more condensed format in a wider outside column, whilst the Psalms text is shown in a much larger script on the inside column. This would suggest that the Fulda manuscript was intended for a scholarly, non-monastic audience. Furthermore, though the manuscript does contain some initials, none of these are luxury productions, and completed in simple colours such as red, blue and green.[98] In fact, the initial of the Trinity and David on f. 65r is completed in the same red and black ink that is used for the text, rather than being fully illuminated and painted. This would suggest that the manuscript was not produced for a high-end, luxury market. It also suggests that the scribe who was responsible for copying the text could also have designed the initial. The script is completed in a neat, careful hand, and the layout and form of the manuscript kept consistent throughout, meaning the manuscript would certainly not have been a cheap production. Bearing in mind the wide scholarly use of Gilbert's text, it is likely the manuscript in the Fulda Hessische Landesbibliothek would have been produced for a community of this kind. In its current form, the Fulda manuscript only contains Gilbert's commentary of Psalms 79-150, and a colophon records that the manuscript is the second volume of his work.[99] It is likely that the first volume is lost.

---

[95] Ibid, p. 27.
[96] Christopher De Hamel, *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Book Trade* (Woodbridge, 1984), pp. 5-7; Gross-Diaz, *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers*, pp. 35-51.
[97] Gross-Diaz, *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers*, p. 37.
[98] The manuscript contains one other illustrated initial, with an image of a lion, on f. 64r.
[99] f. 1r: 'hec secunda pars spalterii est ecclesie…'; the remainder of the inscription has been damaged. See Hausmann, *Die theologischen Handschriften der Hessischen Landesbibliothek*, p. 118.

The Seated Trinity in the initial of Psalm 109 in the Fulda manuscript shows a conscious effort to depict the Trinity in literal reference to the words of the Psalm. The Trinity itself is shown inside the rounded border of the initial 'D'. The Father, depicted to the right of the initial, is shown seated on a jeweled throne, looking directly out at the viewer, with his right arm raised in a gesture of blessing. He holds a jeweled book in his left arm, and his left knee is raised slightly above the right. The Father has a youthful face with no beard and long hair that falls down his back, and he is shown with a plain halo. To his right, the figure of Christ seems to emerge from the frame of the initial 'D'. Christ's right leg and shoulder are hidden behind the frame, but his left leg is raised as if he is climbing atop the throne to sit beside the Father. Christ's face is shown in three-quarter profile, looking towards the Father on his left. He holds both of his hands upwards towards the Father, and his left hand just touches his shoulder. Like the Father, Christ has a youthful face, without a beard and long hair that falls behind his shoulders. He is, however, shown with a cruciform halo, which clearly identifies him as the crucified Son. The dove is shown flying upwards between the two figures of the Father and Son, with the curve of its outstretched wings following the shape of the Father's halo and the side of Christ's face. This detail serves to visually unite the three persons of the Trinity.

The figure of David is positioned to the left of the initial 'D', under an additional rounded arch that extends from the border of the initial. He is seated upon a dog-headed throne, and shown wearing regal attire, with a crown and jeweled garments. These kingly attributes are reiterated in the regal setting of the architectural frame, which has jeweled column shafts and arches and elaborate capitals and bases. With his left hand, David plays the harp balanced on his knee, whilst in his right hand he holds an unfolding scroll that bears the opening words of the Psalm. This detail serves to underscore David's role as author of the Psalm, clearly outlining his primacy as author over that of Gilbert. The image of David also grounds Gilbert's commentary in an orthodox, biblical context.

Gross-Diaz, in her analysis of the sources for Gilbert's Psalms commentary, has argued that Gilbert displays a 'radical dependency' on Augustine's *Enarrationes in Psalmos* and Cassiodorus' *Expositio Psalmorum* in his work.[100] Gilbert's commentary on Psalm 109 illustrates his use of these two authorities.[101] The commentary opens with a statement on the overall subject matter of the Psalm, which presents a condensed and shortened version of Cassiodorus' introduction to Psalm 109 in his exposition.[102] Gilbert writes that the Psalm

[100] Gross-Diaz, *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers*, p. 99.
[101] Ibid, p. 102.
[102] Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalterium*, ed. J. P. Migne, PL (Paris, 1865), vol. 70, col. 792-799, trans. P. G. Walsh, *Cassiodorus: Explanation of the Psalms*, vol. 3 (New York, 1991), pp. 120-129.

speaks of Christ's dual nature, and, to a limited extent, his incarnation and the all-powerful nature of his divinity.[103] He goes on to quote from the opening words of John's gospel, conflating the opening line of verse one 'in the beginning was the word', with verse fourteen, 'and the word was made flesh'.[104] In this respect, Gilbert departs from Cassiodorus' introduction to the Psalm, which only refers to the evangelist's first verse.[105] These verses from John's gospel are discussed by both authors in reference to the third verse of Psalm 109, which states: 'With thee is the principality of the day in the day of thy strength: in the brightness of the saints: from the womb before the day star I begot thee'.[106] Cassiodorus and Gilbert believed both of these scriptural references to be an indication of Christ's existence before he came to earth, and evidence that he was with the Father during creation. However, Gilbert's addition of a verse that refers specifically to Christ's incarnation presents a wider scope than is offered by Cassiodorus, situating the Psalm within the theme of Christ's incarnation as well as the narrative of creation.

The main body of Gilbert's commentary relies more heavily on Augustine's exposition of Psalm 109 in *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, though still drawing on Cassiodorus' commentary.[107] Significantly, two themes discussed by both Augustine and Cassiodorus are also emphasised in Gilbert's text. The first is the interpretation of the opening verse of the Psalm as conversation between the Father and the Son, and the implication that this verse refers to the Father inviting the Son to come and sit beside him. Augustine clearly designates the respective roles of the Father and the Son through his description of their placement on the throne, stating that:

> Christ, therefore, sits at the right hand of God, the Son is on the right hand of the Father, hidden from us. Let us believe. Two things are here said: that God said "sit on my right hand" and added "until I make your enemies your footstall", that is, beneath your feet.[108]

---

[103] Gilbert of Poitiers, *Commentary on the Psalms*: 'Psalmus iste de dualibus naturis septimus in christe plene. et breviterque de incarnatione et omnipotens divinitate dicturus': All transcriptions and translations of this text are the author's own from Fulda Hessische Landesbibliothek MS Aa51, f. 65r.

[104] Gilbert of Poitiers, *Commentary on the Psalms*: 'Sic est johanus in evangelio. In principio erat verbum et verbum erat caro factus est'.

[105] Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalterium*, ed. Migne, vol.70, col. 792, trans. Walsh, *Explanation of the Psalms*, p. 120.

[106] Psalm 109:3: 'Tecum principium in die virtutis tuae in splendoribus sanctorum; ex utero, ante luciferum genui te'.

[107] For a discussion of Gilbert's commentary on Psalm 109 compared to that of Augustine and Cassiodrous see Gross-Diaz, *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers*, p. 102.

[108] Augustine, *Enerratio in Psalmum*: 'Sedet ergo a dextris Dei Christus, a dextris Patris Filius in occulto est: credamus. Etenim duas res hic dicit, quia et dixit Deus: "Sede a dextris meus"; et addidit, "donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum", hoc est, sub pedibus tuis', ed. Migne, PL, vol. 37 (Paris, 1885), cols. 1445-1462, (col. 1452), trans. John Henry Parker, *Expositions on the Book of Psalms,* vol. V (Oxford, 1853), pp. 229-255 (p. 232).

Cassiodorus takes a much less literal approach to this verse, commenting that, though the Father does invite the Son to sit at his right hand, this is communicated not through a verbal invitation but a mutual understanding between the two figures. He writes:

> The Father says to the Son words which He did not utter from the mouth, and which the Son did not take in with eager ears. The Father wills and the Son knows; the Son wills and the Father knows.[109]

In his interpretation of the communication between the Father and Son, Cassiodorus is clear to emphasise the unity of these two persons. Gilbert combines and reduces the elaborate commentaries offered by Augustine and Cassiodorus into a single concise statement: "'Lord" (meaning) Father, "my lord" (meaning) son, "said" this: "sit at my right hand"'.[110] Thus, the first Lord, the Father, is shown to speak the words "sit at my right hand" to the second Lord of the Psalm, the Son.

Furthermore, as in Augustine and Cassiodorus' expositions, Gilbert's commentary situates the Psalm at a precise moment in Christological time, after Christ's death, Resurrection and Ascension into Heaven. In his discussion of Christ's Ascension, Augustine emphasises the importance of Christ's human nature at this moment:

> So in that very circumstance, that Christ took upon Him the flesh, that He died in the flesh, that He rose again in the same flesh, that in the same he ascended into heaven, and sits on the right hand of his Father, in the same flesh so honoured, so brightened, so changed in heavenly garb.[111]

Cassiodorus similarly discusses the role of Christ's human nature in relation to his Ascension:

> After his glorious resurrection, the Son as Conqueror, triumphing over the whole world through his Holy incarnation, is offered the seat of honour so that the glory of humanity which He assumed can be emphasised by this position.[112]

---

[109] Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalterium*: 'Pater dixit ad Filium quod nec ille ore protulit, nec ille auribus intentis audivit. Vult enim Pater, et novit Filius; vult Filius, et novit Pater': ed. Migne, PL, vol. 70, col. 793, trans. Walsh, *Explanation of the Psalms*, p. 121.
[110] Gilbert of Poitiers, *Commentary on the Psalms*: "'Dominus" Pater "domino meo" filio "dixit" hoc "sede a dextris meus"'.
[111] Augustine, *Enerratio in Psalmum*: 'Ergo et eo ipso quod carnem accepit Christus, quod in carne mortuus est, quod in eadem carne resurreexit, quod in eadem ascendit in coelum et sedet ad dexteram Patris, et in eadem ipse carne sic honorata, sic clarificata, sic in coelestem habitum commutata', ed. Migne, PL, vol. 37, col. 1450, trans. Parker, *Expositions on the Book of Psalms*, p. 240.
[112] Cassiodorus, *Expositio in Psalterium*: 'Victori Filio et per sanctum incarnationem totius mundi triumphatori, post resurrectionis gloriam honorabilis consessus offertur, ut per hunc situm susceptae

Both Augustine and Cassiodorus, though highlighting the importance of Christ's incarnation in the process of his Ascension, clearly outline the final place of Christ in heaven as sitting at the right hand of the Father. This is also made explicit in Gilbert's commentary. He states: 'That which is said "the seat", has been fulfilled in [Christ] the man after the Ascension, because he observed the locality of the seat'.[113]

The iconographic nuances of the Seated Trinity in the Fulda manuscript present a thoughtful representation of Gilbert's commentary. The Father and Son are visually differentiated, and easily identified, by the differences in their haloes. The artist's expression of the figural action also reveals his work to be a careful interpretation of Gilbert's commentary. The Son is shown in the process of ascending to the throne to accompany the Father, hurrying to respond to his invitation to sit at his right hand. The portrayal of Christ rushing to the throne and twisting in three-quarter profile also emphasises his dynamic humanity. However, one particular element of the illustration, the dove of the Holy Spirit, presents a significant visual departure from Gilbert's commentary. The Holy Spirit is not mentioned once in Gilbert's text, and neither is the Trinity; the commentary's emphasis is clearly on the relationship between the Father and the Son, and particularly on the divine and human nature of Christ. The addition of the dove of the Holy Spirit in the Fulda manuscript illustration thus complicates the idea that the artist presents a straightforward, literal explication of the commentary, which, without the image, has a clear Christological focus, rather than a Trinitarian one.

In light of the controversy surrounding Gilbert of Poitiers' attitude towards the Trinity, perhaps this too is a thoughtful choice on the part of the artist. Whilst the representations of the Father and Son correspond directly to the themes established in Gilbert's text, the artist's addition of the Holy Spirit, and thus the transformation of this image into the Trinity, is a design choice that has been made independently from the accompanying commentary. It is possible that the initial may instead have functioned as a response to the wider societal developments related to Gilbert's trial and orthodoxy. The ambiguous status of Gilbert's orthodoxy after his trial in 1148, and the types of additions – both visual and textual, positive and negative – in later copies of his work implies that compilers (and students) of Gilbert's writings were actively participating in affirming or denying his orthodox status. The designer of the Fulda initial has copied Gilbert's text without

humanitatis gloria declaretur', ed. Migne, PL, vol. 70, col. 793, trans. Walsh, *Explanation of the Psalms*, p. 122.

[113] Gilbert of Poitiers, *Commentary on the Psalms*: 'Quod ait 'Sede' post ascensionem impletum est in homine, quia situm locale notat'.

censorship or criticism, but with respect. The inclusion of an illustration of David and the Seated Trinity in the initial for Psalm 109 appears to function as an endorsement of Gilbert's text. The image presents a 'literal' representation of the triune God, drawing directly on the words of scripture, rather than abstract notions associated with Gilbert's dialectic, linguistic approach to the Trinitarian doctrine that had attracted Bernard of Clairvaux's accusation of heresy. Significantly, the image contextualises the Trinity within the narrative theme of the Ascension and specifically differentiates between the figures of the Father and the Son, thus drawing directly not only on the authority of Gilbert's commentary, but also the themes expressed in Augustine and Cassiodorus' expositions on Psalm 109. The image thus transmits an interpretation of the Trinity that is legitimised through its association with the writings of the Church Fathers, and in doing so confirms the orthodoxy of Gilbert's own Trinitarian doctrine. The inventive and dynamic aspects of the iconography of this 'seated' Trinity connect Gilbert's exegesis, which synthesise the works of earlier theologians, directly to King David's words, bypassing the condemnation of Gilbert by Bernard. Thus, the interrelationship between text and image in the Fulda Landesbibliothek Commentary serves as an effective and thoughtful endorsement of Gilbert's interpretation of the Trinity.

Trinitarian Orthodoxy at the Turn of the Thirteenth Century

A survey of the Trinitarian controversies of the twelfth century reveals the diversity among the types of accusations brought against these 'heretical' theologians. Whilst, at the Council of Soissons in 1092, Roscelin was condemned for what his opponents perceived to be an argument for the existence of three separate gods, Abelard's second trial at the Council of Soissons in 1120 and Sens in 1140/1 focused on his distinction between the three persons of the Trinity, whilst Gilbert, on the other hand, was accused of claiming that the divine essence was not truly God, and that the properties of the three persons did not constitute the persons themselves. As a number of historians have argued, the accusations leveled against these three theologians at their respective trials, rather than concerning one particular interpretation of Trinitarian doctrine, can be viewed as the reactionary response of leading church figures, such as Anselm and Bernard of Clairvaux, to changes in the study of theology in the twelfth century.[114] What unites Roscelin, Abelard and Gilbert is their application of logic, dialectic and philosophical linguistics to the subject of the Trinity, rendering, in the eyes of more traditional churchmen, their explanation and understanding of the Trinity problematic and heretical.

[114] Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology*; M. L. Colish, 'Systematic theology and theological renewal in the twelfth century', in *Studies in Scholasticism*, ed. M. L. Colish (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006); Mews and Monagle, 'Peter Lombard, Joachim of Fiore and the Fourth Lateran Council', pp. 81-122.

Though some of these suspicions of the scholastic approach to doctrines such as the Trinity persisted after the major trials of the 1140s, the work of John Baldwin and, in particular, Clare Monagle has shown how the late twelfth and early thirteenth century saw a significant shift in attitudes to the methods formerly viewed as inappropriate for theological study.[115] Monagle argues that this period witnessed an 'emerging institutionalization of dialectical reasoning,' which culminated in the support of Peter Lombard's approach to the Trinity in favour of that of Joachim of Fiore at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215.[116] The Church's dramatic departure from their earlier stance on the application of logic and dialectic to the subject of the Trinity can be explained in part by the increasing number of schoolmen in papal positions at the turn of the thirteenth century.[117] This section outlines the response of the Fourth Lateran Council to the respective Trinitarian views of Joachim of Fiore and Peter Lombard, and considers the process by which Peter Lombard's Trinitarian doctrine was accepted and embraced by the Church.

Joachim of Fiore, Peter Lombard and the Fourth Lateran Council (1215)

In its opening Canon, the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215 laid out their definition of Trinitarian belief:

> We firmly believe and simply confess, that there is one only true God, eternal, without measure, omnipotent, unchangeable, incomprehensible, and ineffable, the Father, and the Son, and Holy Spirit; three Persons indeed but one simple essence, substance, or nature altogether; the Father of none, the Son of the Father alone, and the Holy Ghost of both alike, without beginning always and without end; the Father begetting, the Son begotten, and the Holy Ghost proceeding; consubstantial and coequal, co-omnipotent and coeternal, the one principle of all things, the creator of all things visible and invisible, spiritual and corporeal[…]. This Holy Trinity in its common essence undivided and in personal properties divided.[118]

---

[115] J. W. Baldwin, 'The Intellectual Preparation for the Canon of 1215 against Ordeals', *Speculum*, 36 (1961), pp. 613-66; J. W. Baldwin, *Master's, Princes and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chancer and his Circle*, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1970); Monagle, 'Theology, Practice and Policy at the Turn of the Thirteenth Century', p. 442.
[116] Monagle, 'Theology, Practice and Policy', p. 442.
[117] Ibid.
[118] Fourth Lateran Council, Canon 1: 'Firmiter credimus et simpliciter confitemur quod unus solus est verus Deus eternus et immensus omnipotens incommutabilis incomprehensiblis et ineffabilis Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus tres quidem persone sed una essentia substantia seu natura simplex omnino. Pater a nullo Filius autem a solo Patre ac Spiritus Sanctus ab utroque pariter absque initio semper et fine. Pater generans Filius nascens et Spiritus Sanctus procedens consubstantiales et coequales coomnipotentes et coeterni unum universorum principium creator omnium invisibilium et visibilium spiritualium et corporalium… Hic sancta Trinitas secundum communem essentiam

This Canon marks a significant departure from twelfth-century ideas about orthodox Trinitarian doctrine. In stating specifically that the Trinity was 'in personal properties divided' (*personales proprietates discreta*), the Fourth Lateran Council approved an interpretation that had previously been considered heretical. As we have seen, Peter Abelard had been criticised for emphasising the individuality of the three persons of the Trinity through their 'personal properties' (*personales proprietates*), and Gilbert of Poitiers was condemned for insinuating that the properties of the three persons were not related to their substance. By establishing a definition of the Trinity that acknowledged both a 'common essence' (*communem essentiam*) and personal properties (*personales proprietates*), the Fourth Lateran Council embraced an interpretation of the Trinity previously the reserve of theologians who, because of this stance, had remained on the peripheries of twelfth-century scholastic life.

This opening statement was followed, in canon two, by a condemnation of a 'book or tract by Abbot Joachim published against Master Peter Lombard, concerning the unity or essence of the Trinity' (*libellum sive tractatum quem abbas Ioachim edidit contra magistrum Petrum Lombardum de unitate seu essentia Trinitatis*). Joachim is accused of distorting the unity of the three Persons of the Godhead:

> We condemn, therefore, and reprobate the book or tract which Abbott Joachim published against Master Peter Lombard concerning the unity or essence of the Trinity, calling him heretical and insane because he said in his Sentences that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are some supreme entity in which there is no begetting, no begotten, and no proceeding. Whence he asserts that he (Peter Lombard) attributed to God not so much a trinity as a quarternity, namely, three Persons and that common essence as a fourth, clearly protesting that there is no entity that is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, neither is it essence or substance or nature, though he concedes that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one essence, one substance, and one nature.[119]

---

individua et secundum personales proprietates discreta…' ed. G. Alberigo et al. *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, p. 231, trans. *English Historical Documents III, 1189-1327*, ed. H. Rothwell (London, 1975), p. 661.

[119] 'Damnamus ergo et reprobamus libellum sive tractatum quem abbas Ioachim edidit contra magistrum Petrum Lombardum de unitate seu essentia Trinitatis appellans ipsum hæreticum et insanum pro eo quod in suis dixit sententiis quoniam quædam summa res est Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus et illa non est generans neque genita nec procedens unde asserit quod ille non tam Trinitatem quam quaternitatem adstruebat in Deo videlicet tres personas et illam communem essentiam quasi quartam manifeste protestans quod nulla res est quæ sit Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus nec est essentia nec substantia nec natura quamvis concedat quod Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus sunt una essentia una substantia una que natura', ed. G. Alberigo et al. *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, p. 231, trans. Rothwell, *English Historical Documents*, pp. 662-3.

In contrast, aligning themselves with the views of Peter Lombard, the council maintains that in the Trinity is one entity, essence, substance and divine nature, which unites the three persons:

> But we, with the approval of the holy and general council, believe and confess with Peter (Lombard) that there is one supreme entity, incomprehensible and ineffable, which is truly Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, together three persons and each one of them singly.[120]

As we shall see, the Council's description of the Trinity as 'one supreme entity' (*una quaedam summa res*) is taken directly from a section of Peter Lombard's *Sentences* that in the twelfth century had been criticised as heretical.[121] In not only upholding Peter Lombard's general interpretation of the Trinity, but quoting directly from a passage that only a decade before would have been viewed as unorthodox, this description demonstrates the extent to which attitudes towards Trinitarian theology, and to the methods and practices associated with theology more generally, had changed by 1215.

Together the two opening canons of Lateran IV, in simultaneously condemning the work of Joachim of Fiore and upholding that of Peter Lombard, defined the position of the Fourth Lateran Council in relation to the Trinitarian debates of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries and in doing so established what has been considered an 'orthodox' definition of the Trinity, exemplified in the work of Peter Lombard.[122] Considered within the context of the other twelfth-century trials condemning theologians for their views on the Trinity, the Council's support of Peter Lombard and condemnation of Joachim of Fiore marks a considerable departure in attitudes to Trinitarian doctrine.

Peter Lombard's Trinitarian Theology

Peter Lombard's 'scholastic' approach to the subject of the Trinity, as well as to the myriad of other topics he discusses in his theological works, was probably derived from his time in Paris as a teacher, rather than his formal and more 'traditional' training in Rheims under

---

[120] 'Nos autem sacro et universali concilio approbante credimus et confitemur cum Petro quod una quedam summa res est incomprehensibilis quidem et ineffabilis que veraciter est Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus tres simul personae ac sigillatim…' ed. G. Alberigo et al. *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, p. 231, trans. Rothwell, *English Historical Documents*, pp. 662-3. Brackets my own.

[121] Peter Lombard, *Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae*, Liber I, dist. 5, cap. 1, no. 6: 'cum enim una et summa quaedam res sit divina essentia', ed. Ignatius Brady, *Magistri Petri Lombardi Parisiensis Episcopi, Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae,* Editiones Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras, 3 vols. (Rome, 1971-1981), I, part 1 (1971), p. 82. For this passage see below, pp. 159-163.

[122] Robb, 'The Fourth Lateran Council's Definition', p. 23.

Alberic (d. 1141).[123] He arrived in Paris from Rheims in 1134, thus transferring from 'an ancient cathedral school that took pride in its tradition, to an emerging urban centre with a multiplicity of schools and increasing interest in the study of secular philosophy'.[124] He studied initially under Hugh of St Victor (c. 1096-1141) before moving to teach at Notre-Dame, where he stayed until his election as bishop of Paris in 1159.[125] During his time at Notre-Dame Peter Lombard completed a number of works, but it is his four volumes of Sentences, the *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, that became one his most commonly used works in the teaching of scholastic theology and provide the most interesting insight into his methodology.[126] The four books deal respectively with the Trinity, Creation, Incarnation and Redemption, and the Sacraments and final ends, and bring together an impressive range of texts, much from the Church Fathers but also from a wide range of work by contemporary masters. As M. L. Colish states, it is the range of material in the *Sentences* that sets the work apart from other contemporary books on theology: Peter Lombard combines a 'remarkably full coverage of the topics discussed by scholastics in this period' and 'gives the highest priority to the most speculative doctrines of the Christian faith.'[127] The books were intended as a clear and detailed reference work to facilitate in the teaching and learning of masters and students in speculative theology, as is reflected in the books' content. The *Sentences* are also structured and organised according to this purpose: departing from earlier glosses which framed the margins of Biblical text with commentary, the *Sentences* compiled various sources under different themes into one coherent whole, to make structured argument within a scholastic setting easier and more accessible. The content and structure of the *Sentences* was influenced by Peter's teaching on systematic theology at

---

[123] Scholarship on Peter Lombard's life and career are extensive. For the most significant works see Ignatius C. Brady, 'Peter Manducator and the Oral Teachings of Peter Lombard', *Antonianum*, 41 (1966), pp. 454-90 (p. 455); Marcia L. Colish, *Peter Lombard*, 2 vols (Leiden, 1994) and 'Peter Lombard and Philosophy', *Issues in Medieval Philosophy: Essays in Honour of Richard C. Dales*, ed. Nancy van Deusen (Ottawa, 2001), pp. 121-129; Philipp W. Rosemann, *Peter Lombard* (Oxford, 2004); Mews and Monagle, 'Peter Lombard, Joachim of Fiore and the Fourth Lateran Council', pp. 81-122; Laura Cleaver, 'The Many Faces of Peter Lombard: Changing Perceptions of a Master in Images Made Between 1150 and 1215', *Spiritual Temporalities in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. Michael Foster (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2010), pp. 33-56.

[124] Mews and Monagle, 'Peter Lombard, Joachim of Fiore and the Fourth Lateran Council', p. 92.

[125] Ibid.

[126] For the Sentences see Colish, *Peter Lombard*, vol. 1, pp. 170-188; Nancy K. Spatz, 'Approaches and Attitudes to a New Theology Textbook: The Sentences of Peter Lombard', *The Intellectual Climate of the Early University: Essays in Honour of Otto Gründler*, ed. Nancy van Deusen (Kalamazoo, 1997), pp. 27-52; Jacques-Guy Bougerol, 'The Church Fathers and the Sentences of Peter Lombard', *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. Irena Backus, 2 vols (Leiden, 1997), I, pp. 113-164; Russell L. Friedman, 'Peter Lombard and the Development of the 'Sentences' Commentary in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries', *Pietro Lombardo: atti del XLIII Convegno Storico Internazionale, Todi, 8-10 Ottobre 2006* (Todi, 2007), pp. 459-478. For his other works see Marcia L. Colish, '*Psalterium Scholasticorum*: Peter Lombard and the Emergence of Scholastic Psalms Exegesis', *Speculum*, vol. 67 (1992), pp. 531-548; Mark Allen Zier, 'Peter Lombard and the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Bible', *A Distinct Voice: Medieval Studies in Honour of Leonard Boyle, O. P.*, ed. Jacqueline Brown and William P. Stoneman (Notre Dame, Ind., 1997), pp. 629-641.

[127] Colish, *Peter Lombard*, I, p. 79.

Notre-Dame, and was continually revised during his years teaching, evolving from the discussions and disputes that took place in his classes.[128] The revised and final edition of the *Sentences*, probably taught in the academic year 1157-58, went into immediate circulation, and, as M. L. Colish notes, its use beyond the scholastic environment in Paris is witnessed by the wide provenance of the early extant manuscript copies of the work.[129] The *Sentences* did however find their most immediate use in the universities and the book was legislated into the theological curriculum of the University of Paris in 1215.[130] The book was hugely influential in teaching and the study of Scripture and theology, and was 'the point of departure for a study of dogmatics in which numerous questions and answers of various degrees of importance had to be dealt with systematically.'[131]

Peter Lombard's analysis of the Trinity in Book 1 of the *Sentences* operates within this framework of systematic theology intended for the instruction of students, and thus differs considerably from Joachim's interpretations of the Trinity both in his written and visual sources. Lombard is concerned throughout his work with the supreme being of God as a metaphysical reality in and of himself as opposed to the ways in which God has chosen to reveal Himself to man.[132] He is thus interested primarily in the linguistic terminology appropriate for describing the relationship between the individual Persons of the Trinity and the divine attributes that they share, identifying the need for terminological distinctions and lexical specifications in the discussion of Trinitarian theology.[133] It is this concern with linguistic accuracy that shapes Peter Lombard's rendering of the Trinity in a way that is subsequently criticised by Joachim of Fiore. The passage quoted at the Fourth Lateran Council for which it is reported that Joachim of Fiore had called Peter Lombard 'heretical and insane' (*hæreticum et insanum*) is taken from Peter Lombard's discussion in the *Sentences* of the terms Father, Son and Holy Spirit and their relationship to the supreme reality.[134] It is here that Peter Lombard uses the phrase with which Joachim finds fault, which is again repeated in the second canon of the Fourth Lateran Council: that the divine essence of God is '*una et summa quaedam res*', a 'one and supreme certain thing'. The phrase itself is taken from Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana*. Augustine states:

> The things which are to be enjoyed, then, are the *Res igitur quibus fruendum est, pater et*

[128] Brady, 'Peter Manducator', p. 455.
[129] M. L. Colish, *Peter Lombard*, p. 25.
[130] M. L. Colish, 'Systematic theology and theological renewal in the twelfth century', p. 136
[131] Evans, *Old Arts and New Theology*, p. 42.
[132] Colish, *Peter Lombard*, p. 80.
[133] Ibid, p. 80.
[134] Fourth Lateran Council, Canon 1: 'Hic sancta Trinitas secundum communem essentiam individua et secundum personales proprietates discreta…' ed. G. Alberigo et al. *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*, p. 231, trans. Rothwell, *English Historical Documents*, p. 661.

Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and the Trinity comprised by them, which is a kind of single, supreme thing, shared by all who enjoy it.[135]	*filius et spiritus sanctus, eademque trinitas, una quaedam summa res communisque omnibus fruentibus ea.*

Peter Lombard initially repeats this clause faithfully in the *Sentences*, in reference to the difference between use and true enjoyment in the Trinity:

The things therefore which are to be enjoyed, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and the same Trinity, are one certain supreme thing.[136]	*Res igitur quibus freundum est, sunt Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus. Eadem tamen Trinitas quaedam summa res.*

However, it is his second use of the phrase, this time in relation to the divine essence of the Trinity, with which Joachim takes issue. On the question of the generation of the three persons of the Trinity, Peter Lombard states that:

It is not to be asserted that the divine essence generated the Son because, since the Son is divine essence, the Son would already be the thing from which he is generated; and so the same thing would generate itself. And so also we say that the divine essence did not generate an essence. Since the one essence is a one and supreme certain thing, if the divine essence generated an essence, then the same thing generated itself, which is not at all possible. But the Father alone begot the Son, and the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.[137]	*Ita etiam non est dicendum quod divina essentiagenuit Filium: quia cum Filius sit divina essential, iam esset Filius res a qua generator; et ita eadem res se ipsam generatet. Ita etiam dicimus quod essential divina non genuit essentiam: cum enim una et summa quaedam res sit divina essentia, si divina essentia essentiam genuit, eadem res se ipsam genuit, quod omnino esse non potest; sed Pater solus genuit Filium, et a Patre et Filio procedit Spiritus Sanctus.*

As Peter Lombard's initial use of the phrase '*una et summa quaedam res*' makes clear, Augustine's statement on the 'one certain supreme thing' had been in reference to 'the Father Son and Holy Spirit and the same Trinity' (*Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus. Eadem tamen Trinitas*), not the divine essence as a distinct concept. In his repetition of the phrase later in the *Sentences*, Peter Lombard subtly distorts the relation of the meaning of the 'one certain supreme thing', from the three persons in Augustine's rendering, to that of the

---

[135] Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, I, 5, ed. Migne, PL, vol. 34 (Paris, 1865), col. 21, trans. R. P. H. Green, *De Doctrina Christiana* (Oxford, 1995), p. 17.
[136] Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, I d. I, c. 2, n. 4, ed. Brady, *Magistri Petri Lombardi*, p. 56, trans. Giulio Silano, *The Sentences, Vol. 1: The Mystery of the Trinity* (Toronto, 2007), p. 42.
[137] Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, I, d. 5, c. 1, n. 6, ed. Brady, *Magistri Petri Lombardi*, p. 82, trans. Silano, *The Sentences*, p. 71.

divine essence. Constant J. Mews and Clare Monagle have argued that this transition is indicative of the twelfth-century context in which Peter Lombard was working. Whilst Augustine, in employing traditional semantic theory, referred without issue to the individual divine persons as plural things or realities in addition to the divine essence, Peter Lombard, working within the context of a scholastic and speculative theology influenced by notions of distinct realities, found this lack of differentiation between the three persons and the divine essence challenging to the idea of a single underlying divine essence; his 'silent modification' of Augustine's definition thus distinguishes the reality of the divine essence from the relative terms 'Father', 'Son' and 'Holy Spirit', which he positions as conceptually distinct from the divine essence.[138] In Peter Lombard's view, the essence must be a unique entity in itself, an '*una et summa quaedam res*', as it cannot generate itself: if the supreme reality, the divine essence, is said to generate or beget, it must only beget itself, which is a metaphysical impossibility.[139]

Though Peter Lombard's *Sentences* was one of the most popular works for use within the university in the later twelfth century, his work was simultaneously met with considerable criticism in the lead up to Lateran IV. Joachim's criticism of Peter Lombard reported by the Council in the 1170s was part of a wider suspicion concerning his work.[140] Much of the allegations made against Peter Lombard concerned his work in book three of the *Sentences*, particularly his discussion on Christology in which he was accused of nihilianism for emphasising the divine nature of Christ to too great a degree and decreasing his humanity to the point of being nothing. His Christology was debated at Tours in the presence of Pope Alexander III (c. 1100-1181) in 1163 and 1164 in Sens, though no official judgement against him was recorded.[141]

In addition to taking issue with Peter Lombard's doctrine of Christology in the *Sentences*, much of the criticism against him also centred on his choice of methodology, namely his misuse of philosophical works and dialectic reasoning. One of Peter Lombard's former students, the Augustinian canon John of Cornwall (d. c. 1200) and Walter of St-Victor criticised his approach throughout the 1170s on the basis that his style of reasoning and methodology distorted Christian orthodoxy.[142] As we have seen, Walter of St-Victor took a particularly strong stance against Peter Lombard by including him as one of four

[138] Mews and Monagle, 'Peter Lombard, Joachim of Fiore and the Fourth Lateran Council', p. 92.
[139] Fiona Robb, 'The Fourth Lateran Council's Definition of Trinitarian Orthodoxy', p. 25.
[140] Mews and Monagle, 'Peter Lombard, Joachim of Fiore and the Fourth Lateran Council', pp. 84-5.
[141] Mews and Monagle, 'Peter Lombard, Joachim of Fiore and the Fourth Lateran Council', p. 107.
[142] Constant J. Mews and Clare Monagle, 'Peter Lombard, Joachim of Fiore and the Fourth Lateran Council', p. 85. For John of Cornwall's opinion of Peter Lombard see N. M. Häring, ed., 'The *Eulogium ad Alexandram Papam tertium* of John of Cornwall', *Medieval Studies*, 13 (1951), pp. 253-300.

'labyrinths' in addition to Peter Abelard, Gilbert of Poitiers and Peter of Poitiers in his polemic treatise *Contra quatuor labyrinthos Franciae*.[143] Joachim's accusations against Peter Lombard, reported at the Fourth Lateran Council and evidenced in the diagrams 'Contra Petrum Lombardum' in the *Liber Figurarum*, thus seems to have been part of a wider questioning of his work in the twelfth century.

Joachim's Trinitarian Figurae *and his Dispute with Peter Lombard*

Joachim of Fiore's scholarly career, conducted almost entirely within monastic institutions, stands in marked contrast to Peter Lombard's.[144] Born in Calabria in southern Italy, he was educated at the court of the Calabrian Giustiziere and spent time as a wandering preacher before becoming a monk and then Abbot of the Benedictine Abbey of Corazzo from 1171.[145] During his time as abbot, Joachim attempted to affiliate his abbey with the Cistercian order, and as part of this effort visited Casamari Abbey in central Italy in 1182/3.[146] It was here that he composed three of his major works: the *Liber de concordia Novie ac Veteris Testamenti*, *Expositio in Apocalypsim* and the *Psalterium decum chordarum*, which were finished by 1200.[147] In the preface to the *Psalterium*, Joachim states that the three main works were designed as symbols of the Trinity, in the formula of Joachim's unique Trinitarian theology in relation to history, in which the time of Adam to Christ represented the Father, the era of Elisha up until the present time the Son, and the days of St Benedict (c. 480-543/547) to the consumption of the age the Spirit: the *Liber Concordia* thus focuses on the prefiguration of the Old Testament in the New Testament; the *Expositio* is concerned with the risen Christ and the interpretation of the New Testament era; and the *Psalterium* with the 'third' or future part of history, what Joachim terms the *Spiritualis*

---

143 Walter of St Victor, *Le Contra quatuor labyrinthos Franciae de Gauthier de Saint-Victor*, ed. P. Glorieux, 'Le Contra quatuor labyrinthos Franciae', p. 201.

144 Scholarship on Joachim of Fiore is extensive. For the most significant studies see Giorgio La Piana, 'Joachim of Flora: A Critical Survey', *Speculum*, 7 (1932), pp. 257-282; Leone Tondelli, Majorie Reeves and Beatrice Hirsch-Reich, *Liber Figurarum: Il libro delle Figure dell'abate Gioacchino da Fiore* (Torino, 1953); Fritz Saxl, 'A Spiritual Encyclopaedia of the Middle Ages', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 5 (1942), pp. 82-142; Marjorie Reeves, *The Influence of Prophesy in the Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism* (Oxford, 1969); Marjorie Reeves and Beatrice Hirsch-Reich, *The Figurae of Joachim of Fiore* (Oxford, 1972); Bernard McGinn, *The Calabrian Abbot: Joachim of Fiore in the History of Western Thought* (New York, 1985); Mews and Monagle, 'Peter Lombard, Joachim of Fiore and the Fourth Lateran Council', pp. 81-122; *Joachim of Fiore and the Influence of Inspiration: Essays in Memory of Marjorie E. Reeves (1905-2003)*, ed. Julia Eva Wannenmacher (Farnham, 2013); *A Companion to Joachim of Fiore*, ed. Matthias Riedl (Leiden, 2018).

145 For a useful summary of Joachim's life and works see Alfredo Gatto, 'The Life and Works of Joachim of Fiore: An Overview', *A Companion to Joachim of Fiore*, pp. 20-40.

146 Alfredo Gatto, 'The Life and Works of Joachim of Fiore', pp. 23-28.

147 Though the identification of genuine works by Joachim is often hard to establish due to the large number of Pseudo-Joachimist works completed after his death, scholars have now established more firmly a collection of around ten distinct works. In particular see La Piana, 'Joachim of Flora: A Critical Survey', pp. 257-282; Reeves and Hirsch-Reich, *The Figurae of Joachim of Fiore*, p. 20.

Intellectus.[148] Joachim also perceived the condition of the works' creation as an echo of the relationship between the three Persons of the Trinity, again stating in the preface to the *Psalterium* that the third work (the *Psalterium*) proceeded in thought from the first two (the *Liber Concordia* and *Expositio*), as the Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son, and that no one work was designed to be separated from the others, as no one Person of the Trinity can be separated from the others.[149] In their very creation each work was thus designed to be one part of a whole, and the overlap in content between the works is indicative of Joachim's intention, as outlined in the preface to the *Psalterium*, to create a three-in-one body of work.

A further source for understanding Joachim's visual methodology and his extensive use of diagrams is the *Liber Figurarum*, a work comprised of a considerable collection of Joachim's figures and which survives extant in manuscript form in three complete copies and five fragments.[150] As the 'book or tract' (*libellum sive tractatum*) mentioned in the Fourth Lateran Council as containing Joachim's response to Peter Lombard is no longer extant, these diagrams are also the sole witness, along with the Lateran Council's account, of the details of his opposition to the Lombard's Trinitarian theology.[151] The authenticity of the *Liber Figurarum* has been much debated on the basis that no record survives of Joachim's authorship: unlike the *Liber Concordia*, *Expositio* and *Psalterium*, which are all recorded by Joachim's as his own work in his Testamentary letter to Pope Innocent III in 1200, no contemporary source refers to the *Liber Figurarum* as belonging to Joachim's canon.[152] Nevertheless, Reeves and Hirsch-Reich have argued persuasively for the genuine character of the *Liber Figurarum*, on the basis that many of the figures in the *Liber Figurarum* are intimately related to the textual figures in Joachim's three main works and that the work is constructed in a way characteristic of his other texts, for example with attention to the two patterns of number-symbolism unique to Joachim's work.[153] They conclude that it is likely

---

[148] Joachim of Fiore, *Psalterium decum chordarum*, f. 227v in Reeves, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle* Ages, pp. 24-5.
[149] Ibid.
[150] Complete copies of the work survive in Oxford Corpus Christi MS 255 A, ff. 4-14; Reggio Emilia, Episcopal Seminary, ff. 1-20; Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek MS A 121, ff. 87-96. The Reggio Emilia manuscript was discovered by Leone Tondelli in 1937, and the Oxford manuscript was identified by Fritz Saxl in 1942. See Tondelli, Reeves and Hirsch-Reich, *Liber Figurarum: Il libro delle Figure dell'abate Gioacchino da Fiore* and Saxl, 'A Spiritual Encyclopaedia of the Middle Ages', pp. 82-142. See also Berhard McGinn, 'Image as Insight in Joachim of Fiore's *Figurae*', *Envisioning Experience in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Dynamic Patterns in Texts and Images*, ed. Giselle De Nie and Thomas F. X. Noble (Abingdon, 2012), pp. 93-118.
[151] Robb, 'The Fourth Lateran Council's Definition', p. 26. As Robb states, all other references to Joachim's theological position rely on the Fourth Lateran Council account.
[152] For Joachim's letter see *Abbot Joachim of Fiore: Liber de Concordia Noui Ac Veteris Testamenti*, ed. Randolphe Daniel, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 73 (Philadelphia, 1983), pp. 4-6.
[153] Reeves and Hirsch-Reich, *The Figurae of Joachim of Fiore*, pp. 75-98.

that Joachim himself composed the Liber Figurarum, or executed under his direct supervision by one of his close disciples, around c. 1200.[154]

A set of figures '*Contra Petrum Lombardum*' provides an interesting visual explanation of Joachim's attack on Peter Lombard's Trinitarian theology, which led to his condemnation at Lateran IV (fig. 3.2). The only version of the *Liber Figurarum* in which the figures survive is in the manuscript now in Dresden, though there is evidence to suggest that the images may have been removed from a *Liber Figurarum* manuscript in Reggio Emilia due to their controversial nature.[155] The group of figures is comprised of four similar but subtly different diagrams, which present in visual form Joachim's reasoning behind his accusation against Peter Lombard. The first diagram is labelled '*Fides Catholici*', and outlines Joachim's view of the 'true' and orthodox Trinitarian doctrine: here a circle is used to represent the '*essentia*' of the Trinity, from which three channels of the three Persons flow, each with the circle as their source. The channels are arranged so that the second channel, labelled '*Filius*' flows out of that of the first, labelled '*Pater*', but the third, '*Spiritus Sanctus*', flows separately and individually from the circular '*essentia*' which is also named '*Pater*'. This peculiar arrangement of the channels was not addressed by Reeves and Hirsch-Reich in their work on the *figurae*, but instead analysed by Harold Lee, who argues that this double naming of the Father and division of the channels is intended to represent the twofold sending forth of the Son and the Holy Spirit by the Father: the Son is shown as initially sent forth from the Father in the uppermost channel, whilst the Holy Spirit is shown as sent forth from the circular '*Pater*' from whom the Son flows.[156] According to his reading, the figure is thus intended to be read as 'first a circle from which two channels extend (and thus an overall Trinity), and secondly as an intermingling of the Father and Son in the subdivided channel (and circle), who send forth from their intermixture the Holy Spirit' in the third channel.[157] The text to the right of the diagram, which reads '*Singulum istorum aqua et simul tria una aqua*' is concurrent with this idea: the instruction to think of the figure, and the Trinity, through the analogy of water, supports the reading of the diagram as a 'living dynamic process', a 'constant flow' in which the Father and Son intermingle to produce the Spirit in the manner of a body of water.[158] Reinforcing this idea, the circle from which the channels lead is shown as flowing uninterrupted into each of the channels, creating an important distinction between this diagram and the one below representing Joachim's view of Peter Lombard's Trinitarian theology.

---

[154] Reeves and Hirsch-Reich, *The Figurae of Joachim of Fiore*, p. 97.
[155] Ibid, p. 212.
[156] Harold Lee, 'The Anti-Lombard Figures of Joachim of Fiore: A Re-Interpretation' in *Prophecy and Millenarianism: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Reeves* (Harlow: Longman, 1980), p. 136 (pp. 127-142).
[157] Ibid, p. 136.
[158] Marjorie Reeves and Beatrice Hirsch-Reich, *The Figurae of Joachim of Fiore*, p. 213

The 'heresy' of Peter Lombard is represented in the fourth and final diagram, and is shown as a mirror of Joachim's '*Fides Catholici*' diagram, though with a number of important differences. Significantly, the three channels of the Persons, which also extend from a circular figure, are shown as cut off from their source, the '*essentia*'. This simple but effective difference exemplifies Joachim's criticism of Peter Lombard, that he had emphasised the divine essence and unity of the Godhead to such a degree as to make it a separate, fourth entity, cut off from the three additional Persons, thus creating a Quarternity.[159] The circular figure in the fourth diagram is also devoid of the label '*Pater*' that is given to the circle in the '*Fides Catholici*' diagram, again emphasising Joachim's criticism of Peter Lombard that he had overemphasised the '*essentia*' of the Trinity to the extent that it had become another Person. To the right of the diagram is written the key phrase from Peter Lombard's passage on the Trinity in the *Sentences*: '*summa res communis tribus personis nec igenita, nec genita, nec procedens*', so that though the diagram is not explicitly named as concerning Peter Lombard's interpretation of the Trinity, the association to his work is clear.[160] In between these two figures are two further diagrams, each representing another Trinitarian 'heresy': the first, labelled '*Perfidia Sabellii*' represents the Sabellian heresy of anti-trinitarianism as one straight line, representing the one God; the second, the Arian heresy ('*Perfidia Arii*') which denied the unity of the three Persons, is shown in three separate lines of different lengths which represent the separate persons of the Father, Son and Spirit. In this way, Joachim groups Lombard's interpretation of the Trinity alongside that of two of the most famous heretics.

In the absence of the 'book or tract' referred to at the Fourth Lateran Council as Joachim of Fiore's published attack against Peter Lombard, the diagrams against Peter Lombard in the *Liber Figurarum* provide a unique insight into the specifics of Joachim's charges against Peter Lombard's Trinitarian theology.[161] They reveal that the assertion in canon two of the Council's proceedings, that Joachim had accused Peter Lombard of creating a Quarternity with the essence of the Trinity as the fourth Person, has some grounding in Joachim's work: it is with this specific point on the creation of a fourth Person in the Trinity that the diagrams against Peter Lombard in the *Liber Figurarum* take issue. Furthermore, Joachim's figures against Peter Lombard provide another interesting insight into his methodology. His response to Lombard's views on the Trinity in the form of a diagram suggests that Joachim

[159] Ibid, p. 25.
[160] 'The essence is a certain supreme thing, which is common to the three persons and is neither ungenerated, nor generated, nor proceeding.' This is a paraphrase from Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, I, d. 5, c. 1, 6: '…cum enim una et summa quaedam res sit divina essentia, si divina essentia essentiam genuit, eadem res se ipsam genuit, quod omnino esse non potest…', ed. Brady, *Magistri Petri Lombardi*, p. 82. See above, pp. 161-162.
[161] Robb, 'The Fourth Lateran Council's Definition', p. 26.

considered diagrams and images as essential not only in the transmission of his own theology; he also valued images for their ability to summarize and express his objections to other scholars' work and defend what he considered to be orthodox views. Joachim's figures against Peter Lombard demonstrate the extent to which images and visualisations of concepts permeated his theology and method and reasoning, and the centrality of visual methodology to the entirety of his thought and work.

The Fourth Lateran Council's Support of Peter Lombard

The Fourth Lateran Council's support and vindication of Peter Lombard's account of the Trinity over that of Joachim of Fiore's is thus even more surprising considering that the *Sentences* and much of Peter Lombard's theology were by no means considered 'orthodox' prior to 1215. As Constant J. Mews and Clare Monagle have indicated, the endorsement of Peter Lombard's Trinitarian theology at Lateran IV in 1215 in favour of that of Joachim of Fiore marked a significant departure from established tradition.[162] In upholding Peter Lombard's view of the Trinity, and denying the validity of Joachim of Fiore, the council simultaneously approved of the scholastic, conceptual approach to Trinitarian theology, and rejected an approach that was fundamentally concerned with visual images and analogy. However, as Clare Monagle has stated, the reasons for this departure have failed to be sufficiently explained.[163]

Monagle suggests that reasons for the endorsement of Peter Lombard and his dialectical method of understanding the Trinity are rooted in the transformations of the papal curia at the turn of the thirteenth century. One of the key figures in this transition was Innocent III, elected Pope in 1198. As Monagle has shown, Pope Innocent III, before becoming pope, had studied in Paris with some of the leading scholars such as Peter of Poitiers, Peter the Chanter (d. 1197) and Peter of Corbeil (d. 1222), where he would have been taught the scholastic disciplines, including grammar, dialectic and rhetoric.[164] During his time at the schools he would have encountered Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, then the leading text in scholastic education.[165] Though Monagle warns that the precise nature of Innocent's study is unknown, his 'later legislative activity as pope reflected a number of concerns current in his time at Paris', particularly an increased interest in moral and pastoral issues, which

[162] Mews and Monagle, 'Peter Lombard, Joachim of Fiore and the Fourth Lateran Council', p. 82.
[163] Monagle, 'Theology, Practice and Policy at the Turn of the Thirteenth Century', p. 442.
[164] Monagle, 'Theology, Practice and Policy at the Turn of the Thirteenth Century', pp. 446-7.
[165] For the Sentences and their use in university education in the twelfth century see Colish, *Peter Lombard*, vol. 1, pp. 170-188.

become a central issue at Lateran IV.[166] Furthermore, upon becoming pope, Innocent III's appointments to the papal curia reflect his school-centred training: many of his advisors had been students of Peter the Chanter, including key figures such as Stephen Langton (c. 1150-1228), appointed as archbishop in Canterbury in 1207 and one of the leading figures in setting the agenda for the Fourth Lateran Council.[167] Thus, the turn of the thirteenth century witnessed a transformation in the types of figures with power and influence to change church legislation. As Monagle concludes, the 'ringing endorsement of Peter Lombard' can be seen as an endorsement of the methods of the schools themselves, enabled by the dramatic transformation of the papal curia during Innocent III's papacy.[168]

The Seated Trinity and *Gnadenstuhl* in the Wake of Trinitarian Orthodoxy

In supporting the work of Peter Lombard, the Fourth Lateran Council not only established an 'orthodox' definition of Trinitarian doctrine and belief, but also brought to a close debates on the Trinity that had raged in the twelfth century. As a result, the early thirteenth century was the beginning of a period of relative stability in the development of Trinitarian theology. Concurrent with this stability after 1215 is a marked increase in the popularity of the Seated and *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities. The remainder of this chapter will chart the ascent of these two iconographies over the course of the thirteenth century, and into the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. While the reasons for the increasing popularity of the *Gnadenstuhl* and Seated Trinity are undoubtedly manifold, the establishment of Trinitarian orthodoxy in 1215 was crucial to the widespread manifestation and dissemination of these two iconographies. In contrast to chapters four and five, which investigate 'unusual' representations of the Trinity, this section is concerned with the standardisation of typical representations of the Trinity as a way to contextualise the more 'atypical'.

The abundance of the Seated and *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities after 1215 makes a comprehensive or exhaustive survey of these iconographies unfeasible. However, in order to demonstrate the widespread popularity of these two designs, the following discussion highlights several examples of each iconography as an illustration of its diversity. Images have been chosen because they are either demonstrative of a wider trend, or show the Seated Trinity or *Gnadenstuhl* to have been used in a particular context. There is not sufficient space in this section to discuss the following images in great depth; instead, the images highlighted offer

[166] Monagle, 'Theology, Practice and Policy at the Turn of the Thirteenth Century', pp. 447-8.
[167] For Stephen Langton's involvement in the Fourth Lateran Council see Anne J. Duggan, 'Conciliar Law 1123-1215: The Legislation of the Four Lateran Councils', *The History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140-1234: From Gratian to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX*, ed. Wilfried Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington (Washington, 2008), pp. 318-366 (pp. 355-357).
[168] Monagle, 'Theology, Practice and Policy at the Turn of the Thirteenth Century', pp. 456.

an indication of the ubiquitous nature of the Seated Trinity and *Gnadenstuhl* from 1215 to the Reformation. Each case study discussed presents an exciting avenue for further research.

The Seated Trinity after 1215

Throughout the thirteenth century, and into the fourteenth century, the Seated Trinity is increasingly found in illuminated Bibles and Psalters in the historiated initial alongside Psalm 109 (for an idea of this range see figs. 3.3-3.37). The iconography thus retained its close relationship with this Psalm, ostensibly because the image itself so faithfully captures the Psalm's opening verses. Interestingly, a number of Seated Trinities also appear alongside illuminated thirteenth-century copies of Peter Lombard's Commentary on the Psalms (figs. 3.8-3.10)[169], the 'scholastic gloss of choice' for much of the Middle Ages.[170] The iconography was thus deemed appropriate for scholastic circles, and would perhaps to these readers have underscored the relationship between Peter Lombard's interpretation of the Trinity and of his support by Lateran IV.

The Seated Trinity also begins to be used in contexts outside of Psalter illumination in images that are nevertheless still related to Psalm 109. In an illustrated manuscript Jacobus de Voragine's (c. 1230-1298) Golden Legend made in either southern France or northern Italy in the late thirteenth century, for example, the image of the stoning of Stephen on f. 17v shows Stephen kneeling with his hands and head raised towards an image of the Seated Trinity in a canopied frame above him, whilst tormentors throw stones to his right (fig. 3.38).[171] The Golden Legend story is based on the account of Stephen's martyrdom in the book of Acts.[172] At the moment of his death, Stephen is described as witnessing a vision of God that draws directly on the words of Psalm 109:

> But he [Stephen], being full of the Holy Ghost, looking steadfastly to heaven, saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God. And he said: "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of God."[173]

---

[169] For example, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS Latin 448, f. 218r; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale MS Latin 8874, f. 23r; London, BL MS Royal 3 E VII, f. 246r. See figs. 3.8-3.10.
[170] Colish, *Peter Lombard*, vol. 1 (Leiden, 1994), pp. 170-188 (p. 170). See also Colish, '*Psalterium Scholasticorum*: Peter Lombard and the Emergence of Scholastic Psalms Exegesis', *Speculum* 67 (1992), pp. 531-548.
[171] Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, S. France or N. Italy (Rome, Vatican Library, Vaticana, Reg. Lat. 534), f. 17v.
[172] Acts 7:54-59.
[173] Acts 7:55.

The image of Stephen's martyrdom in the illustrated Golden Legend thus visually acknowledges the reference made in both the Golden Legend and the book of Acts to the description of the two 'Lords' in Psalm 109 through an image that was fast becoming the most conventional way to represent this Psalm – the Seated Trinity.[174] This image further illustrates the close scriptural connections between this iconography and the Psalm from which it originated.

The Seated Trinity also begins to be used in contexts outside of the illustration of Psalm 109. In the Bible of Robert of Bello, made in Canterbury between 1240 and 1253, for example, the Seated Trinity is situated within the context of Creation.[175] The elaborately decorated initial 'I' that begins the book of Genesis on f. 5v is decorated with seven roundels, each depicting one of the seven days of Creation. In the final roundel at the terminus of the initial, the Father and Son are shown seated on a throne with the dove of the Holy Spirit flying upwards between them, its wings outstretched, touching both of their mouths. This roundel represents the seventh day, described in the Genesis text as the day God rested.[176] The artist of the Bible of Robert de Bello has interpreted this moment with specific reference to the Trinity, showing all three persons resting in heaven. This decision may be related to the idea current in medieval thought that God as Trinity had created the world, an idea rooted in God's statement in Genesis: 'Let us make man in our own image'.[177] The plurality implied in this verse was often seen to reflect God's Trinitarian nature from the very outset of Creation.[178]

An intriguing illumination in an early fourteenth-century miscellany of sermon material also shows the Seated Trinity to have been associated with teaching and preaching (fig. 3.39).[179] The miscellany begins with Robert Grosseteste's (c. 1175-1253) *Chasteau d'armour*, an Allegorical poem in Anglo Norman written by the bishop in the mid-thirteenth century for the instruction of the laity, and continues with prayers, meditations and poems on topics such as the seven joys, confession, sin and repentance, the Ten Commandments and the Passion.[180] The material throughout the miscellany is in Anglo-Norman and constructed

---

[174] A similar but slightly adapted image appears in a thirteenth-century English Bestiary (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS Fr. 14969, f. 53v), discussed pp. 203-7.
[175] London, BL MS Burney 3, f. 5v. For the manuscript see Nigel Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts, I, 1190-1250*, no. 63.
[176] Genesis 2:2-3.
[177] Genesis 1:26: 'et ait: Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostrum.'
[178] For the exegesis and Trinitarian imagery related to this verse see Adelheid Heimann, 'Trinitas Creator Mundi', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 2 (1938-9), pp. 42-52.
[179] Miscellany, England, late thirteenth century (London, Lambeth Palace Library, MS 522), f. 85r.
[180] For the manuscript see M. R. James, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Lambeth Palace*, vol. II (Cambridge, 1932) no. 522, pp. 715-723 who dates the manuscript to the thirteenth century. Gaston Paris and Alphonse Bos, *Trois Versions rimée de l'Evangile de Nicodème par Chrétien,*

mainly in lyrical verse. The Miscellany's content, as well as its language and lyrical form, suggests it was designed for use in sermons and teaching, perhaps by mendicants, to a more elite audience whose primary language was Anglo-Norman.[181] The intended function of the book as a tool in teaching is also supported by its illuminations, a number of which show members of various mendicant orders teaching and dictating to groups of lay men and women, often holding up a white cross as a sign that they are preaching. Though the majority of these images just depict the preacher and his audience, the illumination on f. 85r incorporates and image of the Seated Trinity into this scene. In a bordered illumination at the top of the page, a friar is shown preaching to a group of four people. His head is turned towards the group on the left, but his finger points to the right of the frame, where an image of the Trinity is depicted: the Father and Son, both shown robed with youthful faces, sit facing each other on a throne, whilst the Holy Spirit, in the form of a dove, flies between them. Two of the members of the lay group to the left are also shown with their hands raised in a pointing gesture, imitating the friars' own raised hand and indicating their active participation in his teaching. The image is placed at the beginning of an Anglo-Norman verse adaption of the Gospel of Nicodemus, and the choice to depict to Trinity is likely related to the opening verse directly below the image, which begins: 'In the name of the Trinity/ Three persons in unity'.[182] It is unclear, however, why an image of the Seated Trinity was chosen for this particular illumination, as no reference is made in the text to Psalm 109.

The Gnadenstuhl *after 1215*

Despite this occasional use in other contexts, from the thirteenth century on the Seated Trinity is nevertheless predominantly used to illustrate Psalm 109 in Bibles and Missals. This stands in quite considerable contrast to the *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity, which begins to be used in a much more diverse array of media, and in conjunction with a variety of different texts and contexts. Like the Seated Trinity, from the early thirteenth century on the

Andre de Coutances et un anonyme, Société des anciens textes français, vol. 22 (Paris, 1885), pp. 139-212, Richard O'Gorman, 'The Gospel of Nicodemus in the Vernacular Literature of Medieval France' in *The Devil's Rights and Redemption in the Literature of Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 1995), pp. 103-131 (p. 105), date the manuscript to the early fourteenth century.

[181] For a discussion of the types and function of Anglo-Norman lyrical poems in this period see David L. Jeffrey and Brian J. Levy, *The Anglo-Norman Lyric: An Anthology* (Toronto, 1990), pp. 1-30.

[182] 'En le nun de la trinite/Treis persones en unite'. Transcription and translation author's own. Lambeth Palace Library MS 522 is the only manuscript in which this version of the Anglo-Norman verse translation of the Gospel of Nicodemus is preserved. It is an anonymous work that shows considerable corruption and numerous textual mistakes. The prologue and dedication to the Trinity are similar to a metrical Old French Gospel of Nicodemus composed by an author named Chrétien in the first half of the thirteenth century. See Paris and Bos, *Trois Versions*, pp. 1-69 and O'Gorman, 'The Gospel of Nicodemus', pp. 104-5.

Gnadenstuhl is used to illustrate Psalm 109 (see figs. 3.40-3.42).[183] Though this image doesn't articulate the opening words of the Psalm as closely as the Seated Trinity, the image of *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity still clearly indicates that the two 'Lords' referred to in the opening line should be understood as the Father and Son, and that the Psalm as a whole alludes to the plurality and Trinitarian nature of God. The *Gnadenstuhl* also appears in Psalters or Books of Hours alongside prayers for the Feast or Office of the Trinity (see figs 3.43-3.51).[184] In the Queen Mary Psalter for example, completed in England between 1310 and 1320, an illustration of the *Gnadenstuhl* is positioned within a bordered frame above the Athanasian Creed, emphasising the Trinitarian nature of the text (fig. 3.52).[185]

However, it became increasingly common to depict the *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity outside of these liturgical contexts. The *Gnadenstuhl* is sometimes employed in illuminated narrative sequences as a depiction of the triune God in the heavenly realms. In the mid thirteenth-century Carrow Psalter, for example, the prefatory cycle of miniatures depicting scenes from the Old and New Testament concludes on f. 29r with five scenes divided by architectural frames, showing the *Noli me tangere*, Doubting Thomas, the Ascension, Pentecost, and an image of the Father seated on a throne holding the crucified Son (fig. 3.53).[186] Interestingly, the Holy Spirit is not represented in this final scene; instead, the dove is shown descending above the heads of Mary and the disciples in the image of Pentecost adjacent to the *Gnadenstuhl* miniature. In this narrative sequence, the final image of the *Gnadenstuhl* is thus used to emphasise the location of each of the three persons of the Trinity at this point in the Biblical narrative; whilst during the Ascension Christ rose to be with the Father in heaven, indicated in the depiction of the Father holding the son on the cross, during Pentecost the Holy Spirit descended to earth. A similar narrative sequence

---

[183] For example: Psalter, France (Paris), c. 1220-30 (London, BL MS Additional 47674), f. 101v; Psalter-Hours of Guiluys de Boisleux, France (Arras), after 1246 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 730), f. 203r; Cuerden Psalter, England (Oxford), c. 1270 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 756), f. 169r; Egerton Psalter, England (East Anglia), c. 1270-90 (London, BL MS Egerton 1066), f. 83r; Psalter, Belgium (Liège), c. 1290-1305 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 155), f. 114v. See figs 3.40-3.42.

[184] For example: Prayer Book, Netherlands (Brussels), c. 1276-1296 (London, BL MS Harley 2449), f. 79r; Psalter-Hours, France (Amiens), c. 1280-1299 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 729), f. 253v; Antiphoner, Netherlands, c. 1300 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. 8997C); Chertsey Abbey Breviary, England, first quarter of the 14th century (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Lat. Liturg. E. 39), f. 147v; Missal, England (Cambridge?), c. 1320 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 107), f. 176r; Book of Hours, France (St-Omer), c. 1320-1329 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 754), f. 22v; Taymouth Hours, England (London?), 2nd quarter of the 14th century (London, BL MS Yates Thompson 13), f. 33r. See figs 3.43-3.51. Occasionally, the *Gnadenstuhl* is also depicted in the historiated initials of other prayers, such as those to the crucified Christ (for example, Book of Hours, England, c. 1300 (Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery MS W 102), f. 6v, fig. 3.50 or the Virgin (for example, Book of Hours made in England (Oxford?), c. 1325-1330 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 700), f. 89v, fig. 3.51.

[185] Queen Mary Psalter, England, c. 1310-20 (London, BL Royal MS 2 B VII), f. 299r.

[186] Carrow Psalter, England (East Anglia), mid-thirteenth century (Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery MS W 34), f. 29r.

also occurs in the Cuerden Psalter, made in England around 1270, where the miniatures of Ascension and Pentecost are followed by an image of the *Gnadenstuhl*, this time showing the dove of the Holy Spirit flying from the Father down to the Son (fig. 3.54).[187]

In the thirteenth century, the *Gnadenstuhl* also begins to be used in conjunction with other established iconographic motifs. On a single leaf from a thirteenth-century German Missal, now regrettably dis-bound from its original volume, the *Gnadenstuhl* is incorporated into a depiction of an elaborate Tree of Jesse (fig. 3.55).[188] The tree forms the 'T' of the *Te igitur* prayer, extending to the left of the prayer text and filling three-quarters of the manuscript. David, shown harping, is the first figure depicted above the sleeping Jesse, followed by a crowned Virgin, who holds an unfolding scroll. Above the Virgin, the three persons of the Trinity are represented in the form of a *Gnadenstuhl* within a green, red and white mandorla. The other descendants of Jesse are shown as busts within curling, flowering vines, and the four evangelists are represented in their symbolic forms in the corners of the frame; the lion head of Luke even grows from the vine itself. This image is a highly unusual rendering of the Tree of Jesse, and no other examples survive in which the Trinity, in any form, is used in the place conventionally occupied by an image of Christ. It is unclear from this page alone why this particular artist chose to adapt the Tree of Jesse with the inclusion of a *Gnadenstuhl*, though, had more of the book survived, the preceding or following images may have explained the rationale behind this unusual use of the *Gnadenstuhl* iconography. The decision may also be linked to the association between the *Gnadenstuhl* and the *Te igitur* prayer explored in the previous chapter.[189]

Another unusual thirteenth-century illumination also uses an image of the *Gnadenstuhl* to show a visionary's experience of the Trinitarian God. The miniature is one of four full-page illuminations in a thirteenth-century collection of treatises in French known by its principle text as *La Sainte Abbaye* (fig. 3.56).[190] The image is divided into four compartments by architectural towers and arches, which each detail in turn the progressive stages of contemplation: the first shows a woman in confession with a Dominican friar; in the second, the woman kneels in prayer in front of an image of the Coronation of the Virgin; the third shows the woman experiencing of a vision of Christ, whose wounds drip blood

[187] Cuerden Psalter, England (Oxford), c. 1270 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 756), f. 8v.
[188] Single leaf from a Missal, Germany, thirteenth century (Hannover, Kestner Museum ms 3985); for the manuscript page see Johannes Sommer, *Das Deckenbild der Michaeliskirche zu Hildesheim* (Hildesheim, 1966), pp. 45, n. 35; Helmer Härtel, *Handschriften des Kestner-Museums zu Hannover*, (Wiesbaden, 1999), pp. 105-6.
[189] Discussed pp. 83-132.
[190] 'La Sainte Abbaye', France, c. 1290 (London, BL MS Yates Thompson 11), f. 29r. The manuscript was originally bound with 'La Somme le Roy', France, c. 1290 (BL Additional 28162). For recent scholarship on this image see Aden Kumler, *Translating Truth: Ambitious Images and Religious Knowledge in Late Medieval France and England* (New Haven, 2011), pp. 162-7 and p. 232.

into a chalice positioned on an altar in front of her; and the fourth and final quadrant shows her experiencing a vision of the Trinity. The *Gnadenstuhl* is shown hovering in a blue and white cloud above a bejewelled altar, and, as in the previous vision, Christ bleeds from the cross onto a chalice positioned on the altar. The woman kneels to the left of the Trinity, gazing at the figure of Christ and raising both hands towards the vision. A scroll unfolds from the hand of the Father round the kneeling woman, declaring '*pater verbum spiritus sanctus hii tres unum sunt*' ('Father, Word, Holy Spirit, these three are one'). The culmination of these four stages of the contemplative experience in a vision of the Trinity, though unusual in visual form, is reflective of the more common idea that the ultimate vision that could be achieved through contemplation was of God in three persons.[191] That the artist in this miniature chose to represent this ultimate vision in the form of a *Gnadenstuhl* is perhaps indicative of the relationship between this iconography and eschatological images of the *Majestas Domini*, where God is shown reigning in the heavens. The representation of Christ crucified also allows the artist to repeat the theme introduced in the previous image of Christ bleeding onto a chalice as a representation of his sacrifice celebrated during the mass.

By the late thirteenth century, the *Gnadenstuhl* had also come to be associated with Romance texts. In a manuscript of Robert de Boron's (d. 1212) *L'Estoire del Saint Graal*, made in northern France in the last quarter of the thirteenth century, the text is introduced on f. 1r by a large historiated initial depicting the Trinity in the form of a *Gnadenstuhl* underneath an elaborate Gothic canopy (fig. 3.57).[192] The subject of this initial is related to the opening words of the text, which begins:

> He who condemns himself as the least man in the world, and the most sinful, greets, at the start of this history, all those who put their faith and trust in the Holy Trinity.[193]

The *Gnadenstuhl* initial thus reflects the sentiments of *L'Estoire*'s opening lines, which praises faith in the Trinity. Interestingly, in another thirteenth-century copy of this poem, this text is introduced by an image of the Seated Trinity, rather than the *Gnadenstuhl* (fig. 3.58).[194]

---

[191] Kumler, *Translating Truth*, pp. 162-3.
[192] Robert de Boron, *L'Estoire del Saint Graal*, France, c. 1270-90 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS Fr. 95), f. 1r.
[193] 'Chil ke se tient et iuge au plus petit et au plus peceor du monde. Mande salus au commenchement de ceste estoire a tos cheaus ki lor cuers ont et lor creance en la sainte trinite.' H. Oskar Sommer, *The Vulgate Version of the Arthurian Romances*, 3, pp. 1-4, trans. N. J. Lacy, *Lancelot-Grail: The Old French Arthurian Vulgate and Post-Vulgate in translation*, vol. 1 (London, 1993).
[194] Robert de Boron, *L'Estoire del Saint Graal*, France, second half of the thirteenth century (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS Fr. 749), f. 1r.

In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the *Gnadenstuhl* is also becomes closely affiliated with another romance text, the *Roman de la Rose*. In a number of illuminated *Roman* manuscripts from this period, the section attributed to Jean de Meun (c. 1240-c. 1305), entitled *Testament de maistre Jehan de Meun*, is introduced by a miniature of the *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity, often surrounded by the Evangelists or adored by censing angels (see figs. 3.59-3.62).[195] Like the *L'Estoire del Saint Graal*, Jean de Meun's section of the poem is introduced with an invocation of the Trinity, which provides the rationale for including an image of the *Gnadenstuhl* at the beginning of the text.[196] The use of the *Gnadenstuhl* in this context demonstrates how the iconography was fast becoming a 'short-hand' for depicting the Trinity.

This period also saw the diffusion of the *Gnadenstuhl* into a wealth of different media. As we have seen, the *Gnadenstuhl* was already being used across media in the twelfth century, with the iconography appearing in monumental mural painting at Houghton-on-the-Hill, in stained glass at St-Denis and on a portable altar from Hildesheim, as well as in manuscript illumination.[197] Many of these images are in some way related to the performance of the mass, and this connection continues into the later Middle Ages. The relationship between the *Gnadenstuhl* and the Eucharist is particularly evident on a paten made in the workshop of Hugh d'Oignies at the Priory of St Nicholas in Oignies, near Namur, in around 1228-30 (fig. 3.63).[198] The gold paten is engraved in the center with an image of the Father sat on an elaborate throne, holding the son of the cross while the dove of the Holy Spirit flies to the left. It was designed to accompany an elaborate gold chalice, decorated with images of the crucifixion, the Virgin and various saints. The inscription on the rim of the chalice states that a craftsman named Hugo made the item for the Church of St Nicholas in Oignies, suggesting that this was also the intended function of the accompanying paten.[199] Both items were possibly made for the consecration of the main altar at the Church of St

---

[195] For example: *Roman de la Rose*, France, c. 1340-50 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 185), f. 83r; *Roman de la Rose*, France (Paris), c. 1340-50 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 48), f. 150r; *Roman de la Rose*, France (Paris), c. 1350 (New York, Morgan Library MS M 324), f. 145r; *Roman de la Rose*, France (Paris), fourth quarter of the fourteenth century (London, BL Additional MS 42133), f. 145r.

[196] Jean de Meun*, Le Roman de la Rose*: 'Lis peres et li filz et li sains esperis/Un deiu en trois personnes adoures et cheris'. ed. M. Méon et al., *Le Roman de la Rose par Guillaume de Lorris et Jehan de Meung: nouvelle édition, revue et corrigée sur les meilleurs et plus anciens manuscrits*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1814) IV (1814), p. 1.

[197] See pp. 83-132.

[198] Paten, Begium (Oignies), c. 1228-30 (Namur, Musée provincial des Arts anciens du Namurois – Trésor d'Oignies, inv. no. TO 04). For a brief discussion of the paten see Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, pp. 122-3. Schiller incorrectly identifies the paten as being made for the convent of Nore-Dame de Namur; this is where the majority of the Oignies treasure was moved during the revolution in the nineteenth century. See Emmanuel Collet, *Le Trésor d'Oignies* (Brussels, 2012), p. 8.

[199] '+ HUGO ME FECIT: ORATE PRO EO: CALIX ECCLESIE BEATI NICHOLAI DE OIGNIES: AVE'; 'Hugo made me. Pray for him. The chalice of the blessed church of St Nicholas of Oignies. Hail.' Chalice, Begium (Oignies), c. 1228-30 (Namur, Musée provincial des Arts anciens du Namurois –Trésor d'Oignies, inv. no. TO 03).

Nicholas in January 1228, a ceremony attended by Jacques de Vitry (c. 1160/70-1240).[200] These sumptuous early Gothic pieces were at the forefront of metalwork design in this period, and the use of a *Gnadenstuhl* in this context shows how the iconography was deemed appropriate not only for items intimately connected to the mass but also for some of the most extravagant works of art.

Two paxes decorated with *Gnadenstuhl* motifs show the continued connections between this iconography and the mass in the fourteenth century, as well as its use over different media (figs. 3.64. 3.65).[201] Both paxes were made in the later half of this century, and are luxurious items, one made completely of ivory and the other of champlevé enamel on copper. The ivory pax was made in either England or France and shows a large, bearded Father sat on a throne with curling handles, holding a thin 'tau' or 'T'-shaped cross with the crucified Christ. The dove of the Holy Spirit is shown flying down from his mouth to Christ's head. A square frame decorated with small flower motifs surrounds the central image of the Trinity. Christ's body, particularly his torso and face, has been worn smooth by the kisses of the faithful during the mass ceremony. Similar signs of devotional wear are evident on the enamel pax, which also shows a *Gnadenstuhl* as its central decoration. The area surrounding Christ's torso and head, as well as the head of the Father, which would once have been a bright gold colour, has now been considerably darkened due to repeated touch during the mass. This pax was made in Limoges in the second half of the fourteenth century, and, as indicated by the coats of arms shown to either side of the Trinity, was probably commissioned by Nicole de Chambly, Dame de Rutel (d. c. 1379) and her husband, Gilles Mallet (d. 1411), Vicomte de Corbeil and librarian to King Charles V of France.[202] As with Hugh d'Oignies paten, these paxes are prestigious items and show the *Gnadenstuhl* to have been used and appreciated by elite audiences.

However, examples of the *Gnadenstuhl* that survive from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries suggest that the iconography was increasingly used in contexts and media not as closely associated with the mass. *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities survive in brasses (fig. 3.66)[203], as decoration on finger rings (figs. 3.67-3.70)[204], and on seals (figs. 3.71-3.73).[205] They also

[200] Emmanuel Collet, *Le Trésor d'Oignies*, p. 14, p. 46, n. 3-4.
[201] Ivory pax, England or France, c. 1350-1400 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. 34-1867); Enamel copper pax, Limoges, c. 1350-1400 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. 1148-1864).
[202] Interestingly, Nicole de Chambly and Gilles Malet were buried in a chapel dedicated to the Holy Trinity in the Abbey Church of Chaalis just north of Paris.
[203] For example, Trinity brass, England, c. 1375-1400 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. M. 39-1946).
[204] For example, Finger ring, England, fifteenth century (PAS WMID-439C61); Finger ring, England, 14th-15th century (PAS BERK-BCBDF5); Ring, England, c. 1400-1500 (London, Victoria and Albert

appear in ivories, as part of more extensive narrative scenes (figs. 3.74, 3.75)[206] or commonly as one half of a winged ivory diptych (figs. 3.76, 3.77).[207] An unusual *Gnadenstuhl* ivory exists as the only remaining piece of what was probably an ivory hair parter or *gravoires*, made in either England or France in the fourteenth century and now in the Musée du Louvre in Paris (fig. 3.78).[208] The tiny *Gnadenstuhl* figure, measuring just over 40mm in height, would have formed the uppermost decorative handle of the hair parter, which most likely have been used by a wealthy man or woman as part of a dressing case that also included mirrors and combs.[209]

The use of the *Gnadenstuhl* in the domestic sphere is also attested to by the popularity of this subject in English alabaster sculpture, both in the form of singular statues (fig. 3.79)[210] and as part of more extensive alabaster altarpieces (fig. 3.80).[211] Though these items were undoubtedly used in ecclesiastical spaces, the depiction of a *Gnadenstuhl* alabaster on the Werl Altarpiece, completed by the Netherlandish artist Robert Campin (c. 1375-1444) in 1438, gives an idea as to the other contexts in which they may have been used (fig. 3.81).[212] The right wing of the altarpiece shows St Barbara in a domestic scene, seated in front of a fire and reading a devotional text. An alabaster *Gnadenstuhl* rests on a plinth above the fireplace. This would appear to be a reflection of St Barbara's own particular devotion to the Trinity, but also indicates the potential domestic spaces in which *Gnadenstuhl* alabaster statues may have been used.[213]

Museum, museum no. M.241-1962); Finger ring, England, early 15th century (London, BM, museum no. AF.900).

[205] For example, Bronze seal matrix of Thomas Peverell, Bishop of Llandaff, Wales (?), 1398-1407 (London, BM, museum no. 1839,0921.4); Bronze seal matrix of Holy Trinity College, Stratford-Upon-Avon, England, late 14th century (London, BM, museum no. 1838,1232.20); Seal matrix of the Friars of the Holy Trinity, Hounslow, England, 15th century (London, BM, museum no. 1923,1207.1).

[206] For example, Ivory diptych, Germany (Cologne), c. 1350 (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Cloisters Collection, no. 1970.324.8); Ivory leaf from a Dyptich, England or France (?), 15th century (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, no. 17.190.265).

[207] For example, Ivory panel, France, 14th century (London, The Courtauld Gallery, no. 0.1996.GP.2); Ivory diptych, France, 14th century (Hamburg, Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe, inv. no. 1935.17).

[208] Ivory hair parter, England or France, 14th century (Paris, Musée du Louvre, no. OA 11221).

[209] For hair parters see Glyn Davies and Kirstin Kennedy, *Medieval and Rennaissance Art: People and Possessions* (London, 2009), p. 97.

[210] For example, Trinity Alabaster, England, 15th century (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. A.203-1946).

[211] For example, Swansea Altarpiece, England, 1460-90 (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. A.89:1-8, 10-15-1919). For Trinity alabasters see Francis Cheetham, *English Medieval Alabasters: with a catalogue of the collection in the Victoria and Albert Museum* (Woodbridge, 2005), pp. 296-310.

[212] Robert Campin, Werl Altarpiece, Tournai, 1438 (Madrid, Museo del Prado).

[213] According to the Golden Legend, St Barbara ordered a third window be built into the tower in which she lived in reflection of the three persons of the Trinity. See Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend*, ed. F. S. Ellis, *The Golden Legend: Or, Lives of the Saints*, 7 vols. (London, 1900), XI (1900), pp. 198-205.

Several wall paintings containing the *Gnadenstuhl* also survive from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, attesting to its continued use in murals. The chantry chapel of Edward le Despenser (d. 1342) in Tewkesbury Abbey, built around 1375, contains a painting of about the same date just beneath the fan vaulting on the east wall (fig. 3.82). The *Gnadenstuhl* is shown flanked by censing angels at the top of what was once a fairly large elaborate scene; the only other image to remain below is a depiction of the Coronation of the Virgin. Another fourteenth-century wall painting of the *Gnadenstuhl* can be found in the south choir aisle of Lichfield Cathedral (fig. 3.83), and a fifteenth-century mural on the north transept of All Saints Church, Boughton Aluph, Kent, also indicates the use of the *Gnadenstuhl* in parish church decoration (fig. 3.84).[214]

The Seated Trinity and the Gnadenstuhl*: A Comparison*

By the fifteenth century, the *Gnadenstuhl* had thus become a prolific motif, used across multiple types of media and in conjunction with a variety of texts and contexts. Interestingly, though the *Gnadenstuhl* still retained its connection to the ceremony of the mass, appearing for example on patens or paxes, from the thirteenth century, and particularly in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, its uses became much more diverse. Notably, the iconography was often employed to signify the Trinitarian God in general, rather than specifically reflect God's sacrifice of his son and the relationship of the act to the mass. In comparison, the Seated Trinity remained relatively tied to Psalm 109 and the scriptural context from which it originated, appearing most frequently in the initial accompanying the Psalm in Psalters and Bibles.

Importantly, unlike the Seated Trinity, the *Gnadenstuhl* incorporates an image that became central to Christian visual culture: the Crucifixion.[215] In showing the Father holding the Son on the cross, accompanied by the dove of the Holy Spirit, this iconography indicates visually that the Father, together with the Spirit, offered the Son on the cross for mankind. The *Gnadenstuhl* could thus be used not only as an expression of the Trinitarian God, but also of Christ's sacrifice on the cross, and, specifically, as a representation of the idea that all three persons of the Trinity were involved in the crucifixion. On the other hand, the Seated Trinity, in showing the Father, Son and Spirit seated in the heavenly realms, addresses the location of the Son after the resurrection. Whilst this was an important aspect of

[214] Rosewell, *Medieval Wall Paintings*, p. 34.
[215] For a discussion of the *Gnadenstuhl* in relation to the development of the iconography of the cross see John Munns, *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Norman England: Theology, Imagery, Devotion* (London, 2016), particularly pp. 45-58.

Christological and Trinitarian teaching, it did not occupy as central and prominent a place as the Crucifixion and its associated visual milieu. In specifically depicting the Crucifixion, the *Gnadenstuhl* engaged with an image of paramount importance to Christian visual culture, thus allowing it to be used in wider contexts not only related to the Trinity but also to Christ's passion.

Nevertheless, despite the *Gnadenstuhl's* comparatively immense popularity, from the thirteenth century on, both iconographies had become firmly established as the two conventional ways to represent the Trinity in Gothic art. In showing the Trinity as occupying two different 'states' – as participating in the crucifixion and as reigning in the heavens after Christ's ascension – they offered artists two alternative perspectives on which to draw. As this section has shown, an artist's decision to choose one iconography over the other seems dependent both on the context in which they are working and the message that they wanted to convey: the Seated Trinity depicted the triune God in the heavens in a form closely related to Psalm 109, so was used specifically as an illustration of this Psalm and as a representation of the idea that the Trinity was reigning in heaven, as for example in the Bible of Robert de Bello; the *Gnadenstuhl*, with the image of the crucifixion at its heart, was used in contexts related to the mass and Christ's sacrifice, but due to the proliferation and importance of crucifixion imagery fast became the common representation of the Trinity in medieval visual culture. As such, unlike the Seated Trinity, this iconography came to embody the triune God in and of itself, functioning as a visual shorthand for the Trinity in a remarkably diverse array of contexts.

Conclusion to Chapter Three

Many factors led to the increasing popularity of the Seated and *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities over the course of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The end of the twelfth century had seen new and dynamic developments in architecture, the results of which, the Gothic style, was to have a transformative impact on art and image making across Western Europe in this period. Concurrent with the introduction of this new artistic style were changes in the way the arts, in their broadest sense, were consumed. The laity had always been integral in the production of medieval art, as makers, patrons and consumers, a process that for the earlier Middle Ages is often obscured by the loss of much of the material evidence for this involvement.[216] However, the thirteenth century saw changes in

[216] For the role of women as makers and patrons in early medieval art see Jane Tibbetts Schulenburg, 'Female Piety and the Building and Decorating of Churches, c. 500-1150' (pp. 245-274) and Pierre Alain Mariaux, 'Women in the Making: Early Medieval Signatures and Artist's Portraits (9th-12th

demand amongst the laity for, among a variety of material, vernacular texts and illuminated manuscripts, a demand that is evidenced in the increase in the production of these types of books.[217] Though vernacular and illuminated books were still produced in abundance for non-lay, monastic audiences, the thirteenth century witnessed a general 'shift in patronage', in which 'the number of monastic books decreases in relation to those made for the secular market.'[218] This market provided a rich new context for the use and dissemination of iconography, including that of the *Gnadenstuhl* and Seated Trinity.

These changes in the artistic and literary market were driven in part by shifts in thirteenth-century religious culture. The Fourth Lateran Council had prompted considerable pastoral reform across the Western church, requiring, among other aims, that the laity receive confession at least once a year and that they be instructed sufficiently in the essential elements of their faith.[219] This prompted the production of vernacular texts for instruction, predominantly in Anglo-Norman but increasingly in Middle English.[220] Education of the laity was also a priority of the mendicants, who, during the thirteenth century, became firmly established in the political, cultural and intellectual life of thirteenth-century Western Europe.[221] As chapter five will show, in their capacity as spiritual advisors to aristocratic patrons, it is likely friars were also involved in the shaping and directing of art.[222] The emphasis on learning brought about by both Lateran IV and the rise of the mendicant orders, evident in both the textual and visual arts, may also have contributed to the rise in the popularity of the Seated Trinity and *Gnadenstuhl*. Both of these iconographies visualise the Trinitarian God with reference to concepts fundamental to the basics of Christian belief. This is particularly evident in the image of the *Gnadenstuhl*, which neatly summarises the theme of the Gospels in the representation of the Father offering the Son on the cross for mankind, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit. The Seated Trinity, through its close relationship to the text from which is derived, would have offered a visual interpretation of one of the most important Psalms in the canonical hours, read at the beginning of the Vespers, a service in which audiences beyond the monastic community were increasingly

century)' (pp. 393-428) in *Reassessing the Roles of Women as 'Makers' of Medieval Art and Architecture*, ed. Therese Martin (Leiden, 2012).

[217] Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts*, II, p. 12.

[218] Ibid.

[219] For the pastoral reforms of the Fourth Lateran Council see C. R. Cheney and F. M. Powicke, *Councils and Synods: With Other Documents Relating to the English Church, 1205-1313*, vol. II, part II (Oxford, 1964), p. 13-5; . Leith Spencer, *English Preaching in the Late Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1993).

[220] These are collectively known as 'pastoralia', a term coined by Leonard Boyle, 'The Fourth Lateran Council and Manuals of Popular Theology' in *The Popular Literature of Medieval England*, ed. Thomas J. Heffernan (Knoxville, 1985), pp. 30-43.

[221] For the Mendiants in England see V. G. Green, *The Franciscans in Medieval English Life 1224-1348* (Paterson, 1939); J. R. H. Moorman, *The Franciscans in England* (Oxford, 1974).

[222] See chapter five, pp. 218-252.

becoming involved.[223] The potential of these images as tools for teaching and instruction may thus also have aided their rapid dissemination in Gothic visual culture.

Alongside these developments in the cultural and intellectual life of Western Europe, Trinitarian theology was also evolving. The development of the thirteenth-century universities in particular prompted fresh re-examination of the triunity of the Godhead, with influential schoolmen such as Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus writing extensively on the topic.[224] However, debate on the Trinity was never to become as contentious as it had during the twelfth century. As this chapter has explored, this shift in religious tolerance was as much to do with the changes in approaches to the study of theology itself, rather than solely concerning the intricacies of Trinitarian doctrine. Nevertheless, the stabilisation in Trinitarian doctrine brought about by Lateran IV's promulgation of an orthodox definition of the Trinity in 1215 provided a secure context in which Trinitarian iconographies could flourish and become 'standardised'. Together with the wider developments in the intellectual and cultural life of thirteenth-century Europe discussed above, this process ensured both the Seated and *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities became firmly established in Gothic visual culture.

Concurrent with this standardisation of Trinitarian iconography in the thirteenth century are the appearance of images that, through their non-conformity to these increasingly conventional iconographies, are markedly 'unusual' in their approach to the representation of the triune God. As images that fall outside traditional iconographic groupings, these unconventional images have often been sidelined or overlooked in studies on the representation of the Trinity. However, as the following two chapters will show, the way in which these images deviate from conventional iconographic models can often reveal more about an artist's approach to the visualisation of the Trinitarian nature of God.

The following two chapters focus on the creation of two 'unusual' representations of the Trinity in the later half of the thirteenth century. Chapter four discusses the depiction of a three-headed Trinity in book now known as the St John's Psalter. Though remarkably inventive in its depiction of the triune God with three heads, it is argued that this design may have been conceived with reference to a near-contemporary and equally unusual Trinitarian image: the three-faced Trinity. Chapter five focuses on two unusual representations of the Trinity in a bestiary probably produced in London for an aristocratic

[223] For evidence of increased lay involvement in the canonical hours see Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, pp. 114-6.
[224] For Trinitarian theology from the time of Aquinas see Russel L. Friedman, *Medieval Trinitarian Thought From Aquinas to Ockham* (Cambridge, 2010); see also Giles Emery, *The Trinitarian Theology of Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford, 2007).

patron in the 1270s. In their distortion of conventional iconography, the designer(s) of these moralising images show an awareness of wider societal issues at time of the bestiary's construction. It is argued that these societal concerns, in addition to the designer(s) consideration of the didactic function of the illuminations, were crucial in shaping the bestiary's extraordinary images of the Trinity. Together, these two case studies reveal the highly inventive nature of Trinitarian image making in a time of increasing iconographic standardisation.

Chapter Four: The Three-headed Trinity in the St John's Psalter

Introduction

The three-headed being that occupies the recto and verso pages of folio 9 in a late thirteenth-century manuscript known as the St John's Psalter (figs. 4.1, 4.2), is one of the most striking and remarkable representations of the Trinity to survive from the Gothic period.[1] The figure, shown seated on a cushioned throne, has one large, central body, swathed in voluminous drapery, but three separate heads poised atop three necks, which sprout from its chest in an almost plant-like manner. Each of these identical heads face out towards the viewer, issuing an enigmatic gaze from three pairs of eyes. The figure is shown with three haloes behind each of the heads and a set of wings protruding from its back, suggesting that it is intended to resemble a celestial creature, especially when compared to other angels in the narrative series who are also shown with wings, haloes and similar facial features with blonde curling hair.[2] A Latin caption below the image on folio 9r describes the scene above; it reads: 'Then God appeared to Abraham in the figure of the Trinity' (*De domino apparente abrahe in figura trinitatis*). The text specifies that not only is this image of a tricephalous being intended as an angelic figure, but also, simultaneously, as the Trinity. Its single body represents the unity of the Godhead, with each of its three heads representing the individual persons of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

The two scenes in which this three-headed figure appear depict the Old Testament story of Abraham and the three angels from the book of Genesis, which tells of how three men (*tres viri*) appeared to the patriarch in the vale of Mambre.[3] After greeting these three men, Abraham offers them a meal. These moments are depicted as a sequence on folios 9r and 9v, with the first showing Abraham kneeling to the left of the Trinity, his hands raised in a greeting and prayer, and the second showing him kneeling to the right, lifting up a jug of wine and some loaves of bread. From the time of the early church, Abraham's three visitors were alternately interpreted either as three angels, or as a typological prefiguration of the Trinity, with each of the beings representing the three persons of the triune God.[4] However, while this would explain why the figure on folios 9r and 9v is shown with angelic

---

[1] St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80 (Cambridge, St John's College, MS K 26), ff. 9r-9v. For scholarship on this manuscript, see below, p. 202, n. 675.
[2] For example, on folios 4v, 5r, 5v and 10r.
[3] Genesis 18:1-33.
[4] On the typological pairing of the narrative of Abraham and the three angels with the Trinity see M. R. James, 'Pictor in Carmine', *Archaeologia* 94 (1951), pp. 141-66; on the interpretation of the three men as angels see G. Bunge, *The Rublev Trinity* (New York, 2007), p. 46

features but referenced as the Trinity in the Latin *titulus* below, it does little to explain why the artist of the illuminations in the St John's Psalter chose to represent this Trinitarian, angelic being with three separate but similar heads.[5]

This decision is even more remarkable when considered alongside thirteenth-century images contemporary with the St John's Psalter in which the multiplication of a head or a face is employed as an attribute of evil or monstrosity. In a number of Bibles moralisées, for example, the Antichrist is shown with three faces merged onto a singular head, and a similar iconographic motif is used in the representation of a giant in a Bestiary now in the Westminster Abbey Library (figs. 4.3, 4.4).[6] Studies that discuss the St John's Trinity have often analysed the three-headed being in relation to these more 'monstrous' three-faced images. As a result, this image has been approached predominantly from the perspective of the 'diabolical'; the being has been described as 'undeniably monstrous'[7], and even 'satanic'[8], a 'deformed' Trinity that borders on the idolatrous.[9] Furthermore, in addition to these comparisons, scholars often discuss the figure in the St John's Psalter within the context of later criticisms of other three-headed or three-faced Trinities. As Robert Mills has shown, the type was heavily condemned in the fifteenth century by figures such as Saint Antoninus of Florence (d. 1459), who described the image as 'monstrous in the nature of things' (*quod monstrum est in rerum natura*) and the Counter-Reformation theologian Johannes Molanus (1533-1585), who called these trinities a 'diabolical invention' (*figmentum Diabolicum*).[10] Pope Urban VIII (r. 1623-1644) eventually banned the use of three-headed Trinities in a papal bull of 1628.[11] These later condemnations are important for understanding attitudes towards the visualisation of the Trinity from the fifteenth century on, but they do not tell us anything of the thirteenth-century context in which the three-headed Trinity in the St John's Psalter was created. In fact, these later criticisms of three-headed Trinities have

[5] Though this unusual image of a three-headed Trinity has featured briefly in a number of recent studies, the possible iconographic precedents for such a design have not been discussed in detail. See Michael Camille, *Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image-Making in Medieval Art* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 204; Debra Higgs Strickland, *Saracens, Demons and Jews: Making Monsters in Medieval Art* (Princeton, 2003), pp. 254-5; Robert Mills, 'Jesus as Monster', *The Monstrous Middle Ages*, ed. Bildhauer and Mills (Cardiff, 2003), pp. 28-54. On the iconography of the three-headed Trinity, see G. J. Hoogewerff, 'Vultus Trifons: Emblema diabolico immagine improba della santissima Trinità', *Rendiconti della Pontifica Accademia Romana di Archeologia*, 19 (1942-3), pp. 205-45; R. Pettazzoni, 'The Pagan Origins of the Three-Headed Representation of the Christian Trinity', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 52 (1989), pp. 14-33.

[6] Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS 2554, f. 43v; London, Westminster Abbey MS 22, f. 3r. The three-faced Antichrist appears in a number of Bibles moralisées, including Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS 1179 (f. 101v) and London, British Library Harley MS 1527 (f. 127r).

[7] Strickland, *Saracens, Demons and Jews*, p. 243.

[8] A. N. Didron, *Christian Iconography*, vol. II, trans. E. J. Millington (London, 1891), p. 22.

[9] Camille, *Gothic Idol*, p. 204.

[10] Mills, 'Jesus as Monster', pp. 38-39 and 46-47.

[11] Ibid, p. 47.

affected how we as modern readers have interpreted the figure in the St John's Psalter. As Mills points out, art historians have tended to 'mimic' the tone and language of the later medieval critics in their analysis of the three-headed Trinity, without fully examining the attitudes that may have existed in the period that the St John's Psalter was made.[12]

In presenting a closer examination of the thirteenth-century context in which the St John's Psalter illuminations were produced, and looking specifically to the potential iconographic sources behind the design of the remarkable three-headed being on folios 9r and 9v, this chapter reconsiders the possible iconographic precedents for the creation of a three-headed Trinity. These sources show that whilst the three-headed Trinity in the St John's Psalter is a highly inventive and remarkable image, it may not have necessarily been perceived in the thirteenth century as monstrous, heretical or diabolical. Though 'monstrous' imagery may indeed have formed part of the inspiration for this design, it is probable that the artist of the St John's Psalter was also drawing on new and imaginative developments in Trinitarian iconography in the later half of the thirteenth century in their unique depiction of the Trinity as a three-headed being.

In this chapter, it is suggested that one particular type of Trinitarian image provided a visual precedent for the re-imagining of the Trinity with three heads in the St John's Psalter: the three-faced Trinity. Several extant three-faced Trinities show this image to have been current in English visual tradition before the execution of the St John's Psalter. An early example in which three conjoined heads are interpreted as the Trinity appears as an ingenious adaption of a Roman intaglio on the counterseal or *secretum* of Roger de Pont L'Évêque, Archbishop of York from 1154 to 1181, discussed in the first part of this chapter. After this late twelfth-century seal, the only two examples of three-faced Trinities to survive from the thirteenth century were made in the two decades preceding the execution of the St John's Psalter illuminations, and are both associated with Salisbury Cathedral. The earlier of these two three-faced trinities occupies an initial in the Bible of William of Hales made in 1254 (f. 193v, fig. 4.7).[13] It is argued that this image inspired the design of the later three-faced label stop head in Salisbury Cathedral chapter house (fig. 5).[14] A discussion of the similarities between the design of the spandrels in the Salisbury chapter house and the illuminated cycle in the St John's Psalter will show these two artistic centres to have been fairly well connected in the later half of the thirteenth century, a factor which may have enabled an exchange in ideas related to the visualisation of the Trinitarian God.

---

[12] Mills, 'Jesus as Monster', p. 47.
[13] Bible of William of Hales, England (Salisbury), 1254 (London, BL MS Royal 1 B XII), f. 193v. This manuscript is discussed below, pp. 192-195.
[14] Discussed pp. 195-199.

'Caput nostrum trinitas est': The Secret Seal of Roger de Pont L'Évêque

The *secretum* or 'secret seal' of Roger de Pont L'Évêque (fig. 4.5), the Norman Archbishop of York from 1154-1181, is a witness not only to the creative approach to the visualisation of the Trinity in the later twelfth century, but also to the inventive and often playful re-interpretation of Greco-Roman material culture and imagery for use in a medieval, Christian context. Born in Normandy in around 1115, Roger initially served in the household of Archbishop of Canterbury Theobald of Bec (r. 1139-1161) alongside Thomas Becket (c. 1119/20-1170), and was made Archdeacon of Canterbury in around 1148 before being appointed Archbishop of York in 1154.[15] He is best known for his involvement in the conflict between Henry II of England (r. 1154-1189) and Becket, as it was Roger, as Archbishop of York, that crowned the Young King Henry (1155-1183) in Westminster Abbey on 14 June 1170, in direct contradiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury's papal privilege over the coronation of kings; in response, Becket excommunicated Roger upon his return to England in 1170.[16] He is known to have travelled to the king's court in Normandy upon his excommunication, where he was in all likelihood one of the people to report Becket's actions to Henry, leading to the king's outburst against the Archbishop.[17] A number of Roger's contemporaries therefore suspected him of being implicated in Becket's murder.[18] Pope Alexander III (r. 1159-1181) nevertheless pardoned him in 1171.[19] During his time as Archbishop of York, Roger was heavily involved in the rebuilding of York Minster, and oversaw the reconstruction of the Cathedral choir.[20]

Roger's *secretum*, impressed on the reverse of his Seal of Dignity, is preserved on a number of charters now in the Treasury of the Dean and Chapter of Durham Cathedral.[21] The Seal of Dignity was the largest seal used by high-ranking clergy and was employed to authenticate formal business.[22] The obverse of Roger's Seal of Dignity shows the mitred archbishop standing on a small plinth, with one hand raised in blessing and the other holding a crozier. The inscription around the seal reads: '+ [SIGI]LLUM ROGERI DEI [GRATIA] EBORACENSIS ARCHIEPISCOPI' ('The seal of Roger by the Grace of God

---

[15] For a brief account of Roger's life and career see Marie Lovatt's introduction in *English Episcopal Acta: York, 1154-1181*, ed. Marie Lovatt (Oxford, 2000), pp. xxiii-lxix.
[16] Frank Barlow, *Thomas Becket* (California, 1990), pp. 69-70.
[17] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, p. 224; Lovatt, *English Episcopal Acta*, p. xxiii-iv.
[18] Lovatt, *English Episcopal Acta*, p. xxiii, n. 7.
[19] Ibid, p. xxiv.
[20] Sarah Brown, *'Our Magnificent Frabrick': York Minster, An Architectural History, c. 1220-1500* (London, 2003), p. 4.
[21] Durham D/C 1.1 Archep. 4, 5 and 6.
[22] John P. Dalton, *The Archiepiscopal and Deputed Seals of York 1114-1500* (York, 1992), pp. 6-7.

Archbishop of York'). The *secretum* was a second, often smaller and more personal, seal used predominantly in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to counterseal the Seal of Dignity.[23] Roger's Seals of Dignity preserved at Durham show his *secretum* matrix to have been formed of a Roman or Greek intaglio gem surmounted on an oval metal base inscribed with a clockwise legend.[24] The intaglio itself was decorated with a curious design that showed three separate faces in profile conjoined into one singular head and looking in three directions, up, to the left and to the right. Each of the faces seems to be of a different age: the face looking up is clean-shaven, whilst the head looking to the left has a short pointed beard and the face looking to the right, presumably the oldest, has a long, flowing beard that curls under the conjoined head.[25]

The Romano-Greek meaning of the triple-faced head is difficult to establish conclusively. Scholars have identified it variably as a 'triple-faced mask of Greek comedy,'[26] a chimera[27], the heads of Jupiter, Apollo and Saturn[28] and as a representation of the three ages of man.[29] The medieval re-interpretation of this image, however, is made unequivocal in the inscription surrounding the intaglio, still legible on the surviving seals. Running clockwise, the legend reads: '+ CAPVT NOSTRV[M] TRINITAS EST' ('Our head is the Trinity'). The three conjoined faces on this ancient and precious intaglio were thus re-imagined in the later twelfth century as representative of the three united persons of the Trinity, with their one head but three faces neatly encapsulating the three-in-one nature of God. To Archbishop Roger, and to the recipients of his *secretum*, this inscription would have rendered the otherwise pagan and perhaps obscure visual nature of the intaglio unambiguously Christian.

[23] Dalton, *The Archiepiscopal and Deputed Seals*, pp. 6-7.
[24] W. Greenwell and C. H. Hunter Blair, 'Catalogue of the Seals in the Treasury of the Dean and Chapter of Durham', *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 3rd series, 7-11 (1911-20), pp. 270-360 p. 490, no. 3220, plate 58; Dalton, *The Archiepiscopal and Deputed Seals*, p. 48, plate 2.
[25] Greenwell and Blair describe this as the 'head and trunk of an animal like an elephant', but close inspection of the seal and antiquarian engravings show it to be a long beard, flowing down from the heads in a way that would be easily mistaken as a neck. See Greenwell and Blair, 'Catalogue of the Seals', p. 490. Roger's Seal of Dignity and secretum are recorded in the Society of Antiquaries of London, *Vetusta Monumenta, quae ad rerum britannicarum memoriam conseruandam*, 7 vols. (London, 1747-1906), vol. I (1747), plate LIX (fig. 4.6).
[26] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, pp. 38-9.
[27] Greenwell and Blair, 'Catalogue of the Seals', p. 490.
[28] Philipp R. Schofield, *Seals and Their Context in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2015), p. 16.
[29] Marie Lovatt, *English Episcopal Acta*, p. lxvi

Gems and Intaglios on Medieval Seals

The practice of re-using and re-defining ancient intaglio for use as seals and *secretum* was fairly common in England in the Middle Ages.[30] The first known English prelate to use an ancient gem as part of his counterseal was Henry de Blois, Bishop of Winchester from 1129-1171.[31] They then became particularly popular in the later twelfth century, before declining in use in the fourteenth century.[32] Notable prelates with intaglio seals include Thomas Becket, Roger's contemporary (and rival), whose personal seal showed a figure, possibly Mercury or Mars, resting against a pillar, with the inscription 'SIGILLUM THOME LUND' ('the seal of Thomas of London').[33] The re-use of intaglios on seals was part of a wider trend in which ancient gems, intaglios and cameos were reworked in a variety of contexts, from jewellery to liturgical items and reliquaries. Hubert Walter, Archbishop of Canterbury from 1193-1205 and Lord Chancellor to King John from 1199-1205 was buried with two items containing intaglios, a beautiful green ring decorated with a serpent-like hybrid, and his crozier, which is still set with three ancient gems.[34] The Westminster Retable was decorated with imitation cameos and gems, though now only one complete cameo remains of the original thirty-six,[35] and records show that eighty-five cameos were acquired by Henry III of England (r. 1216-1272) for the shrine of Edward the Confessor between 1244 and 1267.[36] The shrine of the Three Kings in Cologne Cathedral, which contains a number of cameos, including the magnificent Ptolemy cameo made in 278

[30] T. A. Heslop, 'Seals' in *English Romanesque Art 1066-1200*, eds. George Zarnecki, Janet Holt and Tristram Holland (London, 1984), pp. 298-319 (p. 299); M. Henig and T. A. Heslop, 'Three thirteenth-century seal matrices with intaglio stones in Castle Museum, Norwich', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 39 (1986), pp. 305-9; T. A. Heslop, 'The Seals of the Twelfth-Century Earls of Chester', *Journal of the Chester Archaeological Society*, 71 (1991), pp. 197-97; M. Henig, 'The Re-use and Copying of Ancient Intaglios set in Medieval Personal Seals, mainly found in England: An aspect of the Renaissance of the 12th century', *Good Impressions: Image and Authority in Medieval Seals* (London, 2008), pp. 25-34; Schofield, *Seals and Their Context in the Middle Ages*, esp. pp. 6-7, 16; For the use of ancient intaglio in the Middle Ages more generally see *Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England, 1200-1400* (London, 1987), p. 398, no. 456; M. Henig, *A Corpus of Roman Engraved Gemstones from British Sites*, BAR British series 8, 3rd edn. (Oxford, 2007); M. Henig, *Classical Gems: Ancient and Modern Intaglios and Cameos in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1994).

[31] Dalton, *The Archiepiscopal and Deputed Seals*, p. 6.

[32] Heslop, 'The Seals of the Twelfth-Century Earls of Chester', p. 197; Henig, 'The Re-use and Copying of Ancient Intaglios', p. 25.

[33] Barlow, *Thomas Becket*, pp. 38-9.

[34] Walter's tomb was opened in 1890. For these items and the tomb opening see See Neil Stratford, Pamela Tudor Craig and Anna Maria Muthesius, 'Archibishop Hubert Walter's tomb and its furnishings', *Medieval Art and Architecture at Canterbury Before 1200*, British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, vol. 5 (1982), pp. 71-93.

[35] George Henderson, 'The Style and Function of the Cameos on the Frame of the Westminster Retable, *The Antiquaries Journal*, vol. 91 (Sep., 2011), pp. 145-162; John Cherry, 'Cameos and gems on the Westminster Retable', *The Westminster Retable: History, Technique, Conservation*, ed. Paul Binski and Ann Massing (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 131-5.

[36] Cherry, 'Cameos and gems', p. 132, n. 20.

BC, now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, may have inspired the later decorative scheme of the Confessor's shrine at Westminster.[37]

Whether real or imitation, gems, cameos and intaglios had a variety of cultural meanings and functions. They recalled the splendour of the ancient world, and also accorded with the descriptions of the Heavenly Jerusalem in their reflection of light and colour.[38] As recorded in medieval lapidaries, it was also believed that gems had magical properties and could offer supernatural protection.[39] Notably, gems and intaglios were also status items, worn and used to confer authority and opulence.[40]

Roger's three-faced seal, in its re-imagining of a pagan image within a Christian, Trinitarian framework, also demonstrates another way in which these items were valued and conceptualised, as ancient objects that could be given contemporary meaning through association with new contexts and ideas. Intaglios and cameos with ancient signs were commonly interpreted as having Christian significance. Albertus Magnus (c. 1200-1280), in his description of the Ptolemy cameo on the shrine of the Three Kings, inferred that the double portrait of Ptolemy II, King of Egypt (r. 309-246 BC) and his wife Arsinoe II (316-c. 260 BC) and the additional depiction of a head on Ptolemy's helmet was a representation of the three magi.[41] As Martin Henig has shown, intaglio seals in particular were frequently given a Christianised meaning in the inscription surrounding the gem.[42] For example, a seal set with an intaglio depicting the head of Apollo found near Stratford-Upon-Avon contains the inscription '+ CAPUT + OMNIUM + XPC' ('Christ the head of all things'), thus transforming the head of the pagan god into the head of Christ. Another seal found in Fordingbridge, Hampshire, shows two figures of Tyche (Fortuna) greeting one another, but is inscribed with the legend: '+ VERBE + SALUTIS + AVE' ('The word of Salvation: Hail!'), recalling a scene of the annunciation.[43]

The Inventive Iconography of Roger's Seal

In offering a Christian interpretation of a Greco-Roman image, Roger's *secretum* thus accords with the wider use of ancient gems and imagery in this period. It is, however, the only known surviving example in which an ancient image of a three-faced figure is explicitly

[37] Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum, inv. no. ANSA IXa 81. Cherry, 'Cameos and gems', p. 131.
[38] Revelation 21:1-27.
[39] Henig, 'The Re-use and Copying of Ancient Intaglios', p. 25; Cherry, 'Cameos and gems', p. 132.
[40] Heslop, 'Seals', *English Romanesque Art*, p. 299.
[41] Albertus Magnus, *De Mineralibus*, book 2, tract 3, chapter 2, ed. and trans. Dorothy Wyckoff, *Book of Minerals* (Oxford, 1967), p. 131; Cherry, 'Cameos and gems', p. 131.
[42] Henig, 'The Re-use and Copying of Ancient Intaglios', p. 26.
[43] Ibid.

imbued with Trinitarian significance. It is also the earliest extant medieval example of three-faced figure that is specifically intended as a representation of the Trinity. In this respect, Roger's intaglio *secretum* is remarkably inventive. Furthermore, he is the first Archbishop of York to have known to use a *secretum* to counterseal his documents; previous Archbishops or York seem to have just used their Seal of Dignity, rather than an additional personal seal on the reverse.[44] Archbishop Roger thus appears to have been innovative not only in the imagery he chose for his *secretum* but also in the very decision to counterseal his documents with this extraordinary intaglio.

Significantly, the medium in which this twelfth-century three-faced Trinity appears perhaps allows for such invention. The *secretum* would have been designed for the specific purpose of representing Roger as an individual, rather than portraying his office or position. As the impression employed on the reverse of a seal to add a layer of authentication to the associated document, *secreta* were invariably more personal in their imagery and inscriptions.[45] As in the case of Roger's seal, it is difficult to ascertain from the limited remaining evidence if an individual chose a particular intaglio for their seal, and whether this was related to a personal devotional preference.[46] It is possible that Roger was particularly devoted to the Trinity, and envisaged the gem as a sign of this devotion. The *secretum*'s inscription, which recognises the Trinity as the head, certainly reflects a form of devotional loyalty in its acknowledgement of the Trinity's supremacy. However, this personal function also informed the innovative nature of the *secretum*'s design. Whilst the official function of the Seal of Dignity meant its design was fairly standardised, often showing a depiction of the standing archbishop within a vesica-shaped frame, the 'personal' nature of *secreta* resulted in a more diverse imagery that ranged from the busts of singular heads to more complex multi-figured scenes or symbols.[47] They were therefore a medium in which more inventive and even playful images could be employed. This is certainly the case with Roger's *secretum*, and is particularly evident in the seal's inscription, which plays on the imagery of the intaglio: the use of the singular '*caput*' alongside the depiction of three heads creates a tension between the reference to the one 'head' and three heads shown on the *secretum*, recalling the same tensions inherent in the doctrine of the Trinity. This creative approach to the visualisation of the Trinity is thus a result of the medium in which it was

[44] Interestingly, several of thirteenth-century Archbishops of York that followed Roger's archiepiscopate did use *secreta*. It is difficult to know whether this was due to the precedent set by Roger or because of the increase in their popularity more widely. See Dalton, *The Archiepiscopal and Deputed Seals*, pp. 46-8.
[45] Dalton, *The Archiepiscopal and Deputed Seals*, pp. 6-7.
[46] The remaining evidence does not point to Roger's particular devotion to the Trinity. See *English Episcopal Acta*, XX, York 1154-1181, ed. M. Lovatt (Oxford, 2000).
[47] For an idea of this range see Appendix: 'Section 5: Counterseals' and 'Section 6: Legends on secret seals' in *Good Impressions: Image and Authority in Medieval Seals*, pp. 113-5.

rendered, on a personal *secretum* that allowed for inventive re-imagining and re-interpretation of Greco-Roman imagery within a Christian context.

However, whilst the *secretum* of Roger de Pont L'Évêque shows remarkable innovation in its imagery and meaning, as a re-purposing and re-interpretation of an ancient image it differs in its construction to later examples of three-headed and three-faced Trinities. The tricephalous Trinities discussed in the remaining sections of this chapter were all crafted in England in the thirteenth century. Though often drawing on earlier iconographies and designs, the artists that created these extraordinary images either painted or sculpted entirely contemporary Trinitarian designs, rather than re-interpreting classical models. Nevertheless, in their use of three heads or faces as an expression of the Trinitarian God, both Roger's twelfth-century *secretum* and later thirteenth-century tricephalous Trinities show a shared desire to find new and imaginative ways to visually interpret a complex but fundamental aspect of God's nature.

Two three-faced Trinities at Salisbury

The Bible of William of Hales

Unlike the *secretum* of Roger de Pont L'Eveque, the two three-faced Trinities made in Salisbury in the second half of the thirteenth century represent the Father, Son and Holy Spirit as three faces conjoined onto one head, rather than three heads. The earlier of these two three-faced Trinities occupies one of illuminated initials in the Bible of William Hales, now in the British Library (figs. 4.7, 4.8).[48] The Bible can be dated precisely to 1254 from a colophon on folio 431r, which states that the book was written by a William of Hales in that year for Thomas de la Wile, a canon of Salisbury Cathedral who directed the Salisbury school.[49] Nothing else is known about the scribe William of Hales, but the book also has a number of illuminated initials attributed to the Sarum Master and other affiliated artists from his Salisbury workshop.[50] With the patron of the book being a canon at Salisbury

[48] Bible of William of Hales, England, Salisbury, 1254 (London, British Library MS Royal 1 B XII), f. 193v. For the manuscript see Andrew G. Watson, *Catalogue of Dated and Dateable Manuscripts c. 700-1600 in the Department of Manuscripts: The British Library*, vol. 1 (London, 1979), no 855; N. R. Ker, 'From 'Above Top Line' to 'Below Top Line' in N. R. Ker, *Books, Collectors and Libraries: Studies in the Medieval Heritage*, ed. Andrew G. Watson (London, 1985), pp. 70-74; Nigel Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, 1250-1285 (London, 1988), p. 62, no. 102; Kauffmann, *Biblical Imagery*, p. 150.

[49] The colophon reads: 'Hunc librum scripsit Will[elmu]s de Hales, / magist[r]o Thome de la Wile, quem vocavit / magist[er] Radulfus de Hehham tunc cancel/larius Sar[isburiensis] ad regim[en] scola[rum] Sar[isburiensium] quibus / d[eu]s in hoc s[e]c[u]lo et in futuro p[ro]picientur. Amen. / F[a]c[tu]s fuit libere anno M cc.l. quarto. ab i[n]/carnatione domini'; for the colophon see Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, p. 62, no. 102. The birth and death dates of both William of Hales and Thomas de la Wile are unknown.

[50] Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, p. 62, no. 102.

Cathedral and the illumination completed at the Sarum Master's workshop, it is very likely that the Bible of William of Hales was produced at Salisbury in its entirety. Though three or four artists are responsible for the decoration throughout the Bible, Nigel Morgan ascribes a number of initials to the Sarum Master himself.[51] One of these initials, on f. 193v, contains the bust of a blonde-haired man with three faces.

The three-faced man is shown within the initial 'D' to Psalm 109, which begins with the verse: "The Lord said to my Lord: Sit thou at my right hand until I make thy enemies thy footstall'.[52] The first chapter of this thesis explored how exegetical references to this Psalm in the New Testament, as well as in works by early Christian writers and the Church Fathers, understood this verse to be an invitation by the Father to the Son to come and sit by his right hand.[53] Furthermore, though the text mentions only two 'Lords', the plurality implied by this description was often seen to signify God's Trinitarian nature.[54] Whilst some initials that accompany Psalm 109 simply show the Father and Son sat side-by-side, as chapter three has shown, it became increasingly common and conventional to show the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove flying between the two figures of the Father and Son in thirteenth-century Psalters and Bibles produced in Northern Europe.[55]

Considered within the context of the contemporary iconographic traditions related to the visual culture of Psalm 109, the three-faced figure in the Bible of William of Hales can be understood as an unusual but explicitly Trinitarian image. Breaking from the standard practice of showing the triune God as three separate people or beings, the Sarum Master instead conceptualises the Trinity as a three-faced man, with each of these faces representing each of the three persons of the Trinity. This concept of a three-faced figure encapsulates one of the most problematic but central issues surrounding the visualisation of the Trinitarian God: the simultaneous representation of the three individual persons of the Trinity, Father Son and Holy Spirit, and the unity of God. The Sarum Master reconciled this visual paradox in the design of his three-faced figure. Each of the faces represents the three persons of the Trinity while the idea of the 'one-ness' of God is also expressed in the depiction of these faces merged together onto one head.

---

[51] Folios 84v, 95r, 114r, 183r, 184v, 193v, 208r, 320r, 368r, 389v, 390r, 390v; Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, p. 62, no. 102.
[52] Psalm 109:1: 'Dixit dominus domino meo: sede a dextris meis, donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum'.
[53] See above, pp. 47-55.
[54] Cassiodorus in particular emphasises the role of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Father and Son in his *Expositio*; for the medieval interpretation of Psalm 109, see chapter one, pp. 24-31.
[55] For this iconography, see chapter one, pp. 46-82, and chapter three, pp. 170-173.

However, though in this initial in the Bible of William of Hales the Sarum Master shows deviation from tradition, and considerable innovation in the way that he visually interprets Psalm 109, it is likely that he is working from an iconographic precedent. An examination of other extant work by the Sarum Master reveals another context in which he employs this three-faced motif. The Wilton Psalter, made around 1250, can also be attributed to the Sarum Master's workshop in Salisbury, and is described by Morgan as displaying some of the Sarum Master's earlier style and work (f. 6v, fig. 4.9).[56] The Psalter is richly illuminated throughout with large historiated initials and an illuminated Calendar with roundels with the signs of the zodiac and the labours of the month. It is in the Calendar, on the page for December (f. 6v), that we find the other three-faced man. The figure is shown seated at a table laden with food and wine, raising a cup or bowl in one hand towards the face on his right and a drinking horn in his other hand towards the face on his left, whilst his third face looks out towards the viewer. The figure's three faces are executed in the same way as the three-faced man in the Bible of William of Hales: they share three noses, three mouths and three beards, but only two eyes.

The Wilton Psalter is not unique in its depiction of Janus with three faces. The motif gained particular currency in the Calendars of richly illuminated Psalters and Books of Hours made in England and France in the thirteenth century, and a number of examples pre-date the Janus in the Wilton Psalter (figs. 4.11-4.14).[57] The earliest extant example of this design appears in the page for January in a copy of Usuardus' Martyrology, made in Paris in around 1219-1220 for the Abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés in Paris (fig. 4.10).[58] It is thus not the Sarum Master's use of this design in the Wilton Psalter that is particularly unusual; rather, it is his re-employment of this design as a representation of the Trinity in the Bible of William of Hales that demonstrates remarkable innovation and creativity. The Sarum Master's Trinitarian adaption of the three-faced Janus motif is all the more exceptional considering that this image is one of only three examples surviving from thirteenth-century English art in which the Trinity is represented with three heads or faces.

[56] Wilton Psalter, England (Salisbury?), c. 1250 (London, Royal College of Physicians MS 409), f. 6v; for this manuscript see Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, pp. 55-56, no. 99.
[57] For example, Psalter made for the Clunaic Abbey of Reading, Oxford, c. 1250 (Morgan Library MS M 103), f. 4r; Cuerden Psalter, Oxford, c. 1270 (Morgan Library MS M 756), f. 1r. The motif continued to be popular into the fourteenth century; see for example the Peterborough Psalter and Bestiary, Peterborough, c. 1315 (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 53), f. 1r and a Book of Hours, England (Oxford?), c. 1325-1330 (Morgan MS M 700), f. 5r.
[58] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Lat 12833, f. 27r.

The Three-faced Label Stop in Salisbury Chapter House

Remarkably, one other of these three tricephalous Trinities also emerged from the visual milieu associated with Salisbury Cathedral, in the form of a label stop in the Cathedral chapter house (fig. 4.15). The octagonal chapter house has an extensive programme of thirteenth-century sculptural work, with scenes from the books of Genesis and Exodus carved into the spandrels in the blind arcading that runs along seven of the eight walls (figs. 4.17-4.19). The interior of the building is also decorated with sixty-five lively label stop heads, positioned just below the narrative spandrel scenes, in the place where the cinqfoiled arches of the arcading meet (figs. 4.20-4.23).[59] These heads are remarkably diverse, ranging from representations of courtly men and women to monks, nuns and friars. The three-faced head, the twenty-ninth label stop, is positioned on the east wall of the chapter house, directly below the sculpted scene of Jacob rolling the stone from the well and above the high seat of the bishop (spandrel scene xxx, fig. 4.16).[60] Though sculpted in the round rather than painted, this curious label stop is strikingly similar to the three-faced man in the Bible of William of Hales. The head is shown with three noses, three pairs of lips, and three chins, but only four eyes, positioned between and on either side of the noses, so that the figure appears to have three faces fused together onto one singular head. As in the William of Hales illumination, the three-faced figure has short hair that falls in tufts over its forehead, and three short beards on the faces' three individual chins.

The Gothic sculpture in Salisbury Cathedral chapter work is some of the most extensive of the thirteenth century.[61] The narrative programme of the spandrels (see fig. 4.19) begins with depictions of Creation and the fall of Adam and Eve (spandrel scenes 1-12) before

[59] In addition to the label stops below the spandrel scenes, eight appear on the blind arcading above the entrance on the west wall, and three on the entrance itself.

[60] Interestingly, the head is placed above and to the left of the central seat reserved for the bishop in the chapter house meetings. This prominent placing suggests that the three-faced head may be particularly significant either to the bishop personally, or to the ecclesiastical role.

[61] For the spandrel scenes see Pamela Blum, 'The Salisbury Chapter-house and its Old Testament Cycle: An Archaeological and Iconographical Study', unpublished PhD dissertation (Yale University, 1978); 'The Middle English Romance "Iacob and Iosep" and the Joseph Cycle of the Salisbury Chapter House', *Gesta*, vol. 8, no. 1 (1969), pp. 18-34; 'The Sculptures of Salisbury Chapter-house', *Medieval Art and Architecture at Salisbury Cathedral,* The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, ed. Laurence Keen and Thomas Cocke (Leeds, 1996), pp. 68-78; Zoë Dumelow, 'Transitions of Authority: the Joseph Cycle in the Sculpture Series of Salisbury Cathedral Chapter House', *The Art, Literature and Material Culture of the Medieval World*, ed. Meg Boulton, Jane Hawkes and Melissa Herman (Dublin, 2015), pp. 179-197. For the chapter house see Pamela Blum, 'The Sequence of Building Campaigns at Salisbury', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 73 (1991), pp. 6-38; Sarah Brown, *Sumptuous and Richly Adorn'd: The Decoration of Salisbury Cathedral* (London, 1999), p. 58; Brian Richard Kemp and Tim Tatton-Brown, 'The Date of the Cloister of Salisbury Cathedral', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, vol. 161 (2008), pp. 94-103; Tim Tatton-Brown, 'The Fabric of Westminster Chapter House: Filling in the Gaps from Salisbury', *Westminster Abbey Chapter House: The History, Art and Architecture of "A Chapter House Beyond Compare",* ed. Warwick J. Rodwell and Richard Mortimer (London, 2010), pp. 91-101.

detailing episodes from the lives of Old Testament characters, including Cain and Abel, Abraham and Lot (spandrel scenes 13-26). The series also includes extensive scenes from the life of Jacob and Joseph (spandrel scenes 27-55), and ends with five dramatic scenes from the story of Moses in the book of Exodus (spandrel scenes 56-60). Unfortunately, most of these scenes were damaged in the seventeenth century during the Civil War, and, as a result, heavily restored in 1855-56 by Henry Clutton (1819-1893) and William Burges (1827-1881).[62]

Clutton and Burges' notes on their restoration work, in addition to evidence in the chapter house of their nineteenth-century interventions, reveals that the narrative scenes received extensive damage in the Civil Wars and fairly heavy restoration.[63] However, unlike the spandrel scenes above, the majority of the chapter house label stops were not damaged significantly during in the seventeenth century, or restored heavily in the nineteenth century. The series of sketches of the chapter house and its sculptures made in 1802 by John Carter (1748-1817) give a good idea of the condition of the label stop heads prior to the restoration work (figs. 4.24, 4.25).[64] Though Carter recorded the likeness of the heads as individual label stops rather than in the full context of the blind arcading, he nevertheless preserved the order of the heads to give a sense of their placement in the decorative programme.[65] The majority of the label stops in Carter's sketches appear fully intact and undamaged, though at a number of points, instead of including a sketch of the head, Carter has simply entered a non-descript mark. The first of these marks is labelled above with the description 'bad', suggesting that these marks indicate a label stop removed during the damage caused by the Civil War. On inspection, the heads indicated by Carter as 'bad' can be clearly identified as belonging to the nineteenth-century restoration work, and are not label stops from the original thirteenth-century chapter house.[66] Discrepancies between seven other label stops and Carter's drawing also suggest that these heads may belong to the nineteenth-century restorations.[67] The other sixty-six label stops appear in Carter's sketches

[62] Clutton resigned from the restoration work in 1856 and was replaced by G. G. Scott. See Blum, 'The Sculptures of Salisbury Chapter-house', p. 68.
[63] Blum presents a detailed outline of the areas of damage and restoration in 'The Sculptures of Salisbury Chapter-house', pp. 68-78. This is also discussed in more depth below, pp. 167-9.
[64] John Carter, 'Vol. XV: Cos. Surrey, Southampton, Wilts., Sussex; and Salisbury Cathedral', 1802 (London, BL Additional MS 29939), pp. 74-5. This volume forms part of a twenty volume set: John Carter, 'A Collection of Sketches relating to the Antiquities of this Kingdom; taken from real objects by John Carter', 1764-1817 (London, BL Additional MS 29925-29944).
[65] The label stop Carter records as 'number one' in his sketches appears directly to the right of the first spandrel scene of God creating the heavens and earth (spandrel scene I). In keeping with Carter's numbering system, this chapter also counts this label stop as 'number one'.
[66] These are label stop numbers two (directly below the spandrel scene III) and eighteen (directly below the spandrel scene XIX).
[67] Label stop XXVI is appears as a short-haired male head in Carter's drawings, but the label stop now shows a female in a wimple. A series of six label stops on the north-east wall, below spandrel scenes XLIII-L, seem to have been heavily restored.

as they do today in the chapter house, suggesting they belong to the original thirteenth-century sculpture work. The head of the three-faced man in Carter's sketches is among this group, suggesting that it is original. In addition to these drawings, plaster casts of the label stops in the chapter house were made while restoration was underway in the 1850s. The plaster casts are now housed in the Victoria and Albert Museum and though some show signs of damage, the three-faced man appears significantly unaltered (fig. 4.26).[68]

Despite the well-preserved state of the three-faced label stop, the damage incurred by the narrative scenes in the spandrels make it difficult to assess the date of the sculptural work as a whole. The date for the construction of the chapter house itself, as well as the attached cloister, is also contentious.[69] It is clear that the chapter house and cloister were built after the Cathedral's dedication in 1258, though it is likely a large cloister and chapter house were always part of the original plan for the Cathedral.[70] A date of c. 1260s for the cloister is suggested by an episcopal grant of land to the dean and chapter for the cloister, which Pamela Blum has persuasively argued was made by Bishop Walter de la Wyle (r. 1263-1271) – a possible relation of Thomas de la Wile – on 15th June 1263.[71] However, Blum suggests that the construction of the chapter house took place in the 1280s, during a second campaign of building work at Salisbury that ensued c. 1266-1310.[72] Tim Tatton-Brown, in his more recent review of the evidence for the thirteenth-century building work at Salisbury, has argued that the chapter house was completed prior to this second campaign, most likely in the 1260s.[73]

The style of the sculpture work at Salisbury is also consistent with a date in the 1260s. Though damage and restoration particularly to the narrative scenes means evidence for the thirteenth-century work is somewhat fragmentary, enough remains for stylistic analysis and comparison with other near-contemporary schemes. Blum's assessment of the areas of original and restored fabric proves an invaluable source for analysing the remaining

---

[68] London, Victoria and Albert Museum, Museum number A.1916–587.
[69] For discussion of the date of Salisbury Cathedral chapter house see Kemp and Tatton-Brown, 'The Date of the Cloister of Salisbury Cathedral', pp. 94-103 and Tatton-Brown, 'The Fabric of Westminster Chapter House: Filling in the Gaps from Salisbury', pp. 91-101, who argue that the chapter house was built in the 1260s; Blum, 'The Sequence of Building Campaigns at Salisbury', pp. 6-38 argues it was built later, in the 1280s.
[70] Kemp and Tatton-Brown, 'The Date of the Cloister of Salisbury Cathedral', pp. 94-6.
[71] Blum, 'The Sequence of Building Campaigns at Salisbury', p. 26. The grant, which only gives an initial 'W' as the bishop's name, has been erroneously attributed to Bishop William of York (elected 1246, d. 1256) by Thomas Cocke and Peter Kidson, *Salisbury Cathedral: Perspectives on the Architectural History* (London 1993), pp. 3-4, 8, 10, but, as Blum shows, the witnesses to the deed can be firmly attributed to Walter's episcopate. See also the discussion in Kemp and Tatton-Brown, 'The Date of the Cloister of Salisbury Cathedral', pp. 96-9.
[72] Blum, 'The Sequence of Building Campaigns at Salisbury', pp. 35-38.
[73] Tatton-Brown, 'The Fabric of Westminster Chapter House', p. 94.

thirteenth-century work.[74] In addition to this publication, the sculptural scenes have also been consulted in-person to ensure that the following sections discussed are part of the original thirteenth-century fabric.

Throughout the programme, figures are executed in an elegant manner, with expressive gestures that aid in the communication of the Biblical narrative. In the scene of the Hospitality of Abraham (spandrel scene xxi), for example, the angel's raised hands bring a sense of liveliness to the dining scene, whilst in the depiction of Lot's wife turned to a pillar of salt (spandrel scene xxiv), the daughter's grief is evident in her tilted, bent body and the hand raised in sadness to her face. The drapery style accentuates these animated gestures, falling in dramatic 'v'-folds around the figures' bodies. The sculptors show a particular propensity for drapery designs in their depictions of elaborate, three-dimensional hangings in several scenes, including the Hospitality of Abraham, Isaac instructing Esau (spandrel scene xxvii) and Isaac blessing Jacob (spandrel scene xxviii). The style of the figures and drapery is comparable to earlier sculptural work at Westminster Abbey in the 1240s and 50s, for example the sculptural figures once in-situ in the chapter house, where 'v'-shaped folds in long, flowing drapery on figures' clothes are also employed (fig. 4.31). The Salisbury sculptures are however closer in style to later work at Lincoln Cathedral, comparing well to the figures in the triforium and the bosses in the Angel choir, completed c. 1270-80 (fig. 4.32).[75] These slightly stockier figures are shown with more angular, plasticised drapery than the linear form found in the earlier work at Westminster. The style, form, and, as we shall see, narrative programme of the sculpture in the Salisbury chapter house is also related to manuscript art from the 1260–70s.[76]

Probably dating to the 1260s-70s, the three-faced label stop head was likely to have been executed only a short while after an artist also working at Salisbury Cathedral completed the Trinitarian initial in the Bible of William of Hales. The striking iconographic similarities between this three-faced label stop and the Bible initial may suggest that the sculptor of the chapter house label stops knew of this earlier illuminated design in the Bible, which was still in Salisbury Cathedral in the third quarter of the thirteenth century when the chapter house was being constructed.[77] The similarities in these designs not only demonstrates the ways in which medieval artists and designers could have worked across media; they also suggest that the label stop head, like the illuminated initial, may have been conceptualised as a representation of the Trinity. Like the Bible illumination, the label stop's singular head of

[74] Blum, 'The Sculptures of Salisbury Chapter-house', pp. 68-78.
[75] Paul Williamson, *Gothic Sculpture c. 1140-1300*, p. 208.
[76] See below, pp. 206-215.
[77] It is very likely the Bible remained at Salisbury until the Reformation. See Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, p. 62, no. 102.

the figure represents the one-ness of God, and its three heads represent the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.[78] As the following discussion shows, the artistic context in which the sculptor of this three-faced head was likely working also saw the production of another extraordinary Trinitarian image in the St John's Psalter where a head, rather than a face, was employed in triplet to convey the triune nature of God. Iconographic similarities between the narrative scenes of the St John's Psalter, another illuminated manuscript known as the Murthly Hours, and the spandrel scenes in Salisbury Cathedral chapter house, show each of these late thirteenth-century Gothic works to have been produced within a well-connected sphere in which visual ideas and concepts were exchanged. It was perhaps through these channels that ideas related to the visual interpretation of God's Trinitarian nature were also communicated. The following section assesses the date and style of the illuminations in the St John's Psalter in order to investigate their possible relationship to the spandrel scenes in Salisbury Cathedral chapter house and the illuminations in the Murthly Hours in more depth.

The Three-headed Trinity in the St John's Psalter

Date and Style of the St John's Psalter Illuminations

The series of 46 full-page illuminations containing the images of the three-headed Trinity in the St John's Psalter were not originally designed for the Psalter in which they are now bound.[79] Sometime prior to the donation of the MS K 26 to St John's College in 1672, the cycle of miniatures were removed from their original manuscript context and bound into the front of a fourteenth-century Psalter.[80] This Psalter, which together with the 46

[78] This has been suggested by Robert Mills, 'Jesus as Monster', p. 47. Mills discusses this label stop briefly but does not note the connection between the iconography of the sculpture and the three-faced head in the Bible of William of Hales. The close iconographic parallels between these two three-faced heads also confirms that the three-faced label stop is not a nineteenth-century head, or restored heavily in the restoration work.

[79] C. S. Cockrell, *Exhibition of Illuminated Manuscripts* (London, Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1908), no. 48, p. 23 was the first to catalogue the manuscript when it featured as part of the Burlington Fine Arts Club Exhibition of Manuscripts in 1908; for a description of the manuscript and its iconography see M. R. James, *Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1913), pp. 264-270, no. 231; George D. S. Henderson, 'MS K. 26 in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge: A Study of the Style and Iconography of its Thirteenth Century Illustrations' (Cambridge, unpublished PhD dissertation, 1959); Jonathan Alexander and Paul Binski, ed. *Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England 1200-1400* (London, 1987), no. 353, p. 353; Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, no. 179, p. 183; C. M. Kauffmann, *Biblical Imagery in Medieval England, 700-1550* (London, 2003), p. 174; Paul Binski and Stella Panayotova, *The Cambridge Illuminations: Ten Centuries of Book Production in the Medieval West* (London, 2005), pp. 181-2, no. 74; George Henderson, 'The Idiosyncrasies of a thirteenth-century Illustrator: The Old Testament Cycle in St John's College, Cambridge, MS K 26 revisited', *Tributes to Nigel Morgan, Contexts of Medieval Art: Images, Objects and Ideas*, ed. Julian M. Luxford and M. A. Michael (London, 2010), pp. 109-124.

[80] Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, no. 179, p. 183; Binski and Panayotova, *The Cambridge Illuminations*, pp. 181-2, no. 74.

illuminations now forms MS K 26, contains a Calendar, various tables detailing the movement of the sun, moon and planets, the full text of the Psalms, the Canticles and Liturgy, and an image of Zodiacal man on f. 41v. The names of members of the Howard family are included in the Calendar, and it is likely that the fourteenth-century section of the Psalter was made for and owned by them.[81] It is also possible that the full-page illuminations were bound into the front of this Psalter in the fourteenth century shortly after it had been completed. The first 23 folios containing the thirteenth-century illuminations appear to have been resized before their incorporation into their current Psalter format, and the volume now measures 11x 7.25cm in size.

The distinctive full-page Biblical images are characterised by enigmatic drawings of large-scale figures in dramatic poses that communicate the Biblical stories with style and finesse. The illuminations open with a scene of the Creation of the animals before detailing episodes from the Old Testament, from the stories of Cain and Abel to Noah and Solomon (ff. 3r – 10v) before continuing on to a New Testament cycle of the Nativity and Passion narratives (ff. 11r – 22r). The series of images also contains a Last Judgement scene (f. 22v), an extensive cycle of the Death and Funeral of the Virgin (ff. 23r – 25r) and end with an image of David playing the harp (f. 25v).

The Old Testament images are consistent in their style and execution, suggesting that they are the work of one artist. The pictures are stylistically comparable with illumination completed in England in the 1260s-1280s and belong to what Paul Binski and Stella Panayotova have described as a 'somewhat mysterious phase in the history of English illumination and painting beginning in the 1260s, which saw the production of the major late series of Apocalypse manuscripts [the Lambeth, Abingdon, Gulbenkian and Douce Apocalypses], the Oscott Psalter… and the Westminster Retable in Westminster Abbey.'[82] This affiliation is notable in the angular style of drapery on the figures in the Old Testament miniatures, and their expressive, exaggerated poses, which are similar to the full-page figures in the Oscott Psalter, and the lively figures in the Douce Apocalypse.[83] The facial features of the figures in the Oscott Psalter and Douce Apocalypse, which are characterised by heavy brows and long, prominent noses, are also comparable to the head types of the characters in the St John's illuminations.

[81] James, *Descriptive Catalogue*, p. 264.
[82] Binski and Panoyatova, *The Cambridge Illuminations*, p. 182
[83] Oscott Psalter, England (Oxford?), c. 1260-70 (London, BL Additional MS 5000), for example f. 7v, f. 47; Douce Apocalypse, England (Westminster?), c. 1265-70 (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 180), for example pp. 24, 26.

The face types in the St John's illuminations are perhaps even closer in style to those from the Westminster Retable (fig. 4.33). The male face third from the left in the depiction of the Feeding of the Five Thousand, for example, is comparable to a number of the male faces in the St John's images, particularly the figure of God in the Genesis scenes and Adam, Noah and Abraham: all have an elongated faces and chins, an accentuated skull, and flowing hair that falls in curls around their ears and neck (figs. 4.35, 4.36). The face second from the left in the depiction of the Feeding of the Five Thousand from the Westminster Retable is also similar in style and composition to the more 'angelic' faces in the St John's miniatures, such as the face of Abel, the three-headed Trinity and various angels throughout the Old Testament pictures, whose rounded faces are framed by blonde hair in tight curls around the figures' foreheads (fig. 4.34). George Henderson has also noted how the decorated jewelled hem and mantles of the figures in the St John's Psalter seem to be modelled on the dress of the figures in the Retable, as are small details on the faces and hands of the figures.[84] The St John's illuminations' affinities with the Westminster Retable may suggest a provenance that is in some way connected with Westminster or London in the period c. 1260-80, and perhaps shortly after the Retable was made, on account of the artist's imitation of some of the Retable's features.[85]

Further stylistic similarities between the Psalter illuminations and examples of *Opus Anglicanum* support a connection to London in this period. The figures on the Tree of Jesse Cope, made 1310-25 and the Syon Cope, made in 1310-20, also show notable similarity to those in the St John's illuminations: the male saints positioned predominantly around the base of both copes have the same kidney-bean shaped head and blue flowing hair that follows the shape of the skull and falls in curls at the nape of the neck (figs. 4.37, 4.38).[86] Figures' necks are given definition by two distinctive lines that curve down towards the chest, a feature particularly pronounced in the depiction of St James on the Syon Cope and used throughout the St John's Psalter cycle.[87] Notably, the Syon Cope also contains an embroidered image of the Funeral of the Virgin, an image also included in the narrative sequence in St John's (f. 24r, figs. 4.39, 4.40). In both examples, a crowd of Apostles carry the Virgin in a draped bier, while a group of Jewish boys (two are depicted on the cope,

[84] In particular the representation of figures' noses, which is achieved by 'outlining of the bridge and tip of the nose with a single stroke, and another discreet stroke for the nostril'. See Henderson, 'Idiosyncrasies', p. 110

[85] Paul Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400* (London, 1995), pp. 152-67.

[86] The Tree of Jesse Cope, 1310-25, England (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. 175-1889); The Syon Cope, 1310-20, England (London, Victoria and Albert Museum, museum no. 83-1864). For these items see *English Medieval Embroidery: Opus Anglicanum*, eds. Clare Woodthorpe Browne, Glyn Davies, Michael A. Michael and Michaela Zöschg (Yale, 2016), pp. 30-5.

[87] For example, ff. 3r, 4r, 4v, 5r, and, in a more exaggerated fashion, on the three-headed Trinity on ff. 9r and 9v.

three in the St John's Psalter) are shown trying to overturn the bier, a story recounted in the Golden Legend.[88] The similarities between these embroidered works and the painted manuscript images in the St John's Psalter also demonstrates the close working connections between illuminators and embroiderers in this period.[89]

A distinctive feature of the St John's pictures is also their striking and rich colour scheme, where contrasting deep blues and bright reds and oranges give the images a distinctive and almost ethereal quality that compliments the obscure nature of the iconography and subject matter of many of the miniatures. This colour use results in bold and exaggerated images with perceivable motion and depth. Though the colour palette of the St John's images is significantly different to that of the Douce Apocalypse or Westminster Retable, it perhaps has more of an affinity with that of the Lambeth and Gulbenkian Apocalypses, in which reds, blues and oranges are also frequently used.[90] The monumental composition of some of the St John's miniatures also find parallels in the full-page illuminations in the Lambeth Apocalypse, with the dramatic folds of the drapery on the image of the Virgin and Child in particular bearing an interesting resemblance to the seated three-headed figures on folio 9 of MS K 26 (f. 48r, fig. 4.41).[91]

Though the Old Testament miniatures of the St John's Psalter are consistent with work produced in England, and perhaps in Westminster, in c. 1270-80, the image of the Visitation on f. 11r (fig. 8), which begins the series of New Testament miniatures, marks a noticeable departure in the style of the illuminations. The treatment of colour on the figures, draperies and background of the image is no longer completed in the light-wash manner of the previous miniatures; instead the paint is applied in a thick coat, with less consideration given to folds in the drapery or on the faces and bodies of the figures. Furthermore, in contrast to the delicate line drawings used on folios 3r-10v, many of the figures from folio 11r onwards are bordered with a thick black outline, contributing to their flat and less detailed appearance. In some cases this is very clumsily applied, such as in the Annunciation and the Flight to Egypt (f. 16r, fig. 4.42). However, in many of the

---

[88] Jacobus de Voragine, *The Golden Legend*, ed. F. S. Ellis, *The Golden Legend: Or, Lives of the Saints*, 7 vols. (London, 1900), IV (1900), pp. 234-271.
[89] Woodthorpe et. al., *English Medieval Embroidery*, p. 4.
[90] Lambeth Apocalypse, England (London?), c. 1260-67 (London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 209); Gulbenkian Apocalypse, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Lisbon, Museu Calouste Gulbenkian MS L. A. 139). Morgan also suggests that the St John's artists' use of colour, and some aspects his execution of folds and facial types, has some affinity with the Trinity Apocalypse (Cambridge, Trinity College MS R 16 2) and may indicate that the St John's artist was 'trained in the workshop of Artist 1 of the Trinity Apocalypse'. See Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, no. 179, p. 183.
[91] For the Lambeth Apocalypse see Nigel Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II* (London, 1988), no. 126, pp. 101-6 and Nigel Morgan and Michelle P. Brown, *The Lambeth Apocalypse: Manuscript 209 in Lambeth Palace Library, A Critical Study* (London, 1990).

miniatures, the work of the artist that completed the Old Testament images is still visible. In the miniature of the Flight to Egypt, for example, Mary's face and hands are coloured with a thick white paint with features drawn in dark lines, whilst Joseph's face has a much lighter pencilling and is contoured with light washes of tinted colour in the same manner as the Old Testament illuminations (f. 16r, fig. 4.43). The continued presence of work of the artist that completed the Old Testament in the New Testament illustrations suggests that this first artist initially completed the entire series of illuminations, which were then painted over at a later date by a second artist.[92]

Despite the second artist's repainting of the New Testament series of miniatures, it is relatively clear from the lines still visible beneath the second coat of paint, and from the sections of the miniatures left without the second coat, that the format and iconography of the illuminations was left relatively intact; there is no evidence of a major revision of the miniatures' iconographic scheme on behalf of the second artist. The artist who completed the Old Testament miniatures was also responsible for the preliminary design and execution of the New Testament illuminations, which were then left in the same iconographic format but repainted in some areas by a second artist, perhaps at a slightly later date.[93] Thus, when discussing the 'artist' of the three-headed Trinities in the St John's Psalter, it is this first Gothic artist, as designer of the entire series of illuminations, to which the discussion refers.

Iconographic Influences in the St John's Psalter

The iconographic influences behind the designs of these illuminations show the St John's artist to have a wide knowledge and understanding of thirteenth-century Biblical narratives. As Henderson has shown in his article on the iconography of the St John's illuminations, the Biblical scenes are comparable to a number of similar cycles in English-produced manuscripts such as the Winchester Psalter, the Windmill Psalter, the Rutland Psalter and

[92] James, *Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge*, pp. 264-270, no. 231, initially proposed that three separate artists worked respectively on ff. 3r-10v, ff. 11r-18v and ff. 19r-25v, but this fails to successfully resolve a number of issues, notably that the style of the first artist is still evident at points in the New Testament miniatures. See George D. S. Henderson, 'MS K. 26 in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge: A Study of the Style and Iconography of its Thirteenth Century Illustrations' (unpublished PhD dissertation, Cambridge, 1959), pp. 40-5.

[93] It is unclear when or why the New Testament illuminations were repainted. Henderson, 'MS K. 26 in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge', pp. 41-3, suggests that the second artist, perhaps having some background or experience with large-scale wall painting and thus accustomed to over-painting images, made a deliberate effort to revive this series of illuminations. Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, no. 179, p. 183, has also noted how some of the repainted features in the St John's images, such as the application of thick black lines on many of the figures, have also been added at a later date to other contemporary work, such as the miniatures in the Gulbenkian and Abingdon Apocalypses, perhaps suggesting that this became a popular practise in luxury thirteenth century illuminated manuscripts.

the Oscott Psalter.[94] The St John's artist also shows a familiarity with contemporary Apocalypse and Bestiary imagery. Details such as the depiction of three birds flying up to the sun in the image of the Creation of the animals (f. 3r, fig. 4.44) recalls the Bestiary description of the eagle and may demonstrate the artist's knowledge of this text.[95] In addition to sharing stylistic features with thirteenth-century illuminated Apocalypses, the St John's images appear to have been influenced by the themes and designs of these apocalyptic scenes; for example, the three extended necks fused together onto the one body of the Trinity on folios 9r and 9v echo the depictions of the seven-headed beast in Apocalypse pictures, such as those in the Douce or Trinity Apocalypse.[96]

In addition to these thirteenth-century English works, Henderson also suggests that the design of the St John's illuminations was heavily influenced by a picture cycle in a book now known as the Leiden St Louis Psalter.[97] The illuminations in this Psalter were executed in Northern England, possibly in York, in the last decade of the twelfth century, but had been transferred to library of King Louis IX (r. 1226–1270) in the early thirteenth century, where it remained until it was transferred to Leiden in the early eighteenth century.[98] The Biblical images share a number of interesting similarities with comparable scenes in the St John's Psalter, but as Henderson has shown, the St John's artist often reworks these scenes with knowledge of late thirteenth-century fashions and trends. For example, in the miniature of the murder of Abel on folio 10v of the Leiden St Louis' Psalter, Cain is shown standing on the prostrate figure of Abel, holding onto his hair with his fist. Cain's body is shown contorted into an S-shape as he raises a jawbone in anticipation of the final blow. In the St John's Psalter, Cain similarly swings an animal's jawbone violently upwards, extends almost to the very top of the miniature, whilst his left arm reaches down to grab Abel's hair, contorting his body into a comparable elegant S-shaped pose (fig. 4.45).[99] However, in contrast to the Leiden St Louis Psalter, the figure of Cain strides forward onto the prostrate

[94] Winchester Psalter, England (Winchester), mid-twelfth century-second half of the thirteenth century (London, BL Cotton MS Nero C IV); Windmill Psalter, England (London?), late thirteenth century (New York, Pierpont Morgan Library MS M 102); Rutland Psalter, England, c. 1260 (London), (London, BL Additional MS 62925); Oscott Psalter, England (Oxford?), c. 1265-70 (London, BL MS Additional 50000). Henderson, 'Idiosyncrasies', pp. 109-124.

[95] Henderson, 'Idiosyncrasies', p. 110.

[96] Douce Apocalypse (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 180), for example pp. 46-8; Trinity Apocalypse (Cambridge, Trinity College MS R. 16. 2), for example f. 13r.

[97] Leiden St Louis's Psalter, Northern England (York?) c. 1190 (Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit MS Lat. 76 A). For the Leiden St Louis Psalter see Nigel Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts I* (London, 1982), no. 14, pp. 60-2.

[98] Though illuminated in the North of England, possibly for Geoffrey Plantagenet, Archbishop of York, the Psalter was later owned by Blanche of Castile, and a fourteenth-century inscription (ff. 30v, 185r) records that Louis IX learnt to read from the Psalter in his childhood. See Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts I*, pp. 61-2 and Henderson, 'Idiosyncrasies', p. 113.

[99] For the imagery of Cain's murder weapon see Meyer Schapiro, 'Cain's jawbone that did the first murder', *Art Bulletin*, 24, 3 (1942), pp. 205-212; R. Mellinkoff, *The Mark of Cain* (London, 1981).

figure of Abel lying defeated on the ground, his right leg extended out in an elegant point. The St John's artist's elegant rendering of Cain's distinctive pose is, as Henderson points out, also reminiscent of the dynamic figures in the thirteenth-century martyrdom scenes in the Saint-Chapelle, showing interesting parallels with the scene in the third medallion on the north wall, where the saint is similarly held to the ground by his assailant's pointed, extended leg (fig. 4.46-7).[100] In the St John's image, Cain also wears a cap tied under his chin and his face is shown in profile, accentuating his heavy-set features and clearly differentiating him from the blonde-haired angelic Abel, whose face in three-quarter profile is contorted in a grimace. Cain's accentuated profile, which is repeated with even more force on the image of his expulsion on folio 6v, has affinities with the jugate heads, now lost, on a cameo that once adorned the frame of the Westminster Retable (fig. 4.48).[101]

Henderson has also proposed that an illustration in the late twelfth-century Leiden St Louis Psalter might have served as a model for the design of the three-headed Trinity in the St John's Psalter (fig. 4.49).[102] This image depicts the episode of Abraham and three angels, and similarly shows Abraham kneeling down to worship the three heavenly beings. The full figure of the first angel stands at the front of the group of angels, gazing down at Abraham and pointing towards him with his right arm. The other two angels peer at Abraham from behind the first angel's large outstretched wings, but, unlike the first angel, the artist has not depicted their bodies. Instead, their heads seem to float independently on either side of the first angel's central body. Henderson suggested that this curious arrangement could be explained by the artist's lack of space in the small quarter-page frame, which prevented him from showing the angels side by side. To overcome this problem, the artist chose to 'tuck[…] two of [the angels] in behind their leader.'[103] This unusual visual solution then proved an important stimulus, Henderson argues, for the 'awesome revision' of the Biblical episode in the St John's Psalter, in which the angels' three heads are merged onto the central figures' neck.[104]

---

[100] Henderson, 'Idiosyncrasies', p. 113. The iconography of this medallion is now only identifiable from the watercolours produced in 1870 (Saint-Cyr, Mediathèque de l'architecture et du Patrimoine, Relevé de Louis-Charles-Auguste Steinheil no. 6655.03. Watercolour 'état actuel' of Paris, Sainte Chapelle, mural N3, 1870). For the medallions in the Sainte-Chapelle see Robert Branner, 'The Painted Medallions in the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 58, no. 2 (1968), pp. 1-42 (pp. 25-6), medallion 'N3'.

[101] Henderson, 'Idiosyncrasies', p. 113; for the cameos on the Westminster Retable and their comparisons with MS K 26, see also Henderson, 'The Style and Function of the Cameos on the Frame of the Westminster Retable', *The Antiquaries Journal*, 91 (2011), pp. 145-62 (pp. 147-8); London, BL Cotton MS Nero C IV, f. 2r.

[102] Henderson, 'Idiosyncrasies', pp. 116-7.

[103] Ibid, p. 116.

[104] Ibid, pp. 116-7.

The influences on the St John's pictures are diverse, which indicates that the artist who completed them was well connected and able to synthesise and adapt his material from a range of visual sources. If the pictures were completed in Westminster between the 1260s and 1280s, as both the style and elements of the iconography suggest, then links between the work produced in London and France would account for some of the 'French' influences in the cycle of miniatures.[105] These links would also explain the notable parallels with the narrative Biblical scenes in the Leiden St Louis Psalter, though it is likely that these iconographic similarities were transferred through an intermediary rather than the St John's artist's direct consultation of the book itself.[106] However, whilst certain elements of the iconography of the St John's Psalter illuminations do suggest contact with French-made, or French-owned, narrative cycles, the artist of these pictures also displays a knowledge of Biblical imagery in the more immediate southern English context in which he was working. Henderson has already acknowledged a number of earlier insular sources that may have served as models for the designs in the St John's Psalter miniatures. In what follows, I will argue that the St John's artist's 'awesome revision' of the image of the three angels in the Leiden St Louis Psalter, and specifically the 'merging' together of their heads, was not an inevitable or obvious iconographic step; rather, this transformation can only have occurred in conjunction with specific developments related to the artistic representation of the Trinity in southern England in the second half of the thirteenth century. It is suggested that another narrative cycle of Biblical scenes may also have informed the artist of the St John's Psalter pictures: the carved spandrels scenes in the chapter house of Salisbury Cathedral. The iconographic similarities between these two narrative cycles, in addition to another set of pictures in a book known as the Murthly Hours, suggest the artist of the St John's Psalter was aware of work being produced at Salisbury in the thirteenth century. His knowledge of these narrative scenes in the chapter house suggests that he could have encountered the other 'three-faced Trinities' made by contemporary artists working in Salisbury.

The Narrative Scenes in Salisbury Chapter House and the St John's Psalter

The extensive destruction and restoration of the Salisbury spandrel scenes is regrettable in so far as, from what can be recovered of the original thirteenth-century work, they appear to share a number of interesting iconographic and narrative similarities with the Old

[105] For the connections between work produced in thirteenth-century Westminster and work produced in France see Paul Binski, *The Painted Chamber at Westminster* (London, 1986), pp. 56-63; Binski, *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets*, pp. 163-65. For the influence of 'French' architecture on English building in this period see Peter Draper, 'Architecture Franglais?', *Architecture and Language: Constructing Identity in European Architecture, c. 1000-1650*, ed. Paul Crossley and Georgiana Clarke (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 21-35.
[106] This is also suggested by Henderson, 'Idiosyncrasies', p. 113.

Testament illustrations in the St John's Psalter. Blum's examination of the restoration work on the chapter house spandrel sculpture identified the areas of heavy restoration, and the extent to which the iconography of the scenes may have altered from the original thirteenth-century format.[107] Blum's description of the current state of each scene, as well as the accompanying plates outlining the areas of damage and restoration, provide an invaluable resource for identifying the remaining similarities between the Salisbury chapter house and St John's Psalter schemes.

Fourteen of the St John's illustrations find thematic parallels with the scenes in Salisbury chapter house.[108] Unfortunately, the spandrel scenes of Creation were so badly damaged that their similarity to the St John's miniatures is difficult to ascertain. The image of the fall that follows the Creation scenes, however, contains slightly more surviving thirteenth-century sculpture, and the stances of both Adam and Eve, which are restored but based on original work, show considerable likeness to the figures in MS K 26 (spandrel scene ix, f. 4r; figs. 4.50, 4.51).[109] Though Adam and Eve flank different sides of the tree of knowledge to the two figures in the St John's illuminations, their mirrored stance, with the outer leg pointed towards the tree, and the inner leg set back, bears a close resemblance to St John's scene. Furthermore, in the chapter house spandrel, remains of thirteenth-century sculpture show that Eve simultaneously reaches up into the tree with her left hand and across to Adam with her right, holding the forbidden fruit out towards him, an aspect of the scene that has been preserved in the restoration. Eve's gestures closely resemble those in the St John's Psalter miniature, though in this example a woman-serpent hybrid shown curling around the tree-trunk hands Eve the fruit, which she then passes on to Adam to eat. The serpent in the Salisbury sculpture was destroyed, and neither Burges nor Carter noted whether this scene also depicted the serpent with a female head.[110] Similarly, Adam's reactionary gesture to Eve's passing on of the fruit is irrecoverable, though there is some indication that his arm was shown diagonally across his chest, reaching towards his mouth.[111] Nevertheless, Eve's striking gesture, implicating her as the first to take the fruit and as the temptress of Adam, is clearly paralleled in both scenes. Notably, this distinctive

[107] Blum 'The Sculptures of Salisbury Chapter-house', pp. 68-78.
[108] Creation of the birds and animals and the creation of Adam and Eve (ff. 3r-v, spandrel scenes 1-8); the Fall (f. 4r; spandrel scene 9); the expulsion from the garden (f. 4v, spandrel scene 11); the toil of Adam and Eve (f. 5r, spandrel scene 12); the sacrifices of Cain and Abel (f. 5v, spandrel scene 13); the murder of Abel (f. 6r; spandrel scene 14); the conviction of Cain (f. 6v, spandrel scene 15); the command to Noah and the building of the Ark (ff. 7r-v, spandrel scene 16); Noah enters the ark (f. 8r, spandrel scene 17); Abraham greets the three angels (f. 9r, spandrel scene 21); Abraham entertains the three angels (f. 9v, spandrel scene 22); sacrifice of Isaac (f. 10r, spandrel scene 26).
[109] Blum, 'The Salisbury Chapter-house and its Old Testament Cycle', pp. 139-143.
[110] Ibid, pp. 140-1.
[111] Blum argues that this indicates Adam beating his chest in remorse or dismay; see Blum, 'The Salisbury Chapter-house and its Old Testament Cycle', pp. 142-3.

aspect of the Fall scene is not found in the Leiden Psalter, which shows Adam and Eve simultaneously holding the fruit to their mouths (f. 8v).

The scene of the Conviction of Cain following the scenes of Adam and Eve is one of the best preserved of the chapter house series, and bears considerable likeness to the corresponding scene in MS K 26 (spandrel scene xv, f. 6v; figs. 4.52, 4.53). Whilst the heads of both Cain and God, and God's right hand, were significantly damaged and restored, the poses of both figures survive well.[112] God stands to the left of the spandrel scene, his weight positioned slightly onto his forward most foot, as he turns his upper body towards Cain. Though his hand is restored, the remaining thirteenth-century sculpture confirms the gesture of God's right arm to the right, in the direction of Cain. It is possible that, as in the St John's Psalter, God was also shown pointing in a gesture of speech.[113] In contrast, Cain's body is shown actively turning away from the figure of God, his front leg thrust forward, twisting the lower half of his body to the right. His right shoulder, and the upper half of his body, remains angled back towards God, and though Cain's head belongs to the restoration work, the positioning of his shoulders would support the restoration choice to show him looking back at God in response to his reprimand. The distinctive postures of God and Cain in the Salisbury spandrel scenes, which so epitomise the narrative of the expulsion of Cain in the Biblical text, are echoed in the St John's illuminations. God, facing towards Cain, thrusts out his right arm in a pointing gesture, whilst Cain, his face turned back towards God, turns his body away, as if fleeing to the right. Unlike Cain in the spandrel scenes, his entire body is twisted round to the right, and his left leg, which is bent at the knee, moves forward in a more active running stance than is presented in the spandrel scenes. In the St John's illuminations, Cain is also shown in distinctive blue tights that are not included in the chapter house sculpture, but in both examples the upper part of his body is covered with an over-mantle without sleeves, which is joined at the neck and hangs loosely over the front and back of his body. In the chapter house scene, Cain holds the gathered ends of the mantle in his left hand, whilst they float loosely downward in MS K 26. The inclusion of this mantle, a visually distinct piece of clothing from the standard sleeved tunics and cloaks worn by the other figures, points to Cain's 'otherness', an aspect accentuated in the St John's illumination by the addition of a pair of small brown horns positioned on Cain's head.

[112] Blum, 'The Salisbury Chapter-house and its Old Testament Cycle', pp. 174-178.
[113] As Blum states, this pointing gesture would accord well with the Biblical description of this episode, which includes a considerable amount of dialogue between Cain and God. See Blum, 'The Salisbury Chapter-house and its Old Testament Cycle', p. 177.

The scenes of Noah and the ark that follow the Expulsion of Cain in both narrative cycles also show a number of iconographic similarities. In Salisbury chapter house, the Noah and the ark scenes are divided over two spandrels, the first showing God instructing Noah to build the ark as Noah simultaneously builds a half-completed boat (spandrel scene xvi, fig. 4.54), and the second showing Noah entering the completed ark and emerging the other side to send forth a dove (spandrel scene xvii, fig. 4.57). The sculptures in both spandrels have survived well, with the scene of the floating ark in particular showing almost no signs of severe damage.[114] The spandrel showing God instructing Noah suffered from the destructing of both Noah and God's heads and hands, but the rest of the scene remains intact.[115] In the St John's Psalter, the narrative presented in the two chapter house spandrels is spread over three folios, beginning with the instruction to Noah (f. 7r, fig. 4.55), followed by Noah building the ark (f. 7v, fig. 4.56) and Noah and his family entering the ark (f. 8r, fig. 4.58). In the miniature of the instruction to Noah, God's posture differs considerably from the chapter house scene. His right leg, positioned atop a raised section of the ground, pulls the movement of his body away from Noah, in a contorted angle that is reminiscent of the angels in the Douce Apocalypse who herald with the second and fourth trumpets (figs. 4.59, 4.60).[116] The image of Noah constructing the ark, however, finds a number of parallels with the chapter house scene. In both examples, the ark on which Noah works is a half-completed, and comprised of a series of parallel wooden slats that come together into a point on the right hand side of the boat to form the bow. The pointed half-made bow is topped with the figurehead of a dog, which in the St John's Psalter has long ears that point upwards and is mirrored in a similar dog-headed bow on the other side of the boat. In both scenes the boat is raised slightly from the ground and positioned atop the stumps of sawn-off tree trunks. Noah is shown in the process of building the ark with an auger, his hands clasped on either side of the tool's handle.[117] In the chapter house scene, Noah sits above the hull of the boat, facing towards the God, whilst in the St John's Psalter he is shown in a curious position, hovering horizontally above the boat, his right leg extended out behind him so that his foot rests on the left-hand border of the frame.

Whilst the hull that Noah is shown building in these scenes is maintained in the following spandrel in Salisbury chapter house, and simply extended with the addition of a barrel-like interior that houses the pairs of animals, the image of the final boat in the St John's Psalter

[114] Blum, 'The Salisbury Chapter-house and its Old Testament Cycle', p. 182.
[115] Ibid, pp. 183-4.
[116] Douce Apocalypse, England (Westminster?), c. 1265-70 (Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 180), pp. 24 and 26.
[117] Though Noah's hands were destroyed in the chapter house spandrels, enough of the tool survives to confirm that Noah is also holding an auger. See Blum, 'The Salisbury Chapter-house and its Old Testament Cycle', p. 183.

bears almost no resemblance to the structure in the previous folio. Instead, the boat is comprised of a series of hierarchical compartments that narrow at the top, so that the ark has a triangular appearance. The only close similarity between these scenes is the depiction of Noah entering the ark on a ladder; unlike in the St John's Psalter, in the chapter house spandrel scenes Noah is also shown reaching out of the ark on the opposite side to send out the dove to look for land.

Two final comparisons of note are the scenes depicting Abraham greeting and worshipping the three angels (figs. 4.61, 4.62). Whilst the artist of the St John's illuminations departs dramatically from the chapter house sculpture in his representation of the angels as a three-headed Trinity, other aspects of the miniature show interesting parallels with the spandrel scenes (figs. 4.1, 4.2). Significantly, in both cycles the Biblical narrative is divided into the same distinct scenes, the first showing Abraham worshipping the three beings and the second showing him offering them food and wine. In the first of these scenes, both examples show Abraham to the left of the angels, kneeling in worship. Though in the spandrel scenes Abraham's head and hands are nineteenth-century replacements, the remnants of his thirteenth-century shoulders suggest, as in the St John's miniature, he was also raising his hands in supplication.[118] Unlike MS K 26, where the singular body of the three-headed angelic figure is seated on a throne, the three angels in the chapter house stand upright with arms raised, their bodies slightly overlapping.[119] Similarly, in the scene of Abraham's offering, the three separate bodies of the angels are shown seated at a table, feasting on the bread offered to them by the kneeling patriarch. The interpretation of Abraham's three visitors is thus drastically different across the two cycles, yet the choice to divide the narrative into two distinct scenes shows a consistency in the construction of the Biblical narrative.

There is enough difference between the Biblical scenes in Salisbury chapter house and the St John's Psalter to dismiss the idea that one cycle was a slavish copy of the other. However, the iconographic and narratological similarities that do exist in these two schemes suggest that the artists of each narrative composition were working within close temporal and geographical spheres. With current research dating the chapter house to the mid-1260s, it is likely that the Biblical spandrel scenes were completed earlier than the St John's Psalter illuminations, though probably only in the decade preceding the execution of these later pictures.

---

[118] Blum, 'The Salisbury Chapter-house and its Old Testament Cycle', p. 196.

[119] Though the faces and hands of the angels were also mutilated, enough of their arms survive for the restoration to be considered accurate. The wings and bodies of the angels are mostly thirteenth-century work. See Blum, 'The Salisbury Chapter-house and its Old Testament Cycle', pp. 196-8.

The 'semi-public' setting of the Salisbury spandrel scenes would have further facilitated this exchange. Unlike the illuminations now in the St John's Psalter, which may have only been intended for one or a small number of users, the Salisbury chapter house spandrel scenes would have been seen by a much wider, albeit still restricted, audience. The building's most frequent use was for chapter meetings, and the space is specifically designed for this purpose.[120] Fifty-one seats, framed by the blind arcading below the spandrel scenes, run around seven of the eight walls and would have accommodated every canon at Salisbury Cathedral, with the recessed seats on the east wall designated specifically for the bishop, dean, precentor and four archdeacons.[121] However, in addition to meetings of the Cathedral chapter, the chapter house at Salisbury was also intended for secular purposes.[122] As with the chapter house at Westminster, as well as the slightly later chapter house at York, the building likely served as a meeting place for city government and for Parliament.[123] Indeed, as Tatton-Brown has suggested, the extensive decoration of the chapter house, which in addition to the sculpture work would also have included a series of large stained glass windows and painted decoration, now lost, attests to the intended use of this space beyond regular chapter meetings and for more prestigious events.[124] The relative accessibility of the thirteenth-century chapter house would thus have allowed for a wider dissemination of the spandrel scenes' iconography and narrative format beyond the immediate locale of Salisbury Cathedral. The early dating of the spandrel scenes would suggest that, whether directly or through intermediary images, it was this cycle that informed some of the iconography in the St John's illuminations.

Salisbury Chapter House, the Murthly Hours and the St John's Psalter

The apparent influence of the Salisbury sculptures on Biblical narrative scenes produced in the decade following the construction of the chapter house is not limited to the pictures in the St John's Psalter. A series of Biblical illuminations in a book now known the Murthly Hours show an even closer iconographic relationship to the series of spandrel scenes in the

[120] Tatton-Brown, 'The Fabric of Westminster Chapter House', p. 94.
[121] Ibid.
[122] Sarah Brown, *"Our Magnificent Fabrick": An Architectural History of York Minster, c. 1220-1500* (London, 2003), p. 58; Tatton-Brown, 'The Fabric of Westminster Chapter House, p. 94.
[123] Parliament most likely met in the chapter house of Salisbury Cathedral in March 1297. See Tatton-Brown, 'The Fabric of Westminster Chapter House, p. 271, n. 12.
[124] Tatton-Brown, 'The Fabric of Westminster Chapter House, p. 94. For the traces of remaining polychromy in the chapter house, see p. 101. For the chapter house stained glass see Blum, 'Thirteenth-Century Glass of the Salisbury Chapter House', *Gesta*, vol. 37, no. 2 (1998), pp. 142-149. For a comprehensive account of the decoration of Salisbury Cathedral see Sarah Brown, *Sumptuous and Richly Adorn'd: The Decoration of Salisbury Cathedral* (London, 1999).

Salisbury chapter house than the narrative scenes in MS K 26.[125] Furthermore, whilst the Old Testament scenes in this cycle are closely connected to the Salisbury sculptures, the New Testament illuminations, completed by a different artist, share a number of interesting iconographic parallels with the New Testament scenes in the St John's Psalter. The shared iconography between each of these narrative schemes suggests that the artists and designers of these narrative cycles were operating within a well-connected artistic sphere.

Like the St John's Psalter, the Murthly Hours is a composite manuscript comprising of two distinct sections: a Book of Hours, which was written and illuminated in Paris in the 1280s, and a cycle of 23 full-page illuminations inserted into the front of the Book of Hours.[126] These full-page miniatures depict various scenes from Genesis and the Infancy and Passion of Christ, though the series appears incomplete and is likely missing a considerable number of images.[127] Unlike the French-made book in which they are now bound, the full-page illuminations were probably made somewhere in southern England in the period 1260-1280.[128] In his monograph on the Murthly Hours, John Higgit identified the work of three different artists across the series of 23 prefatory miniatures. The first artist, which he named the 'Genesis artist', worked on the Genesis scenes in the first two quires (fols. 1-2 and 3-8); the second, the 'Infancy artist', worked on the Infancy of Christ scenes in the third quire (fols. 9-14); and the third hand, the 'Passion artist', worked on the Passion of Christ miniatures in the fourth and fifth quires (fols. 15-21 and 22-23).[129]

As Higgit has argued, the similarities in the style of the 'Genesis' and 'Infancy' artists suggests that the miniatures were produced either in the same workshop, perhaps by a master and his assistant, or by two independent collaborators also working together closely.[130] The figures in these scenes have relatively short, stocky bodies that typically fill only half the frame, and the execution of details on drapery and clothing is not as finely rendered as in the St John's Psalter miniatures. The design of these miniatures is unequivocally similar to the spandrel scenes in Salisbury Cathedral chapter house. Eight narrative episodes appear in each set of Biblical cycles: the Sacrifice of Cain and Abel (f. 1r, spandrel scene xiii); the Murder of Abel (f. 2r, spandrel scene xiv); the Drunkenness of Noah (f. 3r, spandrel scene xix); Abraham and the Three Angels (f. 4r, spandrel scene xxii); the Destruction of Sodom (f. 5r, spandrel scene xxiii and xxiv); Joseph Telling his Dream (f.

[125] Murthly Hours, England, c. 1260-80 (Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland MS 21000). For the manuscript see John Higgit, *The Murthly Hours: Devotion, Literacy and Luxury in Paris, England and the Gaelic West* (London, 2000).
[126] Higgit, *The Murthly Hours*, pp. 1-36.
[127] Ibid, p. 194.
[128] Ibid.
[129] Ibid.
[130] Ibid.

6r, spandrel scene xxxvi); Joseph Cast into the Pit (f. 7r, spandrel scene xxxvii); and Joseph Presented to Potiphar (f. 8r, spandrel scene xl). Each of these scenes shares a nearly identical composition.

Higgit has argued that the unmistakeable iconographic similarities between this series of Old Testament images and the narrative design of the Chapter House sculpture suggests that one was a direct copy of the other, or that there was a common source or model behind each decorative programme.[131] Although the execution of the Chapter House sculpture and the Murthly Hours paintings are dated between 1260 and 1280, Higgit intuited that the 'Genesis Artist' of the Murthly Hours knew of the Salisbury spandrel scenes, rather than the other way round. He observed that the 'Genesis Artist' exhibits less finesse and understanding of the figural forms in his execution of the Biblical scenes, which may suggest he took more of a passive role in their layout. He argues that the Murthly scenes give 'the impression of squeezing horizontally arranged narrative compositions, such as can be seen at Salisbury, into a vertical format.'[132] Higgit concluded that the 'Genesis Artist' of the Murthly Hours had seen and studied the spandrel sculpture in Salisbury Cathedral chapter house, or that he might have encountered preparatory drawings used by the sculptors.

The nine illuminations of Christ's Passion that follow the Genesis and Infancy miniatures in the Murthly Hours form a stylistically distinct group from the previous folios. Though the size and trefoil framing of the illuminations is similar to the Genesis and Infancy scenes, the figures are much taller and more elegant, with long, elongated faces often shown in three-quarter profile. The scenes are also livelier, with the characters shown in jaunty, exaggerated poses. Stylistically, the miniatures are similar to a series of images of the Kings of England in a manuscript known as the *Effigies ad Regum Angliae*, which was possibly made for a royal audience in Westminster in the period c. 1280-1300.[133] This may also suggest a Westminster provenance for the Passion pictures in the Murthly Hours. The Passion miniatures also show some stylistic similarity to the pictures in the St John's Psalter, particularly in the facial types of Christ and God, who have an accentuated skull, hair that curls on the nape of the neck and short, pointed beards.

---

131 Higgit, *The Murthly Hours*, pp. 247-8; these similarities are also noted by Blum, pp. 115-6.
132 Higgit, *The Murthly Hours*, p. 247.
133 *Effigies ad Regum Angliae*, England (London?), c. 1280-1300 (London, BL Cotton MS Vitellius A. XIII). Higgit, *The Murthly Hours*, p. 246; for the *Effigies ad Regum Angliae* see Lucy Freeman Sandler, *Gothic Manuscripts 1285-1385* (London, 1986), vol. ii, p. 19, cat. no. 9 and Judith Collard, '*Effigies ad Regum Angliae* and the representation of Kingship in Thirteenth-Century English Royal Culture', *Electronic British Library Journal* 9, (2007), pp. 1-26.

There are also a number of iconographic connections between the narrative design of the St John's Psalter illuminations and the Passion miniatures in the Murthly Hours. Six of the narrative episodes appear in each set of prefatory illuminations: The Last Supper (folio 15v in the Murthly Hours and f. 18r of the St John's Psalter; figs. 4.63, 4.64); The Betrayal (folios 17v and 18v, figs. 4.65, 4.66); the Flagellation (folios 18v and 19r; figs. 4.67, 4.68); the Deposition (folios 20v and 20v; figs. 4.69, 4.70); the Burial (folios 21r and 21r; figs. 4.71, 4.72) and the Ascension (folios 22v and 21v; figs. 4.73, 4.74). Of these six miniatures, the images of the Betrayal in both series (figs. 4.65, 4.66) display the closest iconographic parallels. In both miniatures, Christ stands at the centre of the panel with his right arm extended towards Peter in a gesture of admonition. Peter is shown in the foreground with his sword drawn, cutting off the ear of one of the soldiers. In his other hand he holds a book, which is also grasped by one of the men arresting him. Judas stands to the right of Christ, reaching up to kiss his cheek, and his facial features bear a close resemblance: his face is rendered in profile, accentuating his heavy, pronounced features and underlining his characterisation as an evil, untrustworthy figure.

The most striking shared feature between the two images of the Betrayal is the positioning of the character to Christ's left. In both scenes, this man, a soldier sent to arrest Christ, is shown in an almost identical manner, with his back turned to the viewer but his body twisted towards Christ. This dynamic movement leaves his right leg with a 'stumped' appearance as he angles his foot away from the viewer. His left arm reaches towards Christ, pulling aside his tunic, and he holds a rounded club in his right hand that extends vertically down his back. In both scenes, the figure wears the same type of tunic, which is pulled in at the waist and positioned at an angle across his knees. Behind this figure is another soldier sent to arrest Christ, who gestures in a similar manner, reaching up with his right arm to the top of Christ's head. In the St John's Psalter, the soldier simply rests his claw-like hand on Christ's head, grabbing viciously at his hair, whereas in the Murthly Hours he is shown holding an implement in the same position.

The clear iconographic connections seen in the vigorous design of both Betrayal scenes implies that the 'Passion artist' of the Murthly Hours and the artist of the St John's Psalter pictures either worked with reference to a common model, or that one artist copied from the other. The close stylistic similarities between the Murthly Passion pictures and the *Effigies* manuscript suggest that the 'Passion artist' was working slightly later than the artist of the St John's illuminations, perhaps in the period c. 1280-90. If, as is also suggested by this stylistic connection, the 'Passion artist' was working in Westminster, then it may have been here that he came into contact with the miniatures in the St John's Psalter.

The iconographic and stylistic relationship between the St John's Psalter pictures and the Murthly miniatures completed by the 'Genesis' and 'Infancy' artist is much less clear than the St John's artist's connections with the 'Passion artist'. Due to the loss of many of the Old Testament miniatures in the Murthly Hours, only two scenes, the sacrifice of Cain and Abel (f. 1r, fig. 4.75) and the murder of Abel (f. 2r, fig. 4.76) find thematic parallels in the St John's Psalter. Some iconographic similarities are evident; in the scene of Cain and Abel's sacrifice, for example, both offerings are placed on a swirling, mound-like pyre topped with flames, and an angel appears from the clouds in the upper most part of the frame, his hand raised in blessing towards Abel. Interestingly, this mound-like pyre also appears in the Salisbury chapter house scene, though the hand of God appears from the clouds, rather than an angel.[134] The miniature of Abel's murder differs considerably from the St John's Psalter image in the positioning of Cain and Abel, who both stand facing the right, Abel bending his knee and raising his hands in supplication. In this respect, the Murthly scene echoes the chapter house spandrel, though in the chapter house both Cain and Abel face left, and Cain raises his leg onto Abel's back. Nevertheless, in both the St John's Psalter and Murthly Hours miniature, Abel is killed with a jawbone.[135] However, though these two illuminated cycles display some small iconographic parallels, the scenes are much more distinct from the St John's miniatures in their composition and style than the scenes completed by the 'Passion artist'.

The convoluted stylistic and iconographic connections between the Salisbury chapter house scenes, the three sets of pictures in the Murthly Hours and the St John's miniatures, in addition to the losses pertaining to all three of these narrative cycles, means establishing the exact nature of the relationship between each set of Biblical narratives may now be insurmountable. The evidence remaining to us suggests that, of all three cycles, the Salisbury chapter house spandrel scenes were the first to be completed. Their influence on Old Testament narrative images made in the years following the completion of the chapter house is attested to in the iconographic schemes in the Murthly Hours and the St John's Psalter. Though the artists of both of these narrative cycles may not have seen the Salisbury chapter house scenes in situ, it is conceivable that both were aware of the artistic milieu at Salisbury, whether through direct knowledge of the work or through an indirect source. In addition to the spandrel scenes, it is possible that the artist of the St John's Psalter knew of

[134] These elements are all original parts of the thirteenth-century sculpture. See Blum, 'The Salisbury Chapter-house and its Old Testament Cycle', p. 161.
[135] In this scene in the Salisbury chapter house, this weapon has been restored as a pickaxe. However, there is reason to think that the weapon included here may also have been a jawbone. See Blum, 'The Salisbury Chapter-house and its Old Testament Cycle', p. 173.

the other sculpture work in the Cathedral chapter house. One of these sculptures, a label-stop of a three-faced head, may have inspired his creation of a three-headed Trinity.

Conclusion to Chapter Four

The three-headed *secretum* of Roger de Pont L'Eveque, the pair of three-faced figures produced in thirteenth-century Salisbury and the three-headed Trinity in the St John's Psalter all represent the concept of the Trinity in a technically different but thematically similar and unconventional manner. Despite the clear distinction between three faces and three heads, a common conception lies behind all of these images – that the Trinitarian God can be represented through the multiplication of a human face or head. Roger's *secretum* is unique in its re-interpretation of an ancient three-headed image within a Trinitarian context; the surviving material suggests that it is not until the thirteenth century that artists begin to craft contemporary three-headed or three-faced images to represent the Trinity.

Furthermore, as this chapter has shown, the iconographic connections between the three tricephalous Trinities made in the thirteenth century suggest that the production of this unconventional type of Trinity occurred within a well-connected artistic sphere, through which new ideas about the visualisation of the Trinitarian God were communicated. The three-faced head in the Bible of William of Hales was certainly completed prior to the execution of the three-headed Trinity in the St John's Psalter, and it is likely that the three-faced label stop in Salisbury Cathedral chapter house also pre-dates the St John's Psalter cycle. Though the clear iconographic similarities between the Leiden St Louis Psalter illustration and the parallel scene in the St John's Psalter strongly suggest the artist of the latter had seen or knew of the former, his distinctive alteration of the Leiden image, and specifically his decision to fuse the three floating heads onto the single body of the angel, seems likely to have been in response to distinctive developments in Trinitarian imagery in a much more local and immediate context. The two three-faced trinities produced at Salisbury Cathedral in the second half of the thirteenth century give an idea as to the visual model on which the artist of the St John's Trinity may have been drawing. Furthermore, the connections between the sculptures in Salisbury Cathedral chapter house and the illuminations in the St John's Psalter offer a glimpse at the tangible channel of transmission through which these ideas about the visualisation of the Trinity could have been conveyed. Though the image in the Leiden St Louis Psalter may have provided the artist of the St John's illuminations with an authoritative model on which to base his design, the concept

of a three-faced Trinity may equally have offered the stimulus for his highly unusual, innovative and remarkable re-imagining of this Trinitarian image.

The image of the three-headed Trinity in the St John's Psalter is unusual for offering a radical visual departure from conventional representations of the Trinity. Whilst the *Gnadenstuhl* and Seated Trinity depict each of the three persons as separate entities, though sometimes offering a visual sign that they are all joined as 'one',[136] the St John's Trinity merges their bodies together, presenting an arresting though ingenious visual solution to the idea of the three-in-one God. Unlike the three-headed Trinity in the St John's Psalter, the two unusual Trinitarian images discussed in the following chapter do not distort the bodies of the three persons to such an extent. Instead, they are unusual for their manipulation and adaption of conventional iconography. The artist(s) and designer(s) that created these bestiary illuminations were likely working in London around the same time that the illuminations in the St John's Psalter were also completed. Together, both of these extraordinary manuscripts are witness to the remarkably inventive artistic culture in southern England in this period.

[136] For example, by depicting the dove's wings outstretched and touching the mouths of the Father and Son, as occurs in the Cambrai Missal, discussed above, pp. 105-108.

Chapter Five: Two Unusual Trinities in the Bestiary of Guillaume Le Clerc

Introduction

The Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, now preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, contains two peculiar images of the Trinity.[1] The first, on folio 54r, shows the head of the Father, the crucified Son and the dove of the Holy Spirit perched in the Tree of Knowledge in the Garden of Eden (figs. 5.1, 5.2). This image forms part of a series of illuminations accompanying the bestiary passage on the dove. The second image, on folio 61r, adapts conventional *Gnadenstuhl* iconography by omitting the dove of the Holy Spirit and showing God the Father with wounds in his side, hands and feet in a manner reminiscent of images of the resurrected Christ (figs. 5.3, 5.4). It is the aim of this chapter to examine why this particular manuscript contains two very unusual images of the Trinity. The following discussion provides a description of the manuscript and an overview of the arguments for its date, place of production and patron. This establishes more thoroughly the context in which the two extraordinary images of the Trinity were created. The chapter then goes on to consider the two Trinitarian images in the bestiary: the image of the Trinity in the tree, and the *Gnadenstuhl* that accompanies the moralisation of the mandrake plant. As a pair of highly unusual and inventive images that break from conventional ways of representing the Trinity, the illuminations in the Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc offer a valuable insight into the processes involved in designing the programme of images in the bestiary, as well as the kind of audience for whom the book may have been intended.

The Bestiary of Guillaume Le Clerc in Context

The Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, MS Français 14969, is a small vellum manuscript measuring 215 mm in length 143 mm in width. The bestiary text is in Anglo-Norman and is completed in a neat, Gothic script. Of the 85 folios in the manuscript, 77 contain framed

[1] Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969). For this manuscript see Florence McCulloch, *Medieval Latin and French Bestiaries* (Chapel Hill, 1962), p. 65; Xenia Muratova, 'Les miniatures du manuscript fr. 14969 de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris (Le Bestiaire de Guillaume le Clerc) et la tradition iconographique franciscaine', *Marche romane* 28 (1978), 141-48; Nigel Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, 1250-1285 (London, 1988), no. 129, pp. 110-112 and 'Pictured Sermons in Thirteenth-Century England', in *Tributes to J. G. Alexander: The Making and Meaning of Illuminated Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts, Art and Architecture* (London, 2006), pp. 323-340; Debra Higgs Strickland, 'The Jews, Leviticus and the Unclean in Medieval English Bestiaries', in *Beyond the Yellow Badge: Anti-Judaism and Anti-Semitism in Medieval and Early Modern Visual Culture*, ed. Mitchell B. Merback (Leiden, 2007) pp. 203-232; for a discussion of the 'monstrous' imagery in the Bestiary see Robert Mills, 'Jesus as Monster', *The Monstrous Middle Ages*, ed. Bettina Bildhauer and Robert Mills (Cardiff, 2003), pp. 28-54 (pp. 35-37).

illustrations in a style contemporary with work produced in London in the period c. 1260-80. This connection suggests that the manuscript was made in England, possibly in London, in the late thirteenth century.[2] The bestiary text used in the manuscript is a copy of the Norman poem by Guillaume le Clerc (fl. 1210-1238), which was composed in England in 1210 or 1211.[3] This version of the bestiary text was very popular, and survives in 23 manuscripts dating from the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries.[4]

Unusually for bestiaries produced in this period, the images in this manuscript illustrate not only the animals and creatures described in the bestiary, but also the moralisations that accompany these descriptions. These illustrations are often larger than the images that depict the bestiary animals, and whilst in many ways they respond directly to the moralising section of Guillaume's text, the moralising images also situate their subjects within contemporary society; many show Franciscans and Dominicans preaching to lay and clerical crowds and performing various ceremonies and devotions within a church setting (figs. 5.5-5.8). The only other bestiary to illustrate Guillaume's moralising sections as well as his descriptions of the animals is a manuscript also in the Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Français 24428, which was made in Northern France in c. 1265. However, the iconography of these bestiary illustrations differs enough to Français 14969 to dismiss a close connection between the two manuscripts.[5] The other extant illustrated versions of Guillaume's bestiary to date from this period only show images of the animals of the bestiary, without the moralised pictures.[6]

Not only is it unusual that the moralised sections of Guillaume's bestiary are illustrated in Français 14969, but these images are also given visual priority over the illustrations of the bestiary animals. Each individual section in the bestiary text is clearly demarcated by a rubric above the text in red, which, with the repeated phrase 'ce est le sarmun del…', to indicate the animal to which the passage refers. In most cases, the image illustrating the moralisation of the animal is placed immediately after this rubric, before the beginning of the text. The image illustrating the animal is then placed at the end of the text, and is

[2] For a discussion of the provenance of the manuscript, see below, pp. 219-228.
[3] For Guillaume le Clerc's bestiary text see C. Hippeau, *Le Bestiaire Divin de Guillaume le Clerc de Normandie* (Caen, 1852); R. Reinsch, *Le Bestiaire: Das Thierbuch des normannischen Dichters Guillaume le Clerc* (Leipzig, 1982); George C. Druce, *The Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc* (Ashford, 1936); McCulloch, *Medieval Latin and French Bestiaries*, p. 65; Debra Hassig, *Medieval Bestiaries: Text, Image, Ideology* (Cambridge 1995), pp. 5-8.
[4] Florence McCulloch, *Medieval Latin and French Bestiaries*, p. 65.
[5] Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, no. 129, pp. 110-112; Muratova, 'Les miniatures du manuscript fr. 14969', p. 142.
[6] As listed in Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, no. 129, p. 111: London, BL Egerton 613; Cambridge, Trinity College MS O. 2. 14; Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Douce 132; Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum MS McClean 123.

accompanied by another, shorter rubric in red, naming the animal that it depicts. All the images in Français 14969 ascribe to this formula, with the one exception of the image of Guillaume le Clerc writing on the opening page of the manuscript (f. 1r, fig. 5.9). In addition to the moralising image being much larger than the illustration of the beast, this positioning in relation to the text establishes a visual hierarchy that prioritises the moralising image over that of the animal illustration. This predominant interest in the moralising aspects of the bestiary may reflect wider practices concerned with the composition and illustration of commentary texts in England in the late thirteenth century.

The Bestiary and the 'Metz-Lambeth' Cycle

Stylistically, the illustrations in the Bibliothèque Nationale bestiary are related to a group of Apocalypse manuscripts referred to as the 'Metz-Lambeth cycle'. Nigel Morgan and Suzanne Lewis' work on this group of six books has done much to elucidate the relationships between the artists and workshops producing this cycle of manuscripts.[7] It is likely that the group of Apocalypses ultimately derive from a lost prototype, probably made in the late 1240s. The artists of the Metz Apocalypse, the Cambrai Apocalypse, the Tanner Apocalypse and the Lambeth Apocalypse probably used this manuscript as a direct exemplar.[8] The Metz Apocalypse was destroyed in 1944 but fortunately photographed. This book, along with the Tanner Apocalypse, date to the early 1250s, whilst the Cambrai Apocalypse was likely made in the late 1250s. The Lambeth Apocalypse dates later still, to around c. 1260-70.[9] The Lambeth Apocalypse was then itself used as an exemplar in the production of two other Apocalypse manuscripts, the Gulbenkian Apocalypse and the Abingdon Apocalypse.[10] The Gulbenkian Apocalypse probably dates from c. 1265-70, whilst the Abingdon Apocalypse is slightly later, dating from c. 1270-5.[11]

---

[7] For the Metz-Lambeth group, see Nigel Morgan and Michelle P. Brown, *The Lambeth Apocalypse: Manuscript 209 in Lambeth Palace Library, A Critical Study* (London, 1990), in particular pp. 39-48 for a detailed discussion of the relationship between the manuscripts. See also Suzanne Lewis, '*Tractatus adversus Judaeos* in the Gulbenkian Apocalypse', *Art Bulletin*, vol. 69 (1986), pp. 343-66 and Suzanne Lewis, 'Giles de Bridport and the Abingdon Apocalypse', *England in the Thirteenth Century*, ed. W. M. Ormrod, Proceedings of the 1984 Harlaxton Symposium (Woodbridge, 1986), pp. 107-119.

[8] For the Metz Apocalypse (Metz, Bibliothèque Municipale MS Salis 38) see Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, no. 108, pp. 70-2; for the Cambrai Apocalypse (Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipale MS 422) see Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, no. 109, pp. 72-3; for the Tanner Apocalypse (Oxford, Bodleian Library Tanner 184) see Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, no. 107, pp. 69-70; for the Lambeth Apocalypse (London, Lambeth Palace Library MS 209) see Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, no. 126, pp. 101-6.

[9] Morgan, *The Lambeth Apocalypse*, pp. 39-41.

[10] Gulbenkian Apocalypse, England (London?), c. 1265-70 (Lisbon, Museu Calouste Gulbenkian MS L. A. 139); Abingdon Apocalypse, England (London?), c. 1270-5 (London, BL MS Additional 42555).

[11] For the Gulbenkian Apocalypse see Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, no. 128, pp. 108-10; Suzanne Lewis, '*Tractatus adversus Judaeos* in the Gulbenkian Apocalypse', pp. 343-66; Nigel Morgan, Suzanne Lewis, Michelle Brown and Aires Augusto Nascimento, *Apocalypsis Gulbenkian* (Barcelona,

The artist of Français 14969 shows the most affinity with the artists working on the Lambeth, Gulbenkian and Abingdon Apocalypses. Significantly, his work is very similar to the second artist of the Lambeth Apocalypse, who, though probably contemporary with the first artist, completed the images in the Lambeth Apocalypse that are additional to the Apocalypse scenes: the illustrations of the Life of St John (ff. 40v-47v), the series of full-page devotional illuminations (ff. iiv, f. 40r, ff. 48r-53v) and the marginal scenes of the Life of the Antichrist (ff. 11v-13r). The artist of these scenes presents a more exaggerated approach to fold types and drapery than the first artist, employing sharp 'V' shapes rather than the more rounded folds used by the first artist (fig. 5.10, 5.11).[12] The second artist of Lambeth also favours a tinted drawing technique, rather than the combination of tinted painting and full painting used by the first artist working on the Apocalypse scenes in the manuscript. In Français 14969, a similar tinted painting technique is used throughout, with light washes of paint applied as highlights to drapery and garments in order to show depth and angularity in folds. The figures completed by artist two of the Lambeth Apocalypse also show a close affinity to those in Français 14969. These similarities are particularly evident when the Français 14969 miniatures are compared to the smaller-scale Life of the Antichrist images in the Lambeth Apocalypse (fig. 5.10, 5.11). The figures in both sets of images have long elongated bodies and small heads, and are shown in animated poses, often gesturing with pointing or raised hands. Combined with the pointed drapery style, these gestures often appear quite forceful and jerky. In both instances, a good number of figures are included inside the frame of the miniature, giving the image a lively but cramped appearance. The facial types of the various figures are also comparable; positive characters in both series are frequently shown in three-quarter profile with shoulder-length curled hair and short beards, whilst negative characters are shown in full profile, with their 'evil' nature conveyed in exaggerated facial features, such as larger noses and grimacing open mouths. The close affinities between the style of these two artists has led Morgan to suggest that, if not the same person, the artists of these series of images were certainly trained and operated in the same workshop, and that the artist of the bestiary was working slightly later than the Lambeth Apocalypse, in the period c. 1265-70.[13]

Until recently it had been thought that the Metz-Lambeth group of Apocalypses and their associated manuscripts were produced in Canterbury in the mid to late thirteenth century.

2002). For the Abingdon Apocalypse see Suzanne Lewis, 'Giles de Bridport and the Abingdon Apocalypse', pp. 107-19; Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, no. 127, pp. 106-8.

[12] Morgan, *The Lambeth Apocalypse*, p. 89 and Morgan, 'Pictured Sermons', p. 324. For a comparison of the style of the two artists of the Lambeth Apocalypse see Morgan, 'Style Colour and Technique' in *The Lambeth Apocalypse*, pp. 83-90 and Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, no. 126, pp. 102-3.

[13] Morgan, 'Pictured Sermons', p. 324.

However, as Nigel Morgan, Suzanne Lewis and Michelle Brown's work has revealed, it is unlikely that any firm evidence exists for this hypothesis.[14] As Morgan has demonstrated in his monograph on the Lambeth Apocalypse, the suggestion that this manuscript and its associates were produced in Canterbury was first put forward in the 1884-94 publication of the *Palaeographical Society*.[15] This hypothesis was based on an assumption that the full-page miniature of the Benedictine monk painting an image of the Virgin and Child on the opening page of the manuscript (f. iiv, fig. 5.12) was a portrait or representation of 'chief artist or compiler'. In addition to this, it was argued that the manuscript's likely patron, Eleanor De Quincy (c. 1236-1274), resided in Kent during the time of the book's production, meaning that it was possible that the manuscript was produced at the Benedictine centre of St Augustine's in Canterbury.[16] The drawing of a peacock on the first folio of the Apocalypse was also thought to suggest a connection with Canterbury, as this motif also occurs in the Bible of Robert de Bello, who was abbot of St Augustine's (r. 1224-1253).[17] These suggestions were supported by M. R. James in his catalogue on the Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover, and incorporated into subsequent studies on the Lambeth Apocalypse and its associated manuscripts.[18]

As Morgan argued, these suggestions do not provide firm enough evidence to suggest that the Lambeth Apocalypse was produced in Canterbury. Though it is very likely that Eleanor De Quincy was the patron of the manuscript, and may have lived for some time in Kent, this does not prove that the Apocalypse was produced in this area. The curious picture of the Benedictine monk is also unlikely to have served as portrait of the manuscript's painter: as Morgan states, the practice of depicting the illuminator on the frontispiece of a manuscript is almost unprecedented in English medieval art, the only example being the image of Eadwine in the Eadwine Psalter.[19] Morgan instead suggests the image of the Benedictine monk in the Lambeth Apocalypse may have been included as a reference to a moral story related to the miracles of the Virgin that would have been known to the

[14] Morgan and Brown, *The Lambeth Apocalypse*, in particular Morgan, 'The Patron, the Date of the Manuscript and the Place of Production', pp. 73-82; Morgan, Lewis, Brown and Nascimento, *Apocalypsis Gulbenkian*, in particular Morgan, 'The Illustrated Apocalypse in Thirteenth-Century England and its Historical Context', pp. 19-29.

[15] Morgan, *The Lambeth Apocalypse*, p. 80; Edward Augustus Bond, Edward Maunde Thompson and George Frederick Warner (eds.), *Palaeographic Society, Facsimiles of Manuscripts and Inscriptions* (London, 1884-94), pp. 376-7.

[16] For a full discussion of the place of production for the Lambeth Apocalypse see Morgan, 'The Patron, the Date of the Manuscript and the Place of Production' in *The Lambeth Apocalypse*, pp. 73-82; Bond, Thompson and Frederick (eds.), *Palaeographic Society, Facsimiles of Manuscripts and Inscriptions* (London, 1884-94), pp. 376-7.

[17] Morgan, *The Lambeth Apocalypse*, pp. 79-82; *Palaeographic Society*, pp. 376-7.

[18] Morgan, *The Lambeth Apocalypse*, p. 80; M. R. James, *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903), pp. 89-90.

[19] Eadwine Psalter, England (Canterbury), c. 1150 (Cambridge, Trinity College R 17 1), f. 283v; Morgan, *The Lambeth Apocalypse*, p. 80.

patron.[20] Although it was owned by a Canterbury abbot, there is no evidence to suggest that the Bible of Robert De Bello was produced in Canterbury, and there are no stylistic, palaeographical or codicological connections between this manuscript and the Lambeth Apocalypse.[21] Concluding that there is no firm evidence to link Lambeth or any of the manuscripts stylistically and iconographically associated with it to Canterbury, Morgan instead argues that the style of this group may suggest they were produced in London.[22]

The Bestiary's Patron and Place of Production

Due to the close stylistic affinities between the second artist of the Lambeth Apocalypse and the artist of Français 14969, studies on the manuscript prior to Morgan's work on the provenance of the Lambeth Apocalypse had suggested that the bestiary was also made in Canterbury. Xenia Muratova's article on the manuscript, one of the first studies to consider the provenance of Français 14969 in detail, drew the same stylistic connections between the artist of the bestiary images and the illuminations in the Lambeth Apocalypse, seeing, as Morgan would in his later study, a particular affiliation with the artist that completed the marginal scenes of the Life of the Antichrist.[23] In accordance with the existing literature on the Lambeth Apocalypse at the time the study was published, Muratova suggested that the bestiary was also a Canterbury product. Furthermore, observing that many of the illustrations in the bestiary depict mendicant figures, specifically Franciscans, preaching to crowds, Muratova also argued that the book was associated with Franciscan circles in Canterbury in the late thirteenth century, and used for material in mendicant sermons and preaches.[24] She suggested that the book was produced in response to the call at Lateran IV for the education of both clerics and the laity, and that it formed part of the wave of sermon material disseminated in the thirteenth century for use by preachers, in this case specifically by Franciscans. Muratova also proposed that the bestiary was related to the appointment of the Franciscan John Peckham as archbishop of Canterbury in 1279 (r. 1279-1292), placing the date of its production in the late 1270s or early 1280s.[25]

Though Muratova's assessment of the artistic relationship between Français 14969 and the Lambeth Apocalypse remains accurate, the subsequent re-evaluation of Lambeth's place of production problematises the perception that the Bibliothèque Nationale bestiary was a

[20] Morgan, *The Lambeth Apocalypse*, pp. 50-1, 80.
[21] For the use of the peacock motif on the opening pages of thirteenth-century manuscripts and their possible significance see Morgan, *The Lambeth Apocalypse*, p. 81.
[22] Ibid, p. 82.
[23] Muratova, 'Les miniatures du manuscript fr. 14969', pp. 143.
[24] Ibid, pp. 145-8.
[25] Ibid, pp. 147-8.

product of the Franciscan environment in Canterbury under John Peckham's archiepiscopate. If the artist of Français 14969 is the same as, or close to, the second artist of the Lambeth Apocalypse, then there is little evidence to suggest that the bestiary manuscript was produced in Canterbury, and may perhaps indicate that it was instead produced in London, alongside the Lambeth Apocalypse. Furthermore, as Morgan has pointed out, it is also unlikely from the style of the illuminations that they were completed as late as the 1280s when John Peckham was archbishop of Canterbury.[26]

In contrast to Muratova, Morgan has suggested that the patron and owner of the bestiary manuscript may have been Eleanor de Quincy, the probable owner of the Lambeth Apocalypse.[27] De Quincy's patronage of the Lambeth manuscript has been established on the basis of her donor portrait on f. 48r, in which she is shown kneeling in front of the image of the Virgin and Child and bearing on her garments the arms of the Ferrers family and the De Quincy family (fig. 5.13). Eleanor, formerly Ferrers, married Roger de Quincy in 1252. Roger died in 1264, and in 1267 Eleanor married Roger de Leybourne, possibly providing a *terminus ante quem* for the dating of the Lambeth Apocalypse.[28] Roger de Leybourne then died in 1271, three years before Eleanor's death in 1274.

Though not explicitly a donor portrait, an image of a kneeling woman similar to that of Eleanor de Quincy in the Lambeth Apocalypse appears on f. 49v in Français 14969 (figs. 5.14, 5.15). The illumination appears before Guillaume's description of the turtledove, and illustrates the moralising section of his text. The framed image is divided into two architectural spaces by trefoil arches and a central column. On the right, a group of women wearing wimples kneel with their hands raised in prayer. Their gaze is directed towards the left section of the image, which is divided into two compartments, the upper showing an image of the crucifixion with Mary and John stood to either side of the cross, and the lower showing an image of Christ's flagellation. The woman at the very front of the group is depicted with much more prominence than the other figures in the scene. She is slightly larger than the other kneeling women, and her clothing is a dark blue colour, rather than the brown garments worn by the majority of the other figures. In addition to a wimple she is shown wearing an outer headdress with blue and white detailing, and her outer garment is lined with fur.

[26] Nigel Morgan, 'Pictured Sermons', p. 335.
[27] Ibid. For a discussion of Eleanor de Quincy's patronage of the Lambeth Apocalypse, see Morgan, 'The Patron, the Date of the Manuscript and the Place of Production' in *The Lambeth Apocalypse*, pp. 73-82.
[28] This dating, and the other possible candidates for the donor figure in the Lambeth Apocalypse, is discussed in more detail by Morgan, 'The Patron, the Date of the Manuscript and the Place of Production' in *The Lambeth Apocalypse*, pp. 74-8.

The moralising text accompanying this image explains how the female turtledove, having lost her mate, remains chaste, never ceasing to lament him and always awaiting his return.[29] Guillaume's poem relates this nature to the 'man or woman/ Who promises to God to keep chaste' (*De home e de femme memerueil/ Ke chastee a deu pramet*), warning them against the breaking of this vow and encouraging them not to remarry.[30] He states:

'Many wicked folk there are	*Mult i ad de la gent uilaine*
Who love not with a constant love	*Ke naiment par dam[or] certaine*
As does the turtle-dove	*Issi come fet la turturele*
Which renews not her affection	*Ky ses amurs ne renouele*
To other than her first love	*Ailurs ke a sun premer ami*
Never will she let him out of mind	*James nel mettrai en obli*
And if he dies, has no care for other.	*E se cil mort de altre na cure*
There are not many people	*Ne sunt mie de tele nature*
Of such nature in this world	*Plusurs genz ke el siecle sunt*
For they will not keep	*Ke ia a un ne se tendrunt*
To one husband or mate.	*Espos ne espose a son per*
When one has just buried the other,	*Kant l'un uent de laltre enterrer*
Before he has eaten two meals	*Ainz ke mange ait deus repaz*
He wants to have another in his arms.'[31]	*Uoelt altre auer entre ses braz.*

Though the text is directed at both men and women, the pronoun used throughout the moralising section is female, and Guillaume consistently relates the moralisation back to the female turtledove. Morgan has argued that the association of the kneeling female figure with this passage could suggest that 'if this [figure] represents the patron, she may be a widow, and perhaps a widow who had taken a vow of chastity.'[32] He goes on to state that 'it is tempting to suggest that the lady patron is Eleanor de Quincy… as a widow after the death of her third husband, Roger de Leybourne in 1271, and before her own death in 1274.'[33] This is a compelling suggestion, especially considering that the artist of the bestiary may be closely tied or identical with the second artist of the Lambeth Apocalypse, for which we have much stronger evidence of Eleanor de Quincy's patronage. However, the

[29] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, section on the turtle-dove: lines 2649-2736. All transcriptions of Guillaume le Clerc's *Bestiaire* are the author's own from Bibliothèque Nationale de France, MS Français 14969.
[30] Ibid, lines 2672-2674, trans. Druce, *The Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc*, p. 75.
[31] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 2675-2688, trans. Druce, *Bestiary*, p. 75.
[32] Morgan, 'Pictured Sermons', p. 331.
[33] Morgan, 'Pictured Sermons', p. 335.

lack of heraldry in Français 14969 makes any firm identification of its patron or owner difficult.

Furthermore, though the kneeling woman on f. 49v must certainly be a significant figure, to identify this one person as the sole patron of the bestiary is to overlook the numerous other, predominantly male mendicant, figures in the manuscript illustrations (figs. 5.5-5.8). Though none are shown kneeling in the manner of a patron, the centrality of the friars throughout the series of images in this book has led some scholars to suggest the manuscript has some connection with the mendicant orders. Debra Higgs Strickland, for example, has argued that 'this book was made for a Franciscan', commenting that specifically the pro-mendicant and anti-Jewish themes in the text would be particularly appropriate for this audience.[34] As has been discussed, Muratova also argued for a similar readership, suggesting that the book was used as a practical tool for mendicant teaching and preaching.[35]

It has also been suggested that other books produced in the same workshop as the Paris bestiary, which contain similar images of mendicant preachers, were intended for use by clerics or mendicants. Suzanne Lewis in her work on the Abingdon Apocalypse concludes that the book was made for Bishop Giles de Bridport, who was bishop of Salisbury from 1256 until his death in 1262. Her argument is based on an inscription in a fourteenth-century hand on f. 57v of the Apocalypse, which states that Bridport gave the book to Abingdon Abbey 'in his memory' (*memoriale ipsius*).[36] In addition to this *ex dono* note, Lewis argues that the texts and images in the book 'reveal the particular interests of its clerical patron throughout,' consistently showing members of ecclesiastic institutions, such as popes, bishops and monks, as well as friars and preachers, leading the fight against the powers of the devil and Antichrist.[37] Furthermore, Lewis' work on the anti-Jewish imagery in the Gulbenkian Apocalypse also concludes that the themes in these illustrations 'reflect the anti-Jewish prejudices of a small but influential group of English churchmen in the 1260s.'[38] It is likely, Lewis argues, that the Gulbenkian Apocalypse was designed and made for 'clerical patrons trained in the Oxford schools' who would have been closely associated

[34] Higgs Strickland, 'The Jews, Leviticus and the Unclean in Medieval English Bestiaries', p. 230.
[35] Muratova, 'Les miniatures du manuscript fr. 14969', pp. 147-8.
[36] Lewis, 'Giles de Bridport', p. 107; the inscription has been erased, but when read under ultra-violet light it reads 'Iste liber est ecclesie conventualis beate marie Abbendonie ex dono domini Egidii Sarum episcopi et memoriale ipsius quicumque ipsum librum a dicta ecclesia alienaverit vel ipsum inde defraudaverit anathema sit. que sentencia lata fuit per predictum dominum episcopum.' ('This book was given to the monastery church at Abingdon by Giles, lord bishop of Salisbury, in his memory. A sentence of anathema has been pronounced by the aforesaid bishop against anyone who removes… this book… from the church.').
[37] Lewis, 'Giles de Bridport', p. 109.
[38] Lewis, '*Tractatus adversus Judaeos*', p. 564-5.

with the friars.[39] As the bestiary in the Bibliothèque Nationale contains similar anti-Jewish imagery, in addition to illustrations of friars, monks and clerics fighting against the evil works of the devil, and was produced in the same workshop as these two Apocalypses, it is possible that, as Strickland has suggested, it too was intended for clerical or mendicant patrons.

However, the clerical ownership of these Apocalypse manuscripts is contested. Morgan in particular has questioned the authority of the inscription on f. 57v of the Abingdon Apocalypse on the basis that, stylistically, the manuscript is unlikely to pre-date Bishop Bridport's death in 1262 and thus could not have been owned by him and subsequently donated to Abingdon Abbey. He suggests that the inscription is either fabricated, or that the manuscript was mistaken in the fourteenth century for a different Apocalypse donated to Abingdon by Bridport.[40] In addition to dismissing claims for Bridport's ownership of the Apocalypse, Morgan also argues persuasively that the presence of clerics, monks and friars in this group of books does not necessarily mean that their owners were elite members of the clergy. As he states, though 'it is quite possible that the clerics who planned out these books might have been friars of monks… that does not mean that they prepared them for mendicant or monastic reading, or even for the higher secular clergy.'[41] He rightly points to the similarly high numbers of monks, secular clergy and friars represented in the Bibles moralisées, which were likely designed by high-status clerics but almost certainly owned by lay members of the French royal family.[42] The Lambeth Apocalypse similarly contains numerous religious figures intervening on behalf of the laity against the forces of the devil and the Antichrist, but was made for a lay aristocratic woman, who was probably Eleanor de Quincy. Though the images in both the Bible moraliséess and the Metz-Lambeth group of manuscripts continuously stress the role of Church in the salvation of the world through repeated images of friars and clergy, this may in fact reflect the status and position of their designer(s), rather than that of their intended reader.

Additionally, these books are finely produced manuscripts, with an impressive number of miniatures completed by skilled artists. They would have been expensive to produce, and could only have been commissioned and paid for by either a very wealthy individual. Though the bestiary in the Bibliothèque Nationale does not have as extensive a programme as the stylistically related Lambeth, Gulbenkian and Abingdon Apocalypses, it is still a finely

[39] Lewis, '*Tractatus adversus Judaeos*', p. 565.
[40] Morgan, *Early Gothic Manuscripts II*, p. 106, no. 127; Morgan, 'The Illustrated Apocalypse in Thirteenth Century England and its Historical Context', *Apocalypsis Gulbenkian*, pp. 36-7.
[41] Morgan, 'The Illustrated Apocalypse', *Apocalypsis Gulbenkian*, p. 38.
[42] Ibid. For the bible moralisée see John Lowden, *The Making of the Bible Moralisées*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 2000).

produced manuscript, with carefully executed texts and images. Its association with a workshop producing other high-quality manuscripts would suggest that this was a relatively expensive book to commission. Furthermore, if an interpretation of the audience for the bestiary relies on the status of the figures in the illustrations, then the numerous images of Benedictine monks, secular clergy and even archbishops that are also represented in the moralised images would equally indicate a patron among these orders (for example, on ff. 8r, 17r, 61r, figs. 5.6, 5.7, 5.3, 5.4). As with the Lambeth, Gulbenkian and Abingdon Apocalypses, the variety in the types of churchmen included in the illustrations is more likely intended as a representation of the force of the church as a whole against the vices and evils of the world, rather than referring specifically to the manuscript's patron.

Though it is unlikely that the mendicant orders represented in the Bestiary are indicative of the book's intended audience, it is possible that the repeated presence of these figures in the images accompanying the Bestiary text reveal the types of figures involved in designing the programme and iconography of the illustrations. This is particularly evident in the unusual image of the *Gnadenstuhl* on folio 61r, which appears to have been adapted in response to the contemporary concerns of the church in the period in which the Bestiary was completed.[43] However, whilst the designer(s) of the Bestiary illustrations may have been mendicants or clerics, the fine quality of the manuscript, and its association with a workshop producing illuminated books for members of the aristocracy, suggest that the Bestiary's intended patron was also of this status. As the striking and unusual image of the Trinity in the tree on f. 54r of the Bestiary reveals, the images in this book appear to be designed for use as didactic tools.[44] It is unlikely that a book of this expense would have been intended for day-to-day use in preaching by a friar, and the fairly pristine condition of the manuscript certainly suggests that the book was never used in this context. It is much more likely that the Bestiary was intended for a member of the aristocracy for use in private devotion and learning.

In the thirteenth century, it became increasingly common for wealthy men and women to employ clerics or friars as private teachers and advisors on spiritual and devotional matters.[45] It is likely that illuminated books were used as aids in this process, with both their

[43] This is discussed in more detail below, pp. 240-250.
[44] Discussed below, pp. 228-237.
[45] For a discussion of the role of religious advisors in the designing of illustrative programmes for a female audience see Loveday Lewes Gee, *Women, Art and Patronage from Henry III to Edward III: 1216-1377* (Woodbridge, 2002), pp. 52-4; for the wider role of male religious advisors see John W. Coakley, *Women, Men and Spiritual Power: Female Saints and Their Male Collaborators* (New York, 2006); *Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and Their Interpreters*, ed. Catherine M. Moody (Philadelphia, 1999); *Pastors and the Care of Souls in Medieval England*, ed. John Shinners and William J. Dohar (Indiana, 1998).

images and texts employed to elucidate important points of scripture and doctrine. As is demonstrated in the illumination containing the image of the Trinity in the tree, together the text and illustrations in the Bestiary in the Bibliothèque Nationale provide an ideal resource for instructing and teaching on Christian morals and beliefs. The size of the book, in addition to its extensive illumination, suggest that it was likely envisioned for use in the private instruction of a lay aristocratic individual by a friar or cleric. This context for the book's use would also support Morgan's suggestion that the female figure kneeling in the manner of a donor on f. 49v may be the intended patron of the bestiary. Though Eleanor's patronage and ownership of the Bestiary may be impossible to establish conclusively, her status and wealth, in addition to her connection to other books produced in similar (or possibly the same) workshops, makes her a very persuasive candidate as the person for who this book may have been made.

The following section examines the relationship between the texts and images relating to image of the Trinity in the tree, in order to elucidate why the designer of the Paris bestiary chose to depict the Trinity in this unusual and highly imaginative format. A close reading of this moralised section of Guillaume's bestiary alongside the relevant illustrations also demonstrates how the designer of the images intended them to be read and understood, and thus the kind of audience that may have been envisioned for the book. This section is followed by a discussion of the only other Trinitarian image in the Paris bestiary, the unusual *Gnadenstuhl* that accompanies the description of the mandrake plant. A similarly close reading of the texts and images associated with *Gnadenstuhl* show the designer of these illuminations to be working in an environment well connected with important centres of learning. Together, the two unusual images of the Trinity in the Paris bestiary reveal vital information about both the designer and the audience of this book.

The Trinity in the Tree

The unusual image of the three persons of God in a tree on folio 54r of the Paris bestiary is incorporated into an illustration of the fall of Adam and Eve, and shows the three persons of God poised on the uppermost braches of the tree of knowledge (figs. 5.1, 5.2). This image relates directly to the description and moralisation of the dove in the bestiary text, but, as is demonstrated in an analysis of the illustration alongside the text, the image both qualifies and complicates the narrative presented in Guillaume's commentary. An examination of this Trinity image and the other illustrations in the miniature alongside the related bestiary text offers an insight into how these images were constructed, and, consequently, how the book may have intended to be read.

The Trinity Tree in Text and Image

The image of the Trinity in the Tree is one of a series of illustrations that together form the largest miniature in the Bestiary. The central part of this miniature is of the same length and width as the majority of the other moralising illustrations in the bestiary, but has been divided into four smaller separate sections, showing, from the top left clockwise, images of Pentecost, the Trinity in the Tree, the Harrowing of Hell and the Crucifixion. Four additional smaller framed sections have then been added to the left and right of this central frame: to the left, under a trefoil arch, is a scene of the Annunciation, and directly below an image of the Baptism of Christ. To the right of the central frame are depictions of the Ascension of Elijah and Jonah and the Whale.

The image of the Trinity in the tree is the most iconographically unusual of the series. The tree itself is situated in the very centre of the small square frame, and is painted in its entirety in the same green colour as the border. It has a central trunk, from which two branches sprout to the left and the right, ending in a bunch of large leaves that curl delicately under the branch. The two naked figures of Adam and Eve sit at either side of the tree. Adam, to the viewer's left, raises a hand up to his face in a sign of anguish. Eve, to the viewer's right, reaches out towards the tree, receiving a piece of fruit from the mouth of a snake that curls around the tree-trunk. In her other hand, Eve holds another piece of fruit as a sign that she has received it from the snake. The three persons of the Trinity are integrated within the tree itself. Christ is depicted at the moment of the crucifixion, his arms outstretched across the vertical beam of the cross. He is shown with a nimbed halo and wearing a loincloth, with blood issuing from his hands and feet. His feet rest on the very edge of the left branch, whilst the rest of his body and the beam of the cross extend up out of the tree and into the frame of the miniature. God the Father is shown on the opposite side of the tree, above the right branch. Unlike Christ, just his face, neck, and two hands are depicted, so that he appears to be rising out of the top of the branch. The Father is shown with a nimbed halo, and he holds a closed book in his left hand. His right hand is extended vertically upwards in a sign of blessing. Between the figures of the Father and the Son is a depiction of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove. The dove is shown flying directly downwards, towards the very centre of the tree between the two branches. Like the Father and the Son, the dove is also depicted with a nimbed halo.

Each of these scenes that make up the larger miniature are referred to either explicitly or implicitly in the accompanying text below. This bestiary text concerns the dove, and is one

of the longest passages in Guillaume's poem. Guillaume begins by describing the dove as a 'courtly and pretty bird' (*Est li colums curteis e beaus*) that has a 'good meaning' (*bone signefiance*), as it is 'in this likeness' (*en sa semblance*) of the dove that the Holy Spirit, who 'descended at the baptising of Christ/Without a doubt' (*descendi au baptizement/ De ihu crist ueraiement*).[46] An image of the baptism of Christ is included in the larger miniature above, but, interestingly, the illustration shows John the Baptist holding a roundel containing the *Agnus Dei* above the head of Christ in the river Jordan. Conventionally, baptism iconography showed the dove of the Holy Spirit descending from above, in reference to the gospel narrative that states that, whilst Christ was being baptised, the Spirit of God descended as a dove from the heavens.[47] As this passage is almost directly referred to in Guillaume's commentary on the dove, it is curious that the accompanying image does not include a depiction of the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove.

The inclusion of the *Agnus Dei* is explained by the presence of John the Baptist, who, especially in the thirteenth century, was often shown holding this symbol as a visual reflection of his words in the gospel of John, where he acknowledges Christ as the Lamb of God.[48] The Lamb of God was also invoked during the ceremony of the mass after the consecration of the host, and this may be alluded to in the depiction of John the Baptist lifting the circular image of the *Agnus Dei* above Christ's head, a gesture reminiscent of the Elevation. However, the Lamb of God is not mentioned in the commentary text, and its inclusion in the place of the dove of the Holy Spirit is all the more unusual considering that the bestiary text that this image accompanies is concerned with the dove. The illustration of the baptism thus complicates the bestiary text below, causing the reader to think beyond the biblical narrative outlined in the moralisation and to reconsider more conventional representations of this scene. The inclusion of the *Agnus Dei*, an allegorical representation of the Son of God, means that Christ is shown twice in the scene. This double appearance suggests that the image was intended to convey something of the two natures of Christ as man and God. Furthermore, the Eucharistic connotations of the *Agnus Dei* are mirrored in the image of the crucifixion immediately to the right of the baptism scene, so that together the images can be read as doubly signifying the sacrificial act of Christ. In its visual departure from the text, the image of the baptism of Christ demonstrates how, though still drawing on the moralising passage, the designer of these illuminations includes extra-

[46] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 2883-2888; Druce, *Bestiary*, p. 80.
[47] Matthew 3:16; for example, see Psalter made in Oxford in the early thirteenth century (London, BL MS Arundel 157), f. 5v; for the iconography of the baptism of Christ see C. M. Kauffmann, *Biblical Imagery in Medieval England, 700-1550* (London, 2003), p. 81.
[48] John 1:36; contemporary examples of John the Baptist with the *Agnus Dei* can be found in a Psalter and Canticles made in St Albans c. 1264-60 (London, BL Royal 2 B VI, f. 11r) and in the slightly later Queen Mary Psalter, England, c. 1310-20 (London, BL MS Royal 2 B VII, ff. 213v, 295v, 304v).

narrative details that complicate a straightforward reading of the bestiary text alongside its images.

This device is also evident in the image of the Trinity in the Tree. The passage to which this image is related follows Guillaume's description of the baptism, and states how the dove is an allegory not only of the Holy Spirit but also Christ and God. He states:

'This bird signifies to us	*Cest oysel signefie*
Jesus who in his charge has all,	*Jesu ky tut ad baillie*
Who governs all and who does all	*Ki tut gouerne e ki tut fait*
And who from all parts brings	*E ky tantes parz a trait*
The dove to his dove-cote.	*Les columns a sun columber*
…	…
God is the spiritual dove	*Deus espiritals colombs*
Good is he, and fair, and broad and tall	*Bons est e beus, e lez, e loines*
And his wings are so wide	*E ses eles si larges sunt*
That they cover all the world.'[49]	*Ky il courent trestut le mund*

Though the text does not specifically refer to God the Father, the mention of both the Son and the Spirit immediately before 'God' (*Deus*) would suggest that this section is intended as an allusion to the Father. The text thus identifies the dove with each of the persons of the Trinity. However, it is in the following section of Guillaume's text, which concerns the tree in which the doves live, that the connection of the dove to the Trinity is made much more explicit.

Guillaume describes the tree in which the doves rest as 'beautiful and full of leaf and shady' (*bel e foillu e ombrant*), bearing fruit that is 'good and sweet and choice' (*frut porte bon e dirz e cher*).[50] Notably, in reference to a point that is developed later in the bestiary description, the shade of the tree also forms part of these introductory remarks. Guillaume states:

'And I can well assure you	*E si vos os ben aficher*
As the writing apprises me	*Si come la lettre me aprent*
That great is the shade, which it [the tree] gives	*Ke granz est lombres ke il rent*
Beautiful it is within and around.'[51]	*Beus est e duz e environ*

[49] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 2919-2923 and 2937-2940; Druce, *Bestiary*, p. 81.
[50] Ibid, lines 2966-1967; p. 82.
[51] Ibid, lines 2968-2971; p. 82.

The tree is also said to be found in 'India the great' (*un arbe ad en Ynde la grant*) and given a further layer of exoticism in Guillaume's assertion that the tree 'has the name/ Paradixion in greek'/ That sounds the equivalent in French/ Of saying "environ la destra"' (*kel ad a non/ paradixon en gregeis/ Si sune autretant en franceis/ Come dire environ la destre*).[52] This description of the tree's geography may allude to the tree of knowledge in the Garden of Eden, as it was believed that the garden was situated in the East, in a country such as India, a point which is developed further on in the narrative. The text then goes on to describe how the tree provides a safe resting place for doves, which use the tree as protection from their 'enemy' (*enemis*) the dragon. The dragon, Guillaume states, 'fears/ To approach the tree and its shadow' (*e autretant cremet li draguns/ Da prismer al arbre e al umbre*), so that he is only able to harm the doves if they venture out away from the tree.[53]

The following section of the bestiary description is then primarily concerned with the signification and moralisation of this tree. Whilst the tree as a whole is intended as a representation of God, different parts of the tree are shown to represent each of the three persons of the Trinity. 'We Christians know well', Guillaume states, 'what is this tree and how it is named' (*Nus crestiens ky ben sauom/ Ky est cel arbre e come ad nun*). First:

'It is our almighty father	*Cest nostre pere omnipotent*
Who spreads his shadow and his branches	*Ke sombre e ses reins estent*
Over all those who come to him	*Suz tuz ceus ki venent a lui*
For to get protection and refuge.'[54]	*Pur aver garant e refui*

God the Father is thus envisioned as the tree itself, protecting his people as the tree protects the doves. This characterisation is partly alluded to in the accompanying image. The Father's positioning, and particularly his upward motion out of the tree, gives the impression that his body is meant to form part of the tree itself, thus echoing the description in the moralising passage. Furthermore, his open arms and gesture of blessing is suggestive of the idea presented in the description that the Father offers 'protection and refuge' (*garant e refui*). However, as the body of the Father and the tree itself are independent of one another, and the Father only appears over the right branch, the idea that the tree itself is meant to signify God the Father is not immediately apparent without reference to the text. In addition, it is also only in reference to the other two persons in the tree, who are clearly defined by their standard iconographic attributes, that the bust of the figure on the right can be identified as God the Father. Though the designer of this image was clearly

[52] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 2965-2975; Druce, *Bestiary*, p. 82.
[53] Ibid, lines 2976-3016; pp. 82-3.
[54] Ibid, lines 3017-3026; p. 83.

attempting to evoke the description of the Father presented in Guillaume's text, the meaning of the Father's positioning and gestures are only fully understood when read in conjunction with the accompanying moralised passage.

The relationship of God the Son to the tree then follows that of the Father:

'The fruit of the tree signifies	*Le frut del arbre signefie*
Jesus, the son of saint Mary.	*Jesum le fiz seinte marie*
That is the fruit, which healed us.	*Cest le fruit ke nus guari*
When we were dead and perished.	*Kant estoient mort e peri*
By the fruit which Adam tasted	*Par le fruit ke adam gusta*
He deprived us of joy;	*De joie nus desherita*
The Son of God who tasted gall	*Le fiz deu ke gusta le fiel*
Restored us to the joy of heaven.	*Nus rendi la joie del ciel*
The fruit of the tree betrayed us,	*Li fruz del arbre nus trai*
The Son redeemed and healed us,	*Le fiz nus raint e nus gari*
Who on the tree-stem let himself be hung	*Ky el fust pendre se lessa*
Drank the vinegar and ate the gall.'[55]	*Leisil but e le fel manga*

This more extended discussion alludes to the connection between the tree in the bestiary and the tree in the Garden of Eden. Whilst the fruit from the tree of knowledge eaten by Adam brought death and punishment, Christ as the new 'fruit' (*frut*) of the tree has 'redeemed and healed' (*raint e… gari*) God's people through his death. Furthermore, the connection made in the text between the tree of knowledge and the 'tree-stem' (*fust*), or cross, on which Christ was crucified, draws on a well-established narrative that describes how the wood of the tree from which Adam and Eve ate came to be used for the cross of Christ's crucifixion.[56] As is suggested in the bestiary text, the idea that the wood of the cross was derived from the tree of knowledge was seen as a prefiguration of Christ's eventual redemption on the cross for the original sins of Adam and Eve.

The inclusion of the figures of Adam and Eve and the serpent in the accompanying image explicitly situates this illustration within the context of the fall, thus echoing the themes of

[55] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 3027-3033; Druce, *Bestiary*, p. 83.
[56] For the development of this story in the English tradition see Nicole Fallon, 'The Cross as Tree: The Wood-Of-The-Cross Legends in Middle English and Latin Texts in Medieval England', unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Toronto (2009); see also Calvin B. Kendall, 'From Sign to Vision: The Ruthwell Cross and *The Dream of the Rood*' in *The Place of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Catherine E. Karkov, Sarah Larratt Keefer and Karen Louise Jolley (Woodbridge, 2006), pp. 129-144 (p. 131).

the moralising passage. However, unlike the description in the text, the tree of knowledge is not specifically figured as the cross on which Christ was crucified. Christ is balanced precariously on the very end of the left branch of the tree, in reflection of the description in the text that he let himself be hung 'on the tree-stem'. Christ's positioning may also refer to his description in the moralising passage as the 'fruit', as he stands at the point of the branch from which fruit conventionally grows, but, despite these other visual references to the text, the cross on which he is shown crucified does not form part of the tree itself. Christ's body extends upwards out of the branches of the tree, his outstretched arms just touching the outer frame of the miniature. The horizontal beam of the cross is incorporated into the frame above the tree, whilst the vertical beam of the cross is either not visible or not depicted. Nevertheless, though the cross is not depicted as the tree itself, indications of the connections between the tree and the cross are perceivable in the colour of the horizontal beam, which is in the same green as the tree, and the depiction of Christ and the cross rising up from the branch, as if they are both growing from the tree.

The allegorical description of Christ as the fruit of the tree is followed by a summary of the moralised meaning of this section:

'Now we must clearly understand	*Ore devum ben entendre tuit*
What is the tree, what is the fruit.	*Quel est larbre quel est le fruit*
The tree is the father, the fruit is the son,	*Labre est le pere li fruiz est le fiz*
And the shadow is the Holy Spirit.'[57]	*Lombre est li seinz esperrz*

The Holy Spirit and the Filioque

In comparison with the Father and Son, the relationship of the Holy Spirit to the tree is less clearly defined by Guillaume. After noting that the shadow of the tree signifies the Holy Spirit, he goes on to quote the words of the archangel Gabriel to the Virgin at the moment of the Annunciation, describing how 'the holy spirit shall come upon thee/ And the power of the lord most high/ Shall overshadow thee' (*Li seinz esperrz survendra/ E tei en ki sa umbera/ La vertu del treshaut seignur*).[58] The mention of this moment in the text likely explains the inclusion of the image of the Annunciation towards the far left of the miniature, though the Holy Spirit is not depicted in this frame. However, the meaning of the shadow of the tree in relation to the Holy Spirit is not elucidated any further in the text. Instead another interpretation of the tree is offered:

[57] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 3039-3042; Druce, *Bestiary*, pp. 83-4.
[58] Ibid, lines 3045-3047; p. 84.

'By the tree must we without mistake	*En larbre devom sanz mesprende*
The person of the father understand	*La persone del pere entendre*
By the fruit, the person of the Son	*El frut la persone de fiz*
The third is the Holy Spirit	*La terce est li seinz esperrz*
Which from the one and the other springs.	*Ky del un e del autre uient*
So it behoves us to believe	*Issi creire le nus covent*
If we wish to save our souls.'[59]	*Si nos almes volonis sauver*

Guillaume's description of the Holy Spirit as 'springing' (*uient*) from the Father and the Son draws on the doctrine of *filioque*, the idea that the Holy Spirit proceeds equally from the other two persons of the Trinity.[60] By the time that Guillaume was writing in the early thirteenth century, the concept *filioque* had become a fully integrated part of Western Christian liturgy and doctrine, and slightly later in the century, received detailed scholastic commentary from, among others, Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas.[61] Though Guillaume might not necessarily have been aware of the historically contentious nature of this doctrine, his engagement with the essential idea of the *filioque* clause – that the Spirit springs from the Father and the Son – does demonstrate an understanding of fairly sophisticated Trinitarian theology.

Notably, this concept is not referred to specifically in the image of the Trinity accompanying Guillaume's passage. Though the dove of the Holy Spirit is shown between the Father and the Son, and thus could in some ways be seen to be 'springing' between or from them, this action is not made explicit. In addition to this, each of the three persons is positioned on the same level as one another, negating any suggestion of hierarchy. Furthermore, though the Holy Spirit is referred to in Guillaume's text as the shadow of the tree, this detail is not alluded to in the image. The Holy Spirit, as in conventional Trinitarian iconography, is simply shown as a dove. In these two respects, the designer of the illustration moves away from the description of the Holy Spirit in the section of the bestiary moralisation related specifically to the tree. His choice to represent the Spirit as a dove perhaps refers instead to the description of the dove at the beginning of the passage, which is said to signify the Holy Ghost, though it is also possible that the artist also felt the idea of the Holy Spirit as a 'shadow' (*lombre*) was too vague and abstract a concept to represent

[59] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 3049-3055; Druce, *Bestiary*, p. 84.
[60] This is discussed above, pp. 33-34.
[61] For Aquinas' discussion of the filioque clause and a comparison with that of Bonaventure see Gilles Emery, *The Trinitarian Theology of Saint Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford, 2010), pp. 52-76, 269-297. See also Oliver Herbel, 'Ratramnus of Corbie, Paulinus of Aquileia, and Aeneas of Paris as Sources for Bonaventure's Filioque Arguments in the Sentences', *Franciscan Studies*, vol. 65 (2007), pp. 87-105.

visually. Moreover, as a much more conventional depiction of the Holy Spirit, the dove would have been a recognisable symbol of the third person of the Trinity, especially shown descending from the heavens as in the bestiary image, which was a commonplace motif in images of the Annunciation and the baptism of Christ. The designer of the Trinity in the tree image thus chooses to replace what is in Guillaume's description of the tree a relatively vague and obscure description of the Holy Spirit as a 'shadow' with a more clearly identifiable representation of the Spirit as a dove. In doing so, though departing from the text's specific description of the Holy Spirit, the image in fact presents a much clearer depiction of the overall message of the bestiary moralisation, which makes a general connection between the tree and the three persons of the Trinity.

Guillaume's explanation of the tree ends with a final exhortation to the reader to 'ponder' and 'keep beneath this tree/ For we are fed with the fruit/ And so well defended by the shadow/ That the wicked jealous dragon/ Shall not come nigh us' (*De suz cest arbre nus tenum/ Kar nus sumes del fruit peuz/ E per lumbre ben defendeuz/ Ke ia na prismerat a nus*).[62] Christ as the fruit of the tree is thus envisioned as the food by which Christians are fed, and the Holy Spirit, as the shadow, is seen to defend and protect the people from the devil. The allegorical connection between the Trinity and the Tree is then referenced for a final time, in Guillaume's call to the reader to keep in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as he has instructed the reader to keep beneath the tree. He explains that those who do this will be blessed, whilst those who don't believe in the Trinity are of an 'anti-Christian race':

'Of this let us be certain and sure	*De ce seums seurs e fiz*
If in the name of the Father and of the Son	*Si el num del pere e del fiz*
And of the Holy Spirit we keep	*E del seint esperit nus tenum*
In the holy religion	*E la seinte religiun*
Which holy church teaches us,	*Ke seinte eglise nus enseigne*
And to the sweet appeal and sign	*E al dirz cri e al ensaigne*
Of the sacred cross adored	*De la seinte croiz auree*
Will our life be blessed.	*Nostre vie sera bonuree*
And know well, he who disbelieves	*E sachez ben ky cest ne creist*
That one God is in three persons,	*Ke uns deus treis persones seit*
Who created all and who made all,	*Ky tut cria e ki tut fist*
He is of the anti-Christian race.'[63]	*Il est de la gent antecrist*

[62] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 3060-3064; Druce, *Bestiary*, p. 84.
[63] Ibid, lines 3071-3082; p. 84.

In this passage, Guillaume situates belief in the Trinity, in addition to adoration of the 'sacred cross' (*seinte croiz*), as the central tenant of the Christian faith. The characterisation of those who do not believe in 'one God […] in three persons' (*uns deus treis persones seit*) as belonging to an 'anti-Christian race' (*la gent antecrist*) implies even more forcefully that belief in the doctrine of the Trinity is essential for any Christian.

The image of the Trinity in the tree was thus figured predominantly as a response to the more general relationship indicated in Guillaume's commentary between the tree and the three persons of the Trinity, which he sums up in this final statement. Though in some respects the depictions of the individual persons reflect their moralisation in the accompanying text, the designer of this image does not conform precisely to the description offered by Guillaume. Instead, conventional images of the three persons are chosen to represent the more abstract concepts discussed in the bestiary commentary. In these depictions, the designer of each of the three persons was most likely drawing on the image of the *Gnadenstuhl*: the Father is shown as a larger, domineering figure, whilst the Son is depicted on the cross and the Holy Spirit descends as a dove, all features of typical *Gnadenstuhl* iconography. However, in order to convey the overall message of the bestiary moralisation, this conventional iconographic formula is broken down, disassembled, rearranged, and then stretched across the branches of the tree. This deconstruction of the *Gnadenstuhl* iconography also allows the designer of the image to adapt his depiction of the individual persons in line with the bestiary text, in order to show, for example, Christ 'growing' up from the branches of the tree in a manner similar to the fruit mentioned in the accompanying moralisation. The designer thus inventively re-interprets the well-known iconography of the *Gnadenstuhl* in an attempt to visually synthesise the description of the Trinity in the accompanying text. In order to understand the precise relationship between each of the individual persons and the tree, the reader is required to study the text and reflect upon the design of the adjacent image.

The Stoning of Stephen and the Seated Trinity

The designer's decision to rearrange the iconography of the *Gnadenstuhl* in their depiction of the Trinity in the tree image also demonstrates an awareness of another conventional Trinity image – that of the Seated Trinity. After the discussion of the tree, Guillaume returns to the allegory of the dove. He describes the doves as being varied in colour, some being 'russet' (*ros*) or 'red' (*vermail*) and others with an 'ashy tint' (*cendros*), a feature that Guillaume relates to the prophets.[64] The variety in these colours 'shows forth the diversity/

[64] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 3105-3110; Druce, *Bestiary*, p. 85.

Of the prophets verily' (*Come dit ma lettre e mon vers/ Demustre la diversete/ Des prophetes pur verite*) who 'Announced the coming/ Of our lord' (*Anuncierent la venement/ Nostre seignur*).[65] The colours of each of the doves are then related to a particular prophet, with a short explanation of the prophet's role in the Bible. Jonah, for example, is associated with the dove 'that is like to ash' (*ky resemble cendre*) and Guillaume describes how God 'preserved him from death' in the belly of the fish and 'brought him safe to land' (*E deu len rendi guerdun/ Quant il el ventre del peissun/ Le salva e guari de mort/ E pus le mena a bon port*).[66] The dove who is 'like to the air' (*ky al air resemble*) signifies Elijah, who was 'taken up' and is 'still alive' (*dunt ie vos di/ Ke nus quidoms encore en vie*), and the white dove is likened to John the Baptist who 'Began baptising/ In the name of him who was coming' (*Comenca le baptizement/ El nun de celui ke veneit*).[67] Each of these three prophets is shown in the miniature above: in the frame on the far left, John baptises Christ, whilst in the two frames on the far right, Jonah is shown emerging from the open mouth of the whale and Elijah disappears into a mass of clouds at the very top of the image. The martyr Stephen, however, who is mentioned next in the bestiary text, does not feature in the main miniature alongside the other prophets. The text describes how:

'The dove which is dark green	*Li colombs ky est stephanin*
Should mark for us Saint Stephen,	*Nus deit seint estefne noter*
Who for God's sake let himself be tortured,	*Ky pur deu se lessat pener*
And was the first rewarded	*E premerement deservi*
Through martyrdom, which he suffered,	*Par le martire kyl suffri*
By seeing the Son of God standing	*Veer le fiz deu a sa destre*
At his right in heavenly joy.'[68]	*En estant en joie celestre*

This short description of the saint's martyrdom draws on the Biblical story in the book of Acts, which recounts how Stephen, having been brought before the Jewish council in response to his zealous preaching, is taken out by the crowd and stoned.[69] As he is being martyred, Stephen, 'looking up steadfastly to heaven' (*intendens in caelum*), is described as seeing 'the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God. And he said: "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing on the right hand of

[65] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 3115-3119; Druce, *Bestiary*, p. 85.
[66] Ibid, lines 3125-3136; p. 85-6.
[67] Ibid, lines 3137-3148; p. 86.
[68] Ibid, lines 3160-3166; p. 86.
[69] Acts 7:54-59.

God.'".[70] Earlier in this thesis, this gospel description of Stephen's vision was shown to be a paraphrase of Psalm 109, which opens 'The Lord said to my Lord: sit thou at my right hand'.[71] Consequently, some images of the stoning of Stephen show him looking upwards towards an image of the Seated Trinity in the heavens. In the aforementioned thirteenth-century illustrated manuscript of Jacobus de Voragine's *Golden Legend*, for example, Stephen is shown kneeling on the ground whilst being stoned, raising his hands up towards an image of the Seated Trinity in the framed compartment above (fig. 3.38).[72]

In the Paris bestiary, Stephen is similarly shown in the midst of his stoning, kneeling with his hands raised and gazing into the heavens (fig. 5.16). Above and to the right, in the direction of Stephen's gaze, are two men framed by a band of undulating clouds. These men are identical in appearance, with short beards, long flowing hair, nimbed haloes, a pale tunic and a green mantle. Both raise their right hand in a sign of blessing whilst holding a closed book in their left hand, and each are shown with their faces turned towards one another. The two figures closely resemble the Father and Son in images of the Seated Trinity. Though only the upper halves of their bodies are shown emerging from the clouds, so that it is not clear whether the figures are seated or standing, their identical appearance and gestures suggest, as in contemporary Seated Trinity examples, that they are intended as a representation of the first two persons of the triune God. The dove of the Holy Spirit is, however, absent from this image. This is possibly explained by the close paraphrasing of Psalm 109 in Guillaume's commentary, where only God and the Son of God are mentioned. Nevertheless, the exclusion of the dove of the Holy Spirit is curious as this particular moralised passage specifically concerns the dove, and a large proportion of the previous description of the tree discusses each of the three persons of the Trinity. In this particular example, the designer of the illustration seems to favour fidelity to the text and to the dying words of Stephen in the biblical narrative, rather than the wider possibilities related to the visual representation of this moment.

In both of the Trinitarian illustrations related to the moralising passage on the dove, the designer of the bestiary images chooses to adapt conventional iconography in response to the related passage in the moralised commentary. His varied response to this text demonstrates an awareness both of the wider implications of Guillaume's moralisations and

[70] Acts 7:55: 'Cum autem esset plenus Spiritu Sancto, intendens in caelum, vidit gloriam Dei, et Jesum stantem a dextris Dei. Et ait: Ecce video caelos apertos, et Filium hominis stantem a dextris Dei.'
[71] Psalm 109:1: 'Dixit Dominus Domino meo: Sede a dextris meis, donec ponam inimicos tuos scabellum pedum tuorum.' See above, pp. 169-170.
[72] Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, S. France or N. Italy (Rome, Vatican Library, Vaticana, Reg. Lat. 534), f. 17v. Discussed in more detail above, pp. 169-170.

the audience who would have been both reading the text and the images. In some cases, the accompanying illustrations complicate the narrative presented in the commentary, causing the reader to reconsider the implications of the moment represented in text and image. In others, as is exemplified in the image of the Trinity in the tree, the designer presents a condensed version of the description in Guillaume's commentary, drawing on established iconographic features likely recognisable to the viewer and adapting these to present a coherent summary of the message presented in the text. As is demonstrated in the image of the stoning of Stephen, this designer also adapts conventional iconography in order to present a closer visual representation of the text. Each of these contexts suggest that the images were intended to be read in close association with Guillaume's commentary, and that, as well as observing the similarities between the text and image, the reader was also required to acknowledge the differences. This interactive dimension suggests that the book would have been an ideal didactic tool for instruction in Christian theology and morality. Its evocative, colourful and expressive images would have well served an aristocratic patron, who could have afforded not only such an expensive book, but also a private cleric or friar to provide instruction alongside these engaging images.

The Bestiary *Gnadenstuhl*

The image of the *Gnadenstuhl* appears in the moralising illustration positioned before the bestiary description of the mandrake plant on folio 61r (figs. 5.3, 5.4). However, as will be discussed, the image in fact refers to the section in Guillaume's bestiary text concerning the diamond, which follows the mandrake plant description. In comparison with the other bestiary illustrations, the image is considerably large, occupying just over a third of the folio. Enclosed within the green rectangular frame is a large and prominent figure, sat atop a cushioned bench. This man has a youthful face with a short beard and shoulder-length hair, and he is shown with a blue cross-halo. An outer robe is draped across his left shoulder, leaving the right side of his torso bare and revealing the bleeding wound in his side. He raises both arms upwards in a gesture reminiscent of Christ in Judgement, and, like the wound in his side, his outward facing palms are shown issuing blood. Similarly, the figure's bare feet are also shown with bleeding wounds. Had this figure been depicted alone, he would clearly have represented the risen Christ, displaying his wounds as evidence for the crucifixion. However, this figure is also shown supporting an image of Christ crucified on the cross. The green tau-cross rests on the larger figures' upheld arms, and extends down between his knees. The much smaller body of the crucified Christ is shown nailed to the green cross, with his arms outstretched and his knees turned slightly to his right. Despite the discrepancies in size, the Christ on the cross closely resembles the figure behind him: he

is shown with a blue crossed halo, a youthful face with a short beard, and blood is shown issuing from his hands, side and feet.

To either side of these central figures, two groups of mendicants kneel in worship. To the left are three tonsured Franciscan monks, shown with their brown habits tied at the waist. The monk in the foreground raises his hands in a gesture of prayer, and both he and the figure to his left gaze upwards towards the two central figures. To the right are a group of three tonsured Dominican monks in dark robes. The Dominican at the front of the group kneels with his hands raised in prayer, mirroring the position of the Franciscan monk on the left. All three Dominicans are shown gazing upwards at the central figures. Above them, two haloed angels descend from the clouds with their hands raised in prayer.

The Mandrake in Text and Image

This image is immediately followed by the description of the mandrake plant. Unlike the majority of the other animals and plant life described in the text, the mandrake section of Guillaume's bestiary is limited just to a short description of the plant and its effects, lacking an extended moralising discussion. Guillaume states that the mandrake is a wild plant, which, once the rind has been boiled in water, can make many diverse medicines.[73] He describes how the root of the mandrake 'has a form/Like to the form of a man' (*Une furme i troverez/ A la furme de home semblable*), and can be both male and female, but that once the plant is pulled from the earth it 'moans and shrieks and cries' (*Ke ele se pleint e brait e crie*), killing the person harvesting it.[74] He goes on to state the ways in which the mandrake plant can be applied to the body in order to cure various maladies. However, Guillaume fails to note how the mandrake can be harvested without harming the person unearthing it. Typically, medieval bestiaries state that the mandrake should be removed safely by tying a dog to the root and enticing the dog to run, so that the mandrake is pulled out of the earth and kills the dog with its screams instead of the harvester.[75] Guillaume simply states in his description that those who pluck the mandrake plant 'do so/ So wisely that they take no hurt' (*Mais cil ki la coilent le funt/ Si sagement ki mal nen unt*).[76]

However, in contrast to Guillaume's omission of information on how to remove the mandrake, the illustration accompanying this passage on folio 61v depicts this process in detail (fig. 5.17). As with the illustrations of animals and beasts throughout the bestiary, the

[73] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 3297-3332; Druce, *Bestiary*, p. 90.
[74] Ibid, lines 3302-3; p. 90.
[75] McCulloch, *Bestiaries*, p. 43.
[76] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 3313-4; Druce, *Bestiary*, p. 90.

image of the mandrake occurs at the end of the related passage. Two mandrakes are depicted inside the green frame, positioned upside down so that their 'human' roots are buried in the ground. A dog is shown running to the left, out of the frame, towards his owner who holds a piece of meat out to the dog. A rope is wrapped around the dog's neck and attached to the legs and stalks of the first mandrake in order to pull it out of the ground. The artist's choice to represent this scene, despite it not being mentioned in the text, is unusual in the context of his other illustrations in the bestiary. In the majority of examples, the artist seems to be heavily dependant on Guillaume's text, often including specific details mentioned in the descriptions in the illustrations themselves. It is unclear why they chose to depart significantly from Guillaume's text in their illustration for mandrake plant. It is possible that the artist knew the bestiary tradition well and felt that the information concerning the safe removal of the mandrake plant was not necessary to include in his image. It also might suggest that the intended audience of the manuscript may have known of this part of the mandrake tradition, and would have understood the image without reference to the text.

The Description of the Diamond and the Image of the Gnadenstuhl

The text that immediately follows the mandrake image on folio 62r begins part way through Guillaume's section on the diamond (fig. 5.18). An examination of the codicology reveals that the manuscript is missing a folio at this point in the text. Furthermore, the numbering that appears to be in a medieval hand on the top right hand corner of each of the folios is missing the consecutive number between folios 61 and 62; f. 61r is numbered "lxi", whilst f. 62r is numbered "lxiii". The folio that would have been numbered "lxii" is likely to have contained the 52 lines of Guillaume's text on the diamond missing from this section. In Fr. 14969, folios without an image are typically ruled to contain 32 lines. The number of lines included on folios with an illustration vary depending on the size of the image, but folio 61v containing the illustration of the mandrake has 20 lines of Guillaume's text. If the missing folio contained an image of the same dimensions as the mandrake illumination, perhaps of the diamond, then the folio would altogether have contained 52 lines, the exact length of the passage missing from Guillaume's description of the diamond.

It is regrettable that Fr. 14969 is missing these lines, as they relate directly to the representation of the *Gnadenstuhl* on folio 61r. Guillaume begins by describing how the diamond is found on a high mountain in the East, and that, by night, it shines brightly.[77] The diamond is so hard that 'no other stone can break it/Nor iron nor fire destroy it' (*Nule*

[77] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 3333-3426; Druce, *Bestiary*, pp. 90-3.

altre perre ne la freint/ Ne fer ne feu ne la destreint) and in order to split the stone an iron hammer must be 'steeped in he-goat's blood' (*Od mail de fer briser la soelent*).[78] Guillaume also states that the diamond is potent against poison, drives away fears and wards off enchantments. The following moralisation of the diamond relates these properties directly to the person of Christ. Guillaume states that the diamond, 'denotes Jesus the king' (*Signefie le rei Jesu*), which he confirms with reference to the book of Amos: 'the prophet records/In accordance with this writing:/ I saw upon a mountain of diamonds/ Saith the prophet/a man standing in the midst of the people of Israel' (*Si com li prophete recorde/ Qui a ceste lettre s'acorde/ Jeo vi sor un mont d'aimant/ Fet le prophete, un home estant/ Enmi le people d'Israel*).[79] He goes on to discuss how the diamond and its location relates to the relationship between the Father and the Son. Guillaume states:

'The mountain where the stone is found	*Li monz, ou la perre est trovee*
Which is so hard and tried	*Qui tan test dure e esprovee*
Signifies God our father	*Signefie Deu, nostre pere.*
The stone, which shines by night	*La perre, qui par nuit est clere*
Must signify Jesus Christ	*Deit signefier Jesu Crist*
Who for us took human flesh	*Qui por nos humanite prist.*
He visited us in darkness	*En tenebres nos visita*
With light he enlightened us	*De clarte nos enlumina*
In the holy writing we find	*En la seinte lettre trovom*
Which we call the gospel	*Cele qu'evangile apelom*
What the saviour said of himself	*Que li salveres dist de sei:*
I am in the Father and he in me	*Jeo sui el pere e il en mei*
And whoso sees me, he sees my father.'[80]	*E qui me veit, il veit mon pere.*[81]

Thus, the mountain in the East, where the diamond is found, is paralleled with God the Father, in whom Christ is found. Guillaume's reference to Christ's words in the gospel of John makes this point explicit: as the diamond is from or in the mountain, so Christ is in the Father.

Guillaume goes on to describe how Christ had come to earth for the salvation of mankind, and inspired the saints to undergo martyrdom for his sake. The final passage of the

[78] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 3343-3347; Druce, *Bestiary*, p. 91.
[79] Ibid, lines 3363-3369; p. 91.
[80] Ibid, lines 3371-3383; pp. 91-2.
[81] Ibid, lines 3343-3347; p. 91.

moralising text may also be significant for our understanding of the *Gnadenstuhl* image. This section describes Christ's heavenly resting place after death:

'But when he had suffered the pain	*Mes q[ua]nt ot suffert la peine*
Of death and was risen	*E fu de mort resuscite*
And ascended to heaven above	*E la sus el cel remunte*
True man whole and perfect	*Verai home. entire. e parfit*
Then the heavenly host	*La celestial compaignie*
Had great conference about it	*Dunc demenerent g[ra]nt plait*
And with jealousy demanded:	*E demanderent sanz enuie*
Whence comes he, who is this king of glory	*'Dunc uint cest rei de gloire*
Who has so great honour and victory?	*Ke tant ad honur e uictoire*
Who is this? It is easy to say:	*Ki ce est. ce est leger a dire*
It is the Lord of all the realm	*Ce est li sires de tut lempire*
He it is who holds all at his right hand	*Ce est cil ke tut tient a sa destre*
He is the glorious king of heaven,	*Ce est li glorius rei celestre*
He is the Lord of all might	*Ce est li sires de uertuz*
It is he who fought for us	*Cil ki pur nus ge est combatuz*
In battle he is powerful and strong	*En bataille est pusant efort*
For he hath slain death.'[82]	*Kar il ad occis la mort*

This passage thus presents Christ as a victorious ruler in heaven, having risen again after his suffering on the cross. The image of the *Gnadenstuhl* echoes the transition described in this moralising description. The Christ on the cross is shown hanging limply with his head bowed, signifying his death for mankind, whereas the figure behind him is shown triumphantly poised atop the throne, gazing straight out at the viewer and displaying the wounds on his hands, feet and side as evidence that he has risen from the dead. The contrast of the dead Christ on the cross with the animated, lively figure on the throne offers a visual narrative of the resurrection that is simultaneously presented in the accompanying moralising text. Through his death on the cross, Christ has 'slain death' (*occis la mort*) by rising again and ascending to 'heaven above' (*cel remunte*). This post-ascension, risen Christ is represented by the larger figure holding the cross. The two angels ascending from clouds above the two figures underscore the heavenly context of this scene.

[82] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 3410-3426; Druce, *Bestiary*, pp. 92-3.

The Bestiary Gnadenstuhl *and John 14:11*

The conflation of the image with the iconography of the *Gnadenstuhl* suggests that the image has a twofold function. As we have seen, in conventional *Gnadenstuhl* iconography, this figure typically represents God the Father. It is possible that the figure in the bestiary image should be understood as the Father as well as the risen Son, especially when the illustration is considered alongside Guillaume's discussion of the relationship between the Father and the Son at the beginning of the moralising section on the diamond. Guillaume's paraphrasing of Christ's words in the gospels that he is 'in the Father, and the Father is in me' (*Jeo sui el pere e il en mei*) and specifically that those who see Christ 'see the Father' (*E qui me veit, il veit mon pere*), is significant in understanding the unusual *Gnadenstuhl* image related to this moralised section.[83] These words imply that, on seeing the physical representation of Christ, the viewer simultaneously witnesses a vision of God the Father. The passage even suggests that it is specifically the physical appearance of Christ that offers a reflection of God the Father's visual form. This process of 'seeing' the Father through the Son is also indicated in the postures and gestures of the friars knelt either side of the central image. Both groups are shown with their heads tilted upwards, gazing directly at the image of Christ on the cross. The emphasis placed on gaze specifically underlines the association of this image with the passage from John's gospel quoted in Guillaume's poem.

Christ's words in the gospel of John are also quoted earlier in Guillaume's bestiary text, in the moralising passage accompanying the description of the unicorn (f. 26r, fig. 5.19). The text describes how the unicorn 'Signifies our Lord/ Jesus Christ, our saviour' (*Signefie nostre saveor/ Jesu crist nostre saveor*), the 'spiritual unicorn' (*unicorne espiritel*) who appeared to the world in the form of a man through the Virgin birth.[84] The passage goes on to specifically implicate the Jews in Christ's crucifixion:

'His people of the Jews	*Son poeple mi ne le crut*
Believed him not, but spied on him,	*Des jueus ainceis lesperriz*
And then took him and bound him	*Tant kil le pristrent e lirent*
Before Pilate they lead him	*Devant pilate le menerent*
And there condemned him to death.'[85]	*E iloec a mort le dampnerent*

Immediately following these lines, Guillaume quotes from John's gospel. He states:

[83] John 14:11: 'Believe you not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me?' (*Non creditis quia ego in Patre, et Pater in me est?*)
[84] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 1417-1425; Druce, *Bestiary*, p. 45.
[85] Ibid, lines 1426-1430; p. 45.

'That horn verily,	*Cele corne veraiment*
Which the beast has – the only one –	*Ke la beste a tant sulement*
Signifies his humanity,	*Signefie lumanite*
As God saith in truth	*Si come deu dist par verite*
In the gospel, plain and clear:	*En levangile aperte e clere*
We are one – I and the Father'[86]	*Nos somes un, jeo e mon pere*

The moralising image that accompanies this description unites the components mentioned in the passage. In the upper register, inside a mandorla frame, God the Father raises his hand in a gesture of blessing, whilst to his left, two angels in a heavenly space demarcated by clouds gaze at the Father with their hands raised in worship. Directly below this scene are two paralleled images of Christ, the first showing him crucified on the cross and, diagonally below, a second showing Christ stepping out from his tomb at the moment of his resurrection, holding a cruciform staff, with wounds in his side and hand. Integrated with these two images is a depiction of the annunciation. An angel flies down from the clouds between the cross and the resurrection scene, his finger pointed at the seated Virgin who receives his message concerning Christ with raised hands. These four figures neatly summarise the Gospel narrative that is also presented in Guillaume's text: Christ was born of the Virgin, died on the cross and was resurrected from the dead.

To the left of these amalgamated scenes is an image of Zechariah, preaching to a group of men identifiable as Jews by their pointed hats. As Suzanne Lewis has pointed out, the figure of Zechariah in the miniature has been 'transformed into a medieval Christian bishop standing next to a vested altar and chalice within a church', implying the sanctity and authority of the message that he preaches with risen, pointed hands.[87] Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, had prophesised that Christ would be born to the Virgin, and his communication of this prophecy to a group of Jews suggests that he is in the process of converting the men with this knowledge of Christ. Coupled with the three images of the poignant moments of Christ's life and death, this image implies that understanding Christ as God is fundamental in the faith, and specifically for the conversion of Jews. The depiction of both the Father and the Son, in conjunction with the textual reference to the verse from John's gospel, also suggests that the concept of their unity is fundamental to this conversion process.

[86] Guillaume le Clerc, *Bestiaire*, lines 1431-1436; Druce, *Bestiary*, p. 45.
[87] Suzanne Lewis, '*Tractatus adversus Judaeos* in the Gulbenkian Apocalypse', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 68, no. 4 (Dec., 1986), pp. 543-566 (p. 552).

The doctrine of the unity of the Father and Son is also associated with the belief or non-belief of Jews in two very similar miniatures in the Gulbenkian and Abingdon Apocalypses. As has been discussed, the Gulbenkian and Abingdon Apocalypses belong stylistically to the group of manuscripts produced in the style of the Lambeth Apocalypse and thus share many iconographic and thematic elements with the Bestiary in the Bibliothèque Nationale.[88] The use of the verse from John's Gospel in this context may shed some light on the unusual *Gnadenstuhl* image in the bestiary. The Berengaudus commentary in both Apocalypses incorporates John's verse into the passage accompanying Revelation 5:7, in which the Lamb takes the book from the One seated on the throne. The commentary states that:

> By the one seated on the throne is meant Christ, because he himself said: "I am the Father and the Father is in me, and he who sees me sees the Father also." In this place, the One sitting on the throne denotes the Father. Therefore the Lamb receives the book from the right hand of the One seated on the throne, just as Christ in his divinity became man.[89]

The illustration for this commentary text on folio 7r of the Gulbenkian Apocalypse shows God the Father seated inside a mandorla, handing down an unfolded scroll to the Son (fig. 5.20). The Son stands at the centre of the miniature, triumphantly holding a staff and banner. The scroll, which Christ reaches up to receive from the Father, reads '*Ego in patre est Pater in me est*', restating the unity between the Father and the Son described in the commentary text below. Beside the Father and Son, two groups of figures sit facing each other. The group to the left all have haloes, and are led by St Peter, who holds his hand up to his face in a sign of anguish. In contrast, the group to the right wear pointed hats, identifying them as Jews. The figure that mirrors Peter at the front of the group raises both hands up to cover his ears, and leans forward in a more threatening gesture than Peter's. In the equivalent image on folio 11r of the Abingdon Apocalypse, Christ's resurrected nature is emphasised by the bleeding wounds in his feet, and his head is angled upwards towards the Father, so that their gaze meets, accentuating the intimacy and unity of the two figures (fig. 5.21). The figure at the foremost of the group of Jews arguing with the saints is inspired by a devil with horns, wings and fish tail, shown flying down at the figure with his finger pointed, an additional detail which insinuates that the Jewish speaker is instructed by the devil.

[88] See above, pp. 223-226.
[89] Morgan, Lewis, Brown and Nascimento, *Apocalypsis Gulbenkian*, p. 253.

Lewis claimed that the image of the group of saints arguing with a group of Jews in both of these miniatures has no relation to the commentary text by Berengaudus.[90] This part of the image thus forms its own visual commentary on the text. Primarily, it is intended as a pictorial representation of the rejection of Christ and the Christian faith by the Jews, with the gesture of the foremost Jewish figure in particular epitomising the idea that Jews actively refuse to hear the truth of the gospel. Taken together with the image of the Father and Son, and the verse from John's gospel on the unity of Christ with the Father, the miniatures suggest that it is in particular the idea that Christ is God, unified with the Father, to which the Jews object. The concept of the unity of the Father and Son in the person of God 'formed the major stumbling block dividing Christians and Jews.'[91] Specifically, the doctrine had particular consequences for the condemnation of contemporary Jews. Whilst it was perceived that Jews born before Christ would be saved through their belief in the 'partial' revelation of God in the Old Testament, the 'full' revelation of God in the New Testament through the person of Christ meant that a continued belief in the 'one' God of the Old Testament amounted to rejection of God's true nature. The Jews of the Old Testament had not known of Christ's divinity and unity with the Father; those who lived after Christ's birth had the opportunity to recognise him as the divine Son of God. Contemporary Judaism was thus seen as an obstinate rejection of God as revealed in the person of Christ.[92]

The increasing persecution of Jews in thirteenth-century England, as well as Europe more widely, has been well documented in recent literature.[93] The 1260s and 1270s, when the Gulbenkian and Abingdon Apocalypses were executed, was a period of particularly heightened tension, with attacks on Jewish communities and synagogues recorded as taking place in a number of large cities in England, including Canterbury, Bristol, Lincoln, Winchester and London.[94] The continued violence against Jews in the later half of the thirteenth century eventually culminated in their expulsion from England in 1290. This growth in violence was accompanied by an increase in anti-Jewish polemic, which attempted, through both word and image, to present Jews as obstinately refusing to accept Christ as God.[95] Anti-Jewish rhetoric was heavily exacerbated by the simultaneous interest

[90] Lewis, '*Tractatus adversus Judaeos*', p. 552.
[91] Ibid.
[92] Ibid.
[93] See S. W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 2nd rev., (New York, 1965), pp. 105-6; Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1964), pp. 59-62; Adler, *The Jews of Medieval England* (London, 1939), pp. 78-9; H. G. Richardson, *The English Jewry under the Angevin Kings* (London, 1960), pp. 187-92. For the representation of Jews in medieval art see Sara Lipton, *Dark Mirror: The Medieval Origins of Anti-Jewish Iconography* (New York, 2014) and *Images of Intolerance: The Representation of Jews and Judaism in the Bible moralisée* (Berkeley, 1999).
[94] Lewis, '*Tractatus adversus Judaeos*', p. 564.
[95] Lipton, *Dark Mirror*, p. 14.

in the end times and the book of Revelation; not only, it was held, would the Jews be severely judged at the end of time for their rejection of Christ, but they would also enter into league with Antichrist and the devil in the battle against the saints.[96]

The rise in anti-Jewish violence and polemic that occurred in thirteenth-century England, contemporaneously with the creation of the Gulbenkian and Abingdon Apocalypses and the Paris bestiary, might explain the heightened emphasis on the unity of the Father and Son in the texts and images of these books. The relationship between this doctrine and the perceived unbelief of the Jews is stated explicitly in the images accompanying the commentary on Revelation 5:7 in the two Apocalypse manuscripts and the image illustrating the bestiary description of the unicorn on folio 26v. In both of these examples, the passage from the gospel of John in which Christ states that he and the Father are one, as well as a visualisation of this concept in the representation of the Father and Son, is presented in the context of a debate between Jews and Christians. The image underscores the idea that Christians have understood the 'true' resonance of the gospel that Christ is God and equal with the Father, but that contemporary Jews have actively rejected this 'divine truth'.

The unusual image of the *Gnadenstuhl* in the Paris Bestiary can also be understood in relation to these contemporary theological and social concerns. If the two figures in the miniature are interpreted, as in conventional *Gnadenstuhl* iconography, as the Father and the Son, then their visually identical appearance can be read as an expression of the unity of the Godhead. The image is a literal response to Guillaume's moralising text, and specifically his reference to the words of Christ in John 14:11: as is suggested in this verse, the Father is 'seen' or made visible through the physical manifestation of God in the person of Christ. The artist of the Bibliothèque Nationale Bestiary has chosen to represent this concept by showing the Father with features and characteristics that are identical to Christ's. This is particularly evident in the prominent depiction of wounds in the hands, side and feet of the Father, which imply that he partook in the suffering that the Son endured on the cross.

Unlike in the Gulbenkian and Abingdon Apocalypses, the image and accompanying text in the Paris Bestiary do not specifically relate the idea of the unity of the Father and the Son to the rejection of Christ by the Jews. However, in his transformation of the *Gnadenstuhl* from an image of the Trinity into a visual statement on the unity of the Father and Son, the artist of the Paris bestiary can be seen to be responding directly to these concerns. The verse from John's gospel used in Guillaume's commentary would have had particular currency

[96] Lipton, *Dark Mirror*, p. 14.

and importance in the period in which this artist was working, which not only explains the unusual iconography of the image but also why the illumination is centred on this particular theme.

In this striking alteration of conventional *Gnadenstuhl* iconography, the designer of the Paris bestiary illustrations demonstrates their awareness of contemporary religious concerns in England in the second half of the thirteenth century. In particular, his emphasis on the unity of the Father and the Son reflects similar concerns held by contemporary churchmen. This would suggest that the designer of these images was working in an environment connected in some way to these individuals. The stylistic connections between this manuscript and the Metz-Lambeth group of Apocalypses suggests that the artist who completed the series was working within an environment that produced some of the most ambitious and theologically rich artistic narrative schemes of the period. Due to the subject matter of these books, it is highly likely that, even if the artists in this workshop were not trained clerics, they would have benefitted from the guidance of clerics or friars with knowledge of the biblical texts and episodes they were illustrating. The theologically complex concerns reflected in the unusual image of the *Gnadenstuhl* can be seen to be a direct result of this informed and educated environment in which the artist of this bestiary was working.

Conclusion to Chapter Five

In their unique approach to Trinitarian imagery, the designer of the Paris bestiary illustrations demonstrates a remarkable ability to adapt conventional iconography in response to both the text with which they are working – Guillaume Le Clerc's moralised bestiary – as well as to wider concerns in contemporary society. Whereas the image of the Trinity in the tree modifies conventional *Gnadenstuhl* iconography in order to summarise the moral message of the bestiary text, the unusual 'double-Christ *Gnadenstuhl*' was likely developed in response to contemporary anti-Jewish rhetoric related to the verse from John's gospel used in the moralised bestiary passage for the diamond.

The bestiary designer's inventive re-designing of conventional Trinitarian iconography also reveals something of the intended function of these unusual images. Whilst drawing heavily on the accompanying text, both images of the Trinity simultaneously provide additional extra-narrative details that cause the reader to question or re-examine the message provided by the commentary. In responding to the overall significance of the tree in the bestiary commentary, the image of the Trinity in the tree departs from the specific description of

the three persons, representing them instead with reference to *Gnadenstuhl* iconography. Reading the image alongside the text, the viewer is encouraged to reflect on the symbolic significance of the relationship between the Trinity and the tree, in addition to the more abstract description provided in the commentary. The image of the *Gnadenstuhl* on f. 61r requires the reader to respond instead to the visual discrepancies between the image and more conventional representations of this iconography, questioning in particular the depiction of God the Father with attributes of the crucified and risen Son. This unusual adaption can only be explained with reference to the accompanying text, as well as to developments in contemporary society.

It was thus the beliefs and wider societal concerns of the Bestiary's designer, as well as their awareness of the didactic function of the book's images, that drove the creation of two highly unusual representations of the Trinity in this late thirteenth-century manuscript. The Bestiary's stylistic connections to the group of manuscripts in the Metz-Lambeth Cycle offers a unique perspective on the kind of environment in which the book was likely created, and the type of patron for whom it may have been created. Without this context, the reason for the designer's radical departure from standardised iconographic forms may not be as clear.

Though we know comparatively less about the provenance of the St John's Psalter illuminations due to their removal from the manuscript in which they were originally bound, their iconographic connections with the Murthly Hours and the scenes in the chapter house at Salisbury Cathedral offer a glimpse into the context in which this artist may have been working, and the kinds of images which may have inspired their creation of a three-headed Trinity. The stylistic connections between the St John's illuminations and work produced in London in the 1260s and 70s also shows this remarkable Trinitarian image to have been created around the same time, and perhaps in the same locale, as the Bestiary now in the Bibliothèque Nationale. The highly unusual Trinitarian images in these two manuscripts are thus witnesses to the inventive and creative artistic circles operating in London in this period. The artists and designers that worked on these two manuscripts would almost certainly have been familiar with the iconography of the Seated and *Gnadenstuhl* Trinity; both designs had, by this point, become well-established in the visual culture of Western Europe. Their decision to move away from these conventional images to create an entirely new representation of the Trinitarian God speaks not only to creativity of these artists and the contexts in which they were working but perhaps, ultimately, to their attempt at representing something of the 'unimaginable' qualities of the Trinity.

Conclusion

Developments in the Iconography of the Trinity

This thesis has focused on the period in which the two most common representations of the Trinity, the Seated Trinity and *Gnadenstuhl*, were created, standardised and rose to immense popularity. In doing so, it has redressed previous and sometimes problematic assumptions about the 'invention' of these two iconographies, offering new perspectives on the eleventh- and twelfth-century contexts in which these influential Trinitarian images appeared. It has also shown how, at the turn of the thirteenth century, the Seated Trinity and *Gnadenstuhl* evolved from images known and used in relatively limited circles to the two most common representations of the Trinity, a phenomenon that occurred alongside significant shifts in Trinitarian theology and doctrine. The standardisation and proliferation of the iconography of the Seated Trinity and *Gnadenstuhl* over the course of the thirteenth century also paved the way for new and exciting visualisations of the Trinitarian God. Whether adapting and manipulating conventional iconography, or crafting an image that departed radically from these more standardised forms, artists working in this period turned to innovative and unusual designs as a means of communicating something new about the 'three-in-one' nature of God.

Chapters one and two offered new perspectives on the contexts in which the two most common iconographic representations of the Trinity were created. Building on the idea first put forward by Kantorowicz that the image of the Seated Trinity was ultimately derived from the image of the two 'Lords' in the ninth-century Utrecht Psalter, chapter one sought to interrogate more thoroughly the time and place in which the transformation of this illustration into a depiction of the Trinity took place. By looking not only to the 'Quinity' in the *Prayerbook of Aelfwine*, the image on which scholars have primarily focused, but to references to the Seated Trinity in media outside of manuscript illumination, such as the seal matrix of Godwin and the Trinitarian vision of Christina of Markyate, this chapter established that the image of the Seated Trinity was current in English visual culture from the mid-eleventh century. Unlike the illustration in the *Prayerbook*, these images, in which an identical Father and Son are shown flanking the dove of the Holy Spirit, are the earliest extant examples to characterise the Trinitarian God in a way that was to become standard in Gothic visual culture.

Half a century after the seal matrix of Godwin and its Seated Trinity handle was created, a radically different image of the Trinitarian God appeared in Western European art, one that

would go on to become the most popular representation of the Trinity in medieval visual culture. With the Crucifixion as its central element, the *Gnadenstuhl* emphasised the role of all three persons of the Godhead in the sacrifice of the Son on the cross. As chapter two revealed, it was this focus on the Crucifixion, and specifically the celebration of this moment during the ceremony of the mass, that drove the creation of the *Gnadenstuhl* design. In a revision of previous assumptions regarding the *Gnadenstuhl's* formation, chapter two argued that this remarkable image resulted from the 'fusion' of the images of the *Majestas Domini* and the Crucifixion in the visual milieu related to the ceremony of the mass. Though the earliest extant example of a *Gnadenstuhl* features as the principal subject of a chancel wall painting in a parish church in Norfolk, probably completed at the turn of the twelfth century, the visual precedents that contributed to this design featured in wider Western European artistic culture related to the Mass. In particular, the decoration of mass books, in which the images of the *Majestas* and the Crucifixion had come to exemplify the respective prayers of the *Sanctus* and *Te igitur*, provide an important witness as to the context in which the 'fusion' of these images may have taken place. The connection between the visual programme of these books and the decoration of the spaces in which they were used and read explains why such an early example of the *Gnadenstuhl* was painted on the chancel wall of a small parish church. This chapter also demonstrated the *Gnadenstuhl's* continued association with the mass in the twelfth century, including in the new artistic programme at Saint-Denis where the *Gnadenstuhl* appeared in Abbot Suger's Anagogical window.

Having established the contexts for the invention and gradual dissemination of the *Gnadenstuhl* and Seated Trinity over the course of the eleventh and early twelfth centuries, chapter three addressed the reason for their rapid rise in popularity after the turn of the thirteenth century. The chapter showed how, following a series of trials of prominent theologians for their supposedly 'heretical' interpretations of the Trinity, the Fourth Lateran Council promulgated a statement on orthodox Trinitarian doctrine in direct response to these upheavals. This statement, in addition to shifts in tolerance towards 'scholastic' methods for understanding the Trinity, ushered in a period of relative stability not only in theological circles but also, the chapter argued, in the artistic landscape of Western Europe. The proliferation of the Seated and *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities across different media, and outside of the contexts in which they were originally conceived, is testament to the relative freedom of artists working from the thirteenth century on to create and depict the Trinitarian God.

This period of standardisation in Trinitarian iconography also provided an important framework for the subsequent creation of inventive and imaginative images of the Trinity. In the striking depiction of the Trinity with three heads, the artist of the St John's Psalter

moved away from more common representations of the three persons as three separate entities, amalgamating their bodies to form an enigmatic illustration of the 'three-in-one' nature of God. In doing so, this artist may have been drawing on similar concepts inherent in the image of the 'three-faced' Trinity, a design that appeared twice in the visual milieu associated with Salisbury Cathedral in the mid-thirteenth century. Though the three-headed image on Roger de Pont L'Évêque's late twelfth-century *secretum* is the earliest extant item to associate the depiction of three conjoined heads with the Trinity, it was only in the second half of the thirteenth century that artists began to craft entirely contemporary images that used the motif of three heads or faces as a representation of God's Trinitarian form.

At around the same time that the three-headed Trinity in the St John's Psalter was being completed, an artist connected to the London workshop that had produced some of the most ambitious Apocalypse manuscripts of the period created two unusual Trinitarian images as part of a series of moralising illustrations for an illuminated Bestiary. These two illustrations are unusual for their unique adaption of conventional *Gnadenstuhl* iconography. The fifth chapter argued that the remarkable depiction of the figure of God the Father as visually identical to the Son was created in response to contemporary anti-Jewish rhetoric employed in relation to Christ's statement in John 14:11 that he and the Father were 'one'. In offering a new and striking visual commentary on this concept, the artist and/or designer of this bestiary responded to concerns in wider society and also possibly to those of the book's patron.

Perspectives on Iconography

In focusing on the invention and dissemination of Trinitarian iconography over the course of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries, this thesis has simultaneously addressed the way in which images themselves were constructed and disseminated. The examples discussed have shown how the formation of an iconographic type was often a multifaceted and complex process, involving exchange across visual and non-visual material, a remarkable array of media and both major and minor works of art. These case studies offer important perspectives on the construction and dissemination of iconography in this period.

As we have seen, in addition to visual and artistic sources, developments in both liturgy and theology were essential to the formation of Trinitarian iconography. The image of the Seated Trinity, for example, is inextricably linked not only to the opening verses of Psalm 109, but also to the rich biblical exegesis that developed around this Psalm. The *Gnadenstuhl*

similarly evolved in response to both visual and non-visual sources, notably the words of the *Te igitur* and *Sanctus* prayers and their accompanying images. The unusual representation of the *Gnadenstuhl* and Seated Trinities in the Bestiary of Guillaume Le Clerc show the artist/designer of these images to have been drawing not only on the moralisations in the related Bestiary text, but also on ideas evident in Apocalypse commentaries. Furthermore, the account of Christina of Markyate's vision indicates that iconographies such as the Seated Trinity found expression in written and literary contexts only shortly after their 'invention' in art. The inherently visual nature of mystic and visionary accounts presents a particularly apt written form through which images and iconographies could be discussed and disseminated.[1]

This study has also demonstrated that images of the Trinity appeared across a particularly diverse array of media. Surviving examples of both Seated Trinity and *Gnadenstuhl* suggest that the very origins of these iconographies lie not in one isolated artistic sphere but as part of a rich tapestry of different visual material. Though ultimately derived from manuscript illumination, the iconography of the Seated Trinity quickly found currency on a sculpted ivory seal matrix and, as discussed, as part of a mystical vision. Early examples of the *Gnadenstuhl*, which appear in wall painting, manuscript illumination, stained glass and metalwork, are also important witnesses to the wide proliferation of this iconography. Later in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the appearance of several three-headed and three-faced Trinities on an adapted intaglio, in manuscript painting and in sculpture reveal the remarkably diverse contexts in which this unusual image appeared. The particularly close similarities between the three-faced head in the Bible of William of Hales and the sculpted three-faced label stop in Salisbury Cathedral chapter house offer a rare glimpse of the way in which designs were transferred between media in this period.

This thesis has also offered new perspectives on the relationship between major and minor works of art and the transfer of iconography between them.[2] As discussed in chapter two, the use of a *Gnadenstuhl* as the central element of a monumental twelfth-century wall painting scheme in a parish church suggests that, from the earliest stage in its development,

[1] For a discussion of the relationship between Trinitarian visionary accounts and iconography see Florence Close, 'Imaginer L'Indicible: À propos de la mise en mouvement des images dans les récits de visions de la Trinité des hagiographes et des mystiques médiévaux (VIIe-XIIe siècles)', *MethIS*, 5 (2016), pp. 49-76.

[2] The transfer of iconography between major and minor arts is discussed in *From Major to Minor: The Minor Arts in Medieval Art History*, ed. Colum Hourihane (Princeton, 2012). See in particular Paul Binski, 'London, Paris, Assisi, Rome around 1300: Questioning Art Hierarchies', in *From Major to Minor*, pp. 3-22, who emphasises the reciprocal transfer of imagery across major and minor arts and Thomas E. Dale, 'Transcending the Major/Minor Divide: Romanesque Mural Painting, Colour and Spiritual Seeing', in *From Major to Minor*, pp. 23-42, who discusses the layering of imagery across major and minor works in sacred spaces.

this iconography was considered appropriate for large-scale works of art. Its contemporary use in the minor arts, particularly on objects associated with the mass, such as the pages of missals and portable altars, show the iconography to have been readily transferrable to works on a smaller scale. A similar exchange can be observed in relation to the two three-faced Trinities crafted in both stone and paint at Salisbury Cathedral in the mid-thirteenth century, as well as in the dissemination of the iconography of the spandrel scenes in Salisbury chapter house onto the pages of two near-contemporary illuminated picture books. Though the loss of material has often obscured the direct channels through which this process occurred, the examples of iconographic exchange discussed in this study show that images travelled between both major and minor arts. Importantly, in the cases discussed, it is probable that this transfer occurred in both directions – from major to minor artworks and from minor to major. The three-faced illuminated head in the Bible of William of Hales was, for example, executed at least half a century before the much larger sculpted head in the chapter house, whilst the spandrel scenes in the chapter house were almost certainly completed before the illuminated picture books. This suggests that neither 'major' monumental nor 'minor' smaller-scale art was exclusively the authoritative exemplar from which iconography was 'copied' and disseminated; rather, the process operated mutually across both types.

These conclusions demonstrate the importance of a holistic approach to the study of iconography. They show that, in order to fully and comprehensively understand the process by which an image type is fashioned, standardised and disseminated, it is vital to understand the wider context in which it was created and then gathered traction. This involves a consideration of both visual and non-visual sources and an understanding of the movement and transmission of iconography between media, including its reciprocal transfer across major and minor works of art. Importantly, the case studies on which this study has focused have revealed that the dissemination of iconography is much more likely to be dependant on the context in which it can be used, rather than the media in which the image appears.[3] This is particularly exemplified in the case of the *Gnadenstuhl*. Early twelfth-century examples of this iconography clearly circulated on objects and in contexts related to the performance of the mass, such as on the chancel wall above the altar in churches, alongside mass prayers in Missals, and on portable altars. The subject and meaning of an image thus appears to have been much more fundamental to the way in which it was disseminated, rather than the aesthetics of its material form.

[3] Binski, 'London, Paris, Assisi, Rome', p. 20 also identifies a similar transfer of iconography across media in relation to the cults of St Edward at Westminster, St Francis at Assisi and St Louis and the Capetians at Paris.

In addition to addressing the standardisation of conventional iconographies, this thesis also explored their relationship to more iconographically unusual images of the Trinity. Though often seen as 'outliers', this study showed that more obscure images are integral to understanding artists' responses to more standardised forms. Crucially, they reveal that once an iconography had become formalised in visual culture, artists could choose to manipulate and adapt these images to communicate something new about the Trinitarian God. In the Bibliothèque Nationale Bestiary, the artist/designer's transformation of an image of the *Gnadenstuhl* into a 'double-Christ' Trinity emphasises the 'one-ness' of the Father and Son as part of wider anti-Jewish rhetoric on this theme. In fusing the heads or faces of the three persons of the Trinity, the artists that completed the three-headed and three-faced Trinities associated with Salisbury Cathedral and the St John's Psalter demonstrated a radical departure from all standardised iconographies of the Trinity, which otherwise show the three persons in three individual bodies. The artist of the Bible of William of Hales in particular showed an understanding of contemporary Trinitarian iconography in their depiction of a three-faced being in the illuminated initial of Psalm 109, the space conventionally reserved for an image of the Seated Trinity. These examples reveal that, during a period of relative stabilisation in Trinitarian iconography, artists were aware of 'conventional' iconographic forms, and could adapt them for specific and dynamic purposes.

Avenues for Further Research

In focusing on the most common and the most unusual representations of the Trinity in England over the course of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries, this thesis has offered a perspective on medieval Trinitarian iconography that could serve as a starting point for the exploration of a number of related avenues of research. In particular, as indicated in the introduction, it would be valuable to consider whether the development of iconographies that have fallen outside the bounds of this study, such as the representation of the Trinity as three separate beings, or the *Scutum fidei*, correspond to the conclusions established in relation to the *Gnadenstuhl* and Seated Trinity. This thesis focused on two rich case studies as an exploration of 'unusual' representations of the Trinity, and this topic too may be extended to other atypical Trinitarian images to further our understanding artists' invention and adaption of established motifs.

This thesis has focused predominantly on English material made in the period c. 1000-1300. Trends in Trinitarian iconography outside of these temporal and geographic boundaries would therefore provide an interesting comparison to the conclusions of this study. As discussed, scholarship on the representation of the Trinity has overwhelmingly focused on

continental examples from the later Middle Ages; early medieval visual culture thus provides a wealth of material that deserves further investigation. Similarly, studies on Trinitarian images from the later Middle Ages often draw a temporal conclusion before the Reformation and sixteenth-century changes to religious thought and practice. The theological understanding of the Trinity in the Latin Church experienced significant shifts in this turbulent period, and an examination of the comparative changes in Trinitarian iconography would be illuminating. Moreover, as this thesis has focused on the rise and formation of the Seated and *Gnadenstuhl* Trinities, a comparable study of their decline would provide a compelling conclusion to this topic.

Final Conclusions

Over the course of the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Trinitarian iconography underwent momentous and radical changes. In this period, two iconographies, the Seated Trinity and the *Gnadenstuhl*, were invented, became standardised, and rose to immense popularity, appearing in an extremely diverse array of media across Western Europe. Following this process of standardisation, artists working in the thirteenth century produced some of the most ambitious and unusual representations of the Trinity to survive from the Middle Ages, among them the three-headed Trinity, an image of the Trinity in the Tree and a 'double-Christ' *Gnadenstuhl*. Both the invention of 'conventional' images of the Trinity and the re-invention of these standardised forms in the production of 'unusual' Trinitarian images demonstrate the remarkably imaginative, inventive and innovative nature of artistic and visual culture in this period.

Crucially, the artists that created these images strove to achieve the very thing that Augustine had deemed impossible: to imagine the unimagineable. Unlike Augustine, the form in which these artists worked – the visual rather than the written – enabled them to communicate something that writers and theologians could not. In moving beyond words, they provided a pictorial answer to the paradoxical problem of a three-in-one God, constructing a tangible, physical and 'visible' representation of a concept that was itself 'invisible'. Images of the Trinity offered viewers a way to 'see' a concept that was invisible and yet essential to their faith; they thus lie at the intersection between belief, understanding and imagination, as a witness to the medieval conception of a God that was three-in-one. As visual solutions to a paradoxical, 'unimagineable' concept, Trinitarian images are also a remarkable testament to the imaginative and rich culture in which they were created.

Bibliography

Primary Sources (Unedited)

Baltimore, Walters Art Gallery
MS W 34: Carrow Psalter, England (East Anglia), mid-thirteenth century
MS W 102: Book of Hours, England, c. 1300

Bamberg, Staatliche Bibliothek
MS Lit. 2: Sacramentary of Bishop Ellenhard von Freising (?), Freising (?), shortly before 1056

Cambrai, Bibliothèque Municipal
MS 234: Cambrai Missal, Cambrai, c. 1120
MS 422: The Cambrai Apocalypse, England (London?), c. 1255-60

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College
MS 53: Peterborough Psalter and Bestiary, Peterborough, c. 1315
MS 422: 'The Red Book of Darley', southern England (Winchester or Sherborne?), c. 1061

Cambridge, St John's College
MS K 26: St John's Psalter, England, c. 1260-80

Durham, Durham University Library
D/C 1.1 Archep. 4: *Secretum* of Roger de Pont L'Évêque, c. 1154

Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland
MS 21000: Murthly Hours, England, c. 1260-80

Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana
MS Plut. 12. 17: Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, England (Canterbury?), c. 1130

Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek
MS aa51: Gilbert of Poitiers, Commentary on the Psalms, Southwest Germany, third quarter of the twelfth century

Hamburg, Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe
Inv. no. 1935.17: Ivory diptych, France, 14th century

Hannover, Kestner Museum
MS 3985: Single leaf from a Missal, Germany, thirteenth century

Hildesheim, Dombibliothek
MS St. God. 1: St Albans Psalter, England (St Albans), c. 1030

Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit
MS Lat. 76 A: Leiden St Louis's Psalter, England (York?) c. 1190

Lisbon, Museu Calouste Gulbenkian
MS L. A. 139: Gulbenkian Apocalypse, England (London?), c. 1265-70

London, British Library
Additional MS 29939: John Carter, Sketches of Salisbury Cathedral for the Society of Antiquaries, 1802

Additional MS 38116: Huth Psalter, England (Lincoln or York?), last quarter of the 14th century
Additional MS 42133: *Roman de la Rose*, France (Paris), fourth quarter of the fourteenth century
Additional MS 42555: Abingdon Apocalypse, England (London?), c. 1270-5
Additional MS 44874: Evesham Psalter, England, after 1245-c. 1270
Additional MS 50000: Oscott Psalter, England (Oxford?), c. 1260-70
Additional MS 54179: York Psalter, England, c. 1260
Arundel MS 83: Howard Psalter and Hours, England, c. 1310-20
Arundel MS 157: Psalter, England (Oxford), 1st quarter of the thirteenth century
Cotton MS Titus D. xxvii: *Aelfine's Prayerbook*, Winchester, c. 1020-30
Cotton MS Galba A X VIII: Athelstan Psalter, North-East Francia, 1st half of the 9th century
Cotton MS Vitellius A. XIII
Egerton MS 1066: Egerton Psalter, England (East Anglia), c. 1270-90
Harley MS 603: Harley Psalter, Canterbury, England, 1st half of the eleventh century
Harley MS 616: Bible, France (Paris?), last quarter of the 13th century
Harley MS 2449: Prayer Book, Netherlands (Brussels), c. 1276-1296
Harley MS 2930: Psalter-Hours, Netherlands (Brabant), last quarter of the thirteenth century
Royal MS 1 B XII: Bible of William of Hales, England, Salisbury, 1254
Royal MS 1 D I: Bible of William of Devon, England, 3rd quarter of the thirteenth century
Royal MS 2 B VII: Queen Mary Psalter, England (London or East Anglia?), c. 1310-20
Stowe MS 12: Stowe Breviary, England (Norwich), c. 1322-5
Stowe MS 944: New Minster *Liber Vitae*, England (Winchester), c. 1031-1771
Yates Thompson MS 8: Breviary of Renaud or Marguerite de Bar, France (Metz), c. 1302-3
Yates Thompson MS 11: 'La Sainte Abbaye', France, c. 1290
Yates Thompson MS 13: Taymouth Hours, England (London?), 2nd quarter of the 14th century

London, British Museum
Museum no. 1838,1232.20: Bronze seal matrix of Holy Trinity College, Stratford-upon-Avon, England, late 14th century
Museum no. 1839,0921.4: Bronze seal matrix of Thomas Peverell, Bishop of Llandaff, Wales (?), 1398-1407
Museum number 1881, 0404.1: Seal Matrix of Godwin, England, c. 1040
Museum no. 1923,1207.1: Seal matrix of the Friars of the Holy Trinity, Hounslow, England, 15th century
Museum no. 1994,1008.1: Parts of a wooden crucifix (The South Cerney Head), All Hallows Church, South Cerney, Gloucestershire, c. 1130
Museum no. AF.900: Finger ring, England, early 15th century

London, The Courtauld Gallery
Museum no. 0.1996.GP.2: Ivory panel, France, 14th century

London, Lambeth Palace Library
MS 209: Lambeth Apocalypse, England (Westminster?), c. 1260-70
MS 522: Miscellany, England, late thirteenth century

London, Royal College of Physicians
MS 409: Wilton Psalter, England (Salisbury?), c. 1250

London, Victoria and Albert Museum
Museum no. 8997C: Antiphoner, Netherlands, c. 1300
Museum no. 10-1873: Hildesheim Portable Altar, Hildesheim, c. 1160-80
Museum no. 34-1867: Ivory pax, England or France, c. 1350-1400
Museum no. 83-1864: The Syon Cope, 1310-20, England
Museum no. 175-1889: The Tree of Jesse Cope, 1310-25, England
Museum no. 1148-1864: Enamel copper pax, Limoges, c. 1350-1400
Museum no. A.89: 1-8, 10-15-1919: Swansea Altarpiece, England, 1460-90
Museum no. A.203-1946: Trinity Alabaster, England, 15th century
Museum no. M. 39-1946: Trinity brass, England, c. 1375-1400
Museum no. M.241-1962: Ring, England, c. 1400-1500

London, Westminster Abbey Library
MS 22: Westminster Bestiary, England, c. 1270-1290

Madrid, Museo del Prado
Robert Campin, Werl Altarpiece, Tournai, 1438

Modena, Biblioteca Estense
MS Latin 844: Psalter, Italy, c. 1276-1300

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek
Clm 10077: Fulda Sacramentary, Corvey, last third of the tenth century

Namur, Musée provincial des Arts anciens du Namurois
Trésor d'Oignies, inv. no. TO 03-04: Chalice and Paten, Belgium (Oignies), c. 1228-30

New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art
Museum no. 17.190.265: Ivory leaf from a Diptych, England or France (?), 15th century
Museum no. 1970.324.8: Ivory diptych, Germany (Cologne), c. 1350

New York, Morgan Library
MS G 25: Glazier Psalter, England (London?), c. 1225
MS G 42: Bible, England (Oxford?), c. 1265
MS G 53: Psalter, England (London or Canterbury), c. 1310-20
MS M 102: Psalter, England, c. 1280-1300
MS M 103: Psalter for the Clunaic Abbey of Reading, Oxford, c. 1250
MS M 107: Missal, England (Cambridge?), c. 1320
MS M 155: Psalter, Belgium (Liège), c. 1290-1305
MS M 185: *Roman de la Rose*, France, c. 1340-50
MS M 269: Bible, France (Paris?), c. 1245-50
MS M 440: Grosbois Psalter, Belgium (Liege), c. 1260
MS M 679: Psalter, England (Winchester?), second half of the 13th century
MS M 700: Book of Hours made in England (Oxford?), c. 1325-1330
MS M 729: Psalter-Hours, France (Amiens), c. 1280-1299
MS M 754: Book of Hours, France (St-Omer), c. 1320-1329
MS M 756: Cuerden Psalter, England (Oxford), c. 1270

Oxford, Bodleian Library
MS Auct. D. 2. 2: Benedictine Choir Psalter, England (Christ Church, Canterbury), second quarter of the fourteenth century
MS Auct. D. 4. 3: Psalter, Belgium, c. 1300
MS Barlow 22: Barlow Psalter, England (Peterborough), c. 1321-41
MS Canon. Liturg. 297: Benedictine Breviary, Germany (Würzburg), after 1154

MS Douce 6: Psalter, Belgium (Ghent), c. 1320-30
MS Douce 23: Psalter, Belgium, c. 1300
MS Douce 50: Psalter, France, third quarter of the thirteenth century
Douce 118: Psalter, France (Artois), end of the 13th century
MS Douce 131: Psalter, England (East Anglia), c. 1340
MS Douce 180: Douce Apocalypse, England (Westminster?), c. 1265-70
MS Lat. Liturg. E. 39: Chertsey Abbey Breviary, England, first quarter of the 14th century
MS Laud. Lat. 114: Psalter, England, c. 1260
MS Lat. Liturg. D 42: The Chertsey Abbey Breviary, England, c. 1310-20
Tanner 184: The Tanner Apocalypse, England (London?), c. 1250-55

Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Arsenale
MS 1186: Psalter of Louis IX and Blanche of Castile, France (Paris), c. 1225-35

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France
MS Français 95: Robert de Boron, *L'Estoire del Saint Graal*, France, c. 1270-90
MS Français 749: Robert de Boron, *L'Estoire del Saint Graal*, France, second half of the thirteenth century
MS Français 14969: Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc, England (London?), c. 1265-70
MS Latin 448: Peter Lombard, Commentary on the Psalms, France (Paris?), first half of the thirteenth century
MS Latin 1141: Sacramentary of Charles the Bald, West Francia, c. 869-870
MS Latin 8874: Peter Lombard, Glossa in Psalmos, France (Avignon?), c. 1210-30
MS Latin 12048: Gellone Sacramentary, Meaux or Cambrai, c. 790
MS Latin 12833: Martyrology for the Abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, Paris, c. 1219-1220

Paris, Musée du Louvre
Museum no. OA 11221: Ivory hair parter, England or France, 14th century

Rome, Vatican Library
Vaticana, Reg. Lat. 534: Jacobus de Voragine, *Legenda aurea*, S. France or N. Italy, late thirteenth century

Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek
MS 32: Utrecht Psalter, Rheims, c. 820

Verdun, Bibliothèque Municipale
MS 107: Breviary of Renaud de Bar, France (Metz), c. 1302-5

Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek
MS 2554: Bible moralisée, France (Paris), c. 1225

Portable Antiquities Scheme, Online:
PAS WMID-439C61: Finger ring, England, fifteenth century
PAS BERK-BCBDF5: Finger ring, England, 14th-15th century

Primary Sources (Edited)

Abbot Suger, 'On What Was Done Under His Administration', in *Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of St Denis and Its Art Treasures*, ed. and trans. Erwin Panofsky, 2nd edn. (Princeton, 1979)

Alberigo, G. et al., eds., *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Generaliumque Decreta: Editio Critica, vol II: The General Councils of Latin Christendom, Part 1: From Constantinople IV to Pavia-Siena (869-1424)*, ed. (Turnhout, 2013)

Albertus Magnus, *De Mineralibus*, ed. and trans. Dorothy Wyckoff, *Book of Minerals* (Oxford, 1967)

Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, ed. Otto Faller, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera Pars VII: Explanatio symboli. De sacramentis. De Mysteriis. De Paenitentia. De Excessu fratris. De Obitu Valentiniani . De Obitu Theodosii.* (Vienna, 1955)

Anselm, *De incarnatione verbi*, ed. F. S. Schmitt, *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archepiscopi opera Omnia*, 6 vols. (Edinburgh, 1946-1961) II (1948)

Anselm, *De incarnatione verbi*, trans. Jasper Hopkins and Herbert Richardson, *Complete Philosophical and Theological Treatises of Anselm of Canterbury* (Minneapolis, 2000)

Augustine of Hippo, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 34 (Paris, 1865)

Augustine of Hippo, *De Doctrina Christiana*, trans. R. P. H. Green, *De Doctrina Christiana* (Oxford, 1995)

Augustine of Hippo, *De Trinitate*, ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* (Paris, 1841), vol. 42

Augustine of Hippo, *De Trinitate*, trans. Edmund Hill, *The Works of Saint Augustine: The Trinity* (New York, 1991)

Augustine of Hippo, *Ennarrationes in Psalmos*, ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* (Paris, 1865), vol. 37

Augustine of Hippo, *Ennarrationes in Psalmos*, trans. John Henry Parker, *Expositions on the Book of Psalms,* vols. 1-5 (Oxford, 1847-1857), V (1853)

Bernard of Clairvaux, *Letter against Abelard, addressed by Bernard to Innocent II*, trans. Ailbe J. Luddy (Dublin, 1947)

Cassiodorus, *In Psalterium Expositio*, ed. J. P. Migne, PL (Paris, 1865), vol. 70

Cassiodorus, *In Psalterium Expositio*, trans. P. G., Walsh, *Explanation on the Psalms*, Ancient Christian Writers, 51, 3 vols. (New Jersey, 1991), III (1991)

De Meun, Jean, *Le Roman de la Rose*, ed. M. Méon et al. *Le Roman de la Rose par Guillaume de Lorris et Jehan de Meung: nouvelle édition, revue et corrigée sur les meilleurs et plus anciens manuscrits*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1814) IV (1814)

De Voragine, Jacobus, *The Golden Legend*, ed. F. S. Ellis, *The Golden Legend: Or, Lives of the Saints*, 7 vols. (London, 1900), IV (1900)

Edgar, S., A. M. Kinney et al., ed. and trans., *The Vulgate Bible: Douay-Rheims translation* (Cambridge, Mass., 2010)

Geoffrey of Auxerre, *Error(es) Gilleberti Pictauensis espiscopi* and *Libellus contra capitula Gisleberti episcopi Pictauensis*, ed. N. M. Häring, 'Geoffrey of Auxerre: Writings Against Gilbert of Poitiers', *Analecta Cisteriensia*, 22 (1966), 3-83.

Jerome, *Tractatus de Psalmo*, ed. G. Morin et al, *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera: Pars II. Opera Homiletica: Tractatus sive homiliae in Psalmos, in Marci evangelium aliaque varia argumenta*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina (Turnhout, 1958), vol. 78

Jerome, *Tractatus de Psalmo*, trans. Marie Liguori Ewald, *The Homilies of St Jerome,* 2 vols. (Washington, 1964-1966), I (1964)

Joachim of Fiore, *Liber de Concordia*, ed. Randolphe Daniel, *Abbot Joachim of Fiore: Liber de Concordia Noui Ac Veteris Testamenti*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 73 (Philadelphia, 1983)

John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, ed. and trans. M. Chibnall, *The Historia Pontificalis of John of Salisbury* (London, 1956)

Lovatt, Marie, ed., *English Episcopal Acta: York, 1154-1181* (Oxford, 2000)

Origen, *De Principiis*, ed. J. P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* (Paris, 1857), vol. 11.

Origen, *De Principiis*, trans. G. W. Butterworth, *Origen: On First Principles, being Koetschau's Text of the De Principiis Translated into English, Together with an Introduction and Notes* (New York, 1966)

Otto of Friesing, *Gesta Friderici I Imperatoris*, ed. G. Waitz and B. von Simson, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum*, 3rd edn. (Hannover and Leipzig, 1912)

Peter Abelard, *Historia Calamitatum*, ed. J. Monfrin, *Abelard: Historia Calamitatum, Texte critique avec une introduction* (Paris, 1959)

Peter Abelard, *Historia Calamitatum*, trans. Henry Adam Bellows, *The Story of My Misfortunes: The Autobiography of Peter Abelard* (New York, 1972)

Peter Abelard, *Theologia Summi boni*, ed. E. M. Buytaert and C. J. Mews, *Petri Abaelardi opera theologica III: theologia "summi boni", Theologia "scholorium"*, Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis 13 (1987)

Peter Lombard, *Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae*, ed. Ignatius Brady, *Magistri Petri Lombardi Parisiensis Episcopi, Sententiae in IV Libris Distinctae*, Editiones Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras, 3 vols. (Rome, 1971-1981), I, part 1 (1971)

Rothwell H., ed., *English Historical Documents III, 1189-1327* (London, 1975)

Tanner, Norman P., ed. and trans., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils vol. I: Nicaea I to Lateran V*, 2 vols. (Washington, 1990)

Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean*, ed. and trans. Ernest Evans, *Tertulliani Adversus Praxean Liber: Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas: The text edited, with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Ernest Evans* (London, 1948)

Vetusta Monumenta, quae ad rerum britannicarum memoriam conseruandam, 7 vols. (London, 1747-1906), vol. I (1747)

Walter of St Victor, *Le Contra quatuor labyrinthos Franciae de Gauthier de Saint-Victor*, ed. P. Glorieux, 'Le Contra quatuor labyrinthos Franciae de Gauthier de Saint-Victor, Édition critique', *Archives d'histoire et littéraire du moyen âge*, vol. 19 (1952), 187-335

Secondary Sources

Alexander, J. J. G., and Paul Binski, *Age of Chivalry: Art in Plantagenet England, 1200-1400* (London, 1987)

Atkin, Tamara and Francis Leneghan (ed.), *The Psalms and Medieval English Literature: From the Conversion to the Reformation*, (Cambridge, 2017)

Ayres, Lewis, *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (New York, 2004)

Baker, Audrey, 'Lewes Priory and the Early Group of Wall Paintings in Sussex', *Walpole Society* 31 (1942-3), 1-44

Baldwin, C. R., 'The scribes of the Sacramentary of Gellone', *Scriptorium*, 27 (1973), 16-20

_____.'The scriptorium of the Sacramentary of Gellone (Paris, Bib. Nat. MS Latin 12048)', *Scriptorium*, 25 (1971), 3-17

Baldwin, J. W., 'The Intellectual Preparation for the Canon of 1215 against Ordeals', *Speculum*, 36 (1961), 613-66

_____. *Master's, Princes and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chancer and his Circle*, 2 vols. (Princeton, 1970)

Baning, Knud, *A Catalogue of the Wall Paintings in the Churches of Medieval Denmark, 1100-1600*, vol. II (Copenhagen, 1976)

Barlow, Frank, *Thomas Becket* (California, 1990)

Baron, W., *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, 2nd rev., (New York, 1965)

Bauerreiß, Romuald, *Arbor Vitae: der "Lebensbaum" und seine Verwengdung in Liturgie, Kunst un Brauchtum des Abendlandes* (Munich, 1938)

Bayer, Clemens M., 'Der Mauritius-Tragaltar in Siegburg: Bemerkungen zu Datierung, Ikonographie und Ikonologie unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Inschriften, *Heimatblätter des Rhein-Sieg-Kreises* (1992-3)

Beenken, Hermann, 'The Annunciation of Petrus Cristus in the Metropolitan Museum and the Problem of Hubert Van Eyck', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 19, no. 2 (Jun., 1937), 220-241

Benton, John F., and Fiorella Prosperetti Ercoli, 'The Style of the *Historia Calamitatum*: A Preliminary Test of the Authenticity of the Correspondence attributed to Abelard and Heloise', *Viator* 6 (1975), 59-86

Binski, Paul, and Stella Panayotova, *The Cambridge Illuminations: Ten Centuries of Book Production in the Medieval West* (London, 2005)

Binski, Paul, *The Painted Chamber at Westminster* (London, 1986)

_____. *Westminster Abbey and the Plantagenets: Kingship and the Representation of Power 1200-1400* (London, 1995)

Blum, Pamela, 'The Middle English Romance "Iacob and Iosep" and the Joseph Cycle of the Salisbury Chapter House', *Gesta*, vol. 8, no. 1 (1969), 18-34

_____. 'The Salisbury Chapter-house and its Old Testament Cycle: An Archaeological and Iconographical Study', unpublished PhD dissertation (Yale University, 1978)

_____. 'The Sculptures of Salisbury Chapter-house' in *Medieval Art and Architecture at Salisbury Cathedral*, The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, ed. Laurence Keen and Thomas Cocke (Leeds, 1996), 68-78

_____. 'The Sequence of Building Campaigns at Salisbury', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 73 (1991), 6-38

_____. 'Thirteenth-Century Glass of the Salisbury Chapter House', *Gesta*, vol. 37, no. 2 (1998), 142-149

Boespflug, François and Yolanta Zaluska, 'Le dogme trinitaire et l'essor de son iconographie n Occident de l'epoque carolingienne au IVe Concile du Latran (1215)', *Cahiers de civilisation medievale*, vol. 37 (1994), 181-240

Boespflug, François, 'Autour de l'hospitalité d'Abraham dans la Bible et le Coran, et de son écho dans l'art chrétien de Moyen Âge (XIIIe-XVIe s.)', *Le comparatisme et l'histoire des religions*, ed. François Dunand (Paris, 1997), 315-343

_____. 'Dieu en pape: une singularité de l'art religieux de la fin du Moyen Âge', *Revue Mabillon: Revue internationale d'histoire et de littératures religieuses*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1991), 167-205

_____. 'La passion de la Trinité dans l'art flamand du XVe siècle', Dieu à l'épreuve de notre cri, ed. A. Guesché (Paris 1999), 45-67

_____. 'La Trinité au Moyen Âge: visions et images (XIIe-XIVe siècle)', *Expérience religieuse et expérience esthétique: Rituel, Art et Sacré dans les Religions* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1993), 121-153

_____. 'La Vision de la Trinité de Norbert de Xanta et de Robert de Deutz', *Revue de sciences religieuses*, vol. 71 (1997), 205-229

_____. 'Le Diable et la Trinité tricéphalous: À propos d'une pseudo-"vision de la Trinité" advenue àun novice de saint Norbert de Xanten', *Revue de sciences religieuses*, vol. 72 (1998), 156-175

_____. *Dieu dans l'art à la fin du Moyen Âge* (Genève, 2012)

_____. *Le Dieu des peintres et des sculpteurs: L'invisible incarné* (Paris, 2010)

_____. *Dieu et ses images: une histoire de l'Eternel dans l'art* (Montrouge, 2011)

_____. *The Trinité dans l'art d'Occident (1400-1460): sept chefs-d'oeuvre de la peinture* (Strasbourg, 2000)

_____. *Trinität: Dreifaltigkeitsbilder im später Mittelalter* (München, 2001)

Bond, Edward Augustus, Edward Maunde Thompson and George Frederick Warner (eds.), *Palaeographic Society, Facsimiles of Manuscripts and Inscriptions* (London, 1884-94)

Bougerol, Jacques-Guy, 'The Church Fathers and the Sentences of Peter Lombard', *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists*, ed. Irena Backus, 2 vols (Leiden, 1997), I, 113-164

Boyle, Leonard, 'The Fourth Lateran Council and Manuals of Popular Theology' in *The Popular Literature of Medieval England*, ed. Thomas J. Heffernan (Knoxville, 1985), 30-43

Brady, Ignatius C., 'Peter Manducator and the Oral Teachings of Peter Lombard', *Antonianum*, 41 (1966), 454-90

Branner, Robert, 'The Painted Medallions in the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 58, no. 2 (1968), 1-42

Brantley, Jessica, 'The Iconography of the Utrecht Psalter and the Old English Descent Into Hell', *Anglo-Saxon England*, vol. 28 (1999), 43-63

Braunfels, Wolfgang, *Die Heilige Dreifaltigkeit* (Düsseldorf, 1954)

Brooks, Nicholas, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066* (Leicester, 1996)

Brown, Sarah, *'Our Magnificent Frabrick': York Minster, An Architectural History, c. 1220-1500* (London, 2003)

_____. *Sumptuous and Richly Adorn'd: The Decoration of Salisbury Cathedral* (London, 1999)

Browne, Clare Woodthorpe, Glyn Davies, Michael A. Michael and Michaela Zöschg (eds.), *English Medieval Embroidery: Opus Anglicanum*, (Yale, 2016)

Budde, M., *Altare Portatile: Kompendium der Tragaltäre des Mittelaltars, 600-1600* (Munich, 1998)

Budny, M., *Insular, Anglo-Saxon and Early Anglo-Norman Manuscript Art at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge: An Illustrated Catalogue*, 2 vols (Kalamazoo, 1997)

Bugyis, Katie Ann-Marie, 'The Author of the Life of Christina of Markyate: The Case for Robort de Gorron (d. 1166)', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 68, no. 4 (2017), 719-46

Bunge, G., *The Rublev Trinity* (New York, 2007)
Burn, A. E., 'Some Spanish MSS of the Constantinopolitan Creed', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 9 (1908), 301-3

Calkins, R. G., *Illuminated Books of the Middle Ages* (Ithaca, 1983)

Camille, Michael, *Gothic Idol: Ideology and Image-Making in Medieval Art* (Cambridge, 1989)

Campion, C. H., 'Mural Paintings in Westmeston Church', *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 16 (Lewes, 1848), 1-19

Carpenter, Hilary, *The Dominican Missal in Latin and English*, Revised Edition (Oxford, 1948)

Cather, S., and I. Kakoulli, *Houghton-on-the-Hill, Norfolk: Technical Examination of the Wall Paintings* (unpublished report, Conservation of Wall Painting, Courtauld Institute of Art, July, 2000)

Chadwick, Henry, *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church, From Apostolic Times until the Council of Florence* (Oxford, 2003)

Chazelle, C. M., 'Archbishops Ebo and Hincmar of Reims and the Utrecht Psalter', *Speculum*, vol. 72 (1997), 1055-1078

Cheetham, Francis, *English Medieval Alabasters: With a Catalogue of the Collection in the Victoria and Albert Museum* (London, 2005)

Cheney, C. R., and F. M. Powicke, *Councils and Synods: With Other Documents Relating to the English Church, 1205-1313*, vol. II, part II (Oxford, 1964)

Cherry, John, 'Cameos and gems on the Westminster Retable', *The Westminster Retable: History, Technique, Conservation*, ed. Paul Binski and Ann Massing (Cambridge, 2009), 131-5

Clanchy, M. T., *Abelard: A Medieval Life* (Oxford, 1997)

Cleaver, Laura, 'Heretic or hero? Posthumous Representations of Gilbert of Poitiers in texts and images before 1200', *Word and Image*, 26:3 (2010), 285-296

_____. 'The Many Faces of Peter Lombard: Changing Perceptions of a Master in Images Made Between 1150 and 1215', *Spiritual Temporalities in Late Medieval Europe*, ed. Michael Foster (Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2010), 33-56

Close, Florence, 'Imaginer L'Indicible: À propos de la mise en mouvement des images dans les récits de visions de la Trinité des hagiographes et des mystiques médiévaux (VIIe-XIIe siècles)', *MethIS*, 5 (2016), 49-76

Coakley, John W., *Women, Men and Spiritual Power: Female Saints and Their Male Collaborators* (New York, 2006)

Cocke, Thomas, and Peter Kidson, *Salisbury Cathedral: Perspectives on the Architectural History* (London, 1993)

Cockrell, C. S., *Exhibition of Illuminated Manuscripts* (London, Burlington Fine Arts Club, 1908)

Colish, M. L., 'Systematic theology and theological renewal in the twelfth century', in *Studies in Scholasticism*, ed. M. L. Colish (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006)

_____. *Peter Lombard*, 2 vols. (Leiden, 1994)

_____. *Studies in Scholasticism* (Aldershot, 2006)

_____. '*Psalterium Scholasticorum*: Peter Lombard and the Emergence of Scholastic Psalms Exegesis', *Speculum* 67 (1992), 531-548

_____. 'Peter Lombard and Philosophy', *Issues in Medieval Philosophy: Essays in Honour of Richard C. Dales*, ed. Nancy van Deusen (Ottawa, 2001), 121-129

Collard, Judith, '*Effigies ad Regum Angliae* and the representation of Kingship in Thirteenth-Century English Royal Culture', *Electronic British Library Journal* 9, (2007), 1-26

Curteis, Tobit, 'St Mary's Church, Houghton on the Hill, Norfolk: conservation of the wall paintings' (unpublished report, Tobit Curteis Associates, 2006)

Cyrille, Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, rev. and trans., William Storey and Niels Rasmussen (Washington, 1986)

Daley, Brian E., S. J. Kolbet and Paul R. Kolbet (eds.), *The Harp of Prophesy: Early Christian Interpretation of the Psalms*, (Notre Dame, IN, 2015)

Dalton, John P., *The Archiepiscopal and Deputed Seals of York 1114-1500* (York, 1992)

Dalton, O. M., *Catalogue of the Ivory Carvings of the Christian Era with Examples of Mohammedan Art and Carvings in Bone in the Department of British and Medieval Antiquities and Ethnography of the British Museum* (London, 1909)

De Hamel, Christopher, *Glossed Books of the Bible and the Origins of the Paris Book Trade* (Woodbridge, 1984)

Deshusses, Jean, 'La sacramentaire de Gellone dans son contexte historique', *Ephemerides liturgicae*, 75 (1961), 193-210

Didron, A. N., *Iconographie chrétienne: histoire de Dieu* (Paris, 1843)

Dillon, J., 'Origen's Doctrine of the Trinity and some later Neoplatonic Theories' in *Neoplatonism and Early Christian Thought: Essays in Honour of A. H. Armstrong* ed. Arthur Hilary Armstrong, H. J. Blumenthal and R. A. Markus (Michigan, 1981), 19-23

Dobrzeniecki, Tadeusz, 'The Toruń Quinity in the National Museum in Warsaw', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 46, no. 3 (Sep., 1964), 380-388

Dodwell, C. R., 'The final copy of the Utrecht Psalter and its relationship with the Harley and Eadwine Psalters', *Scriptorium*, 44 (1990), 21-53

_____. *The Pictorial Arts of the West 800-1200* (New Haven, 1993)

Dolley, R. H. M., *Anglo-Saxon Pennies* (London, 1964)

Draper, Peter, 'Architecture Franglais?' in *Architecture and Language: Constructing Identity in European Architecture, c. 1000-1650*, ed. Paul Crossley and Georgiana Clarke (Cambridge, 2000), 21-35

Dronke, Peter, *A History of Twelfth-Century Philosophy* (Cambridge, 1988)

_____. *Abelard and Heloise in Medieval Testimonies* (Glasgow, 1976)

Druce, George C., *The Bestiary of Guillaume le Clerc* (Ashford, 1936)

Duffy, Eamon, *The Stripping of the Altars: Traditional Religion in England c. 1400-c. 1580* (New Haven, 2005)

Dufrenne, S., *Les Illustrations du Psautier d'Utrecht: sources et apport carolingien* (Paris, 1978)

Duggan, Anne J., 'Conciliar Law 1123-1215: The Legislation of the Four Lateran Councils', *The History of Medieval Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140-1234: From Gratian to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX*, ed. Wilfried Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington (Washington, 2008)

Dumelow, Zoë, 'Transitions of Authority: the Joseph Cycle in the Sculpture Series of Salisbury Cathedral Chapter House'in *The Art, Literature and Material Culture of the Medieval World*, ed. Meg Boulton, Jane Hawkes and Melissa Herman (Dublin, 2015), 179-197

E. T. DeWald, *The Illustrations of the Utrecht Psalter* (Princeton, 1932)

Emery, Giles, *The Trinitarian Theology of St Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford, 2007)

_____. *Trinity in Aquinas* (Ypsilanti, 2003)

Evans, Ernest, *Tertulliani Adversus Praxean Liber: Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas: The text edited, with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Ernest Evans* (London, 1948)

Evans, G. R., *Old Arts and New Theology: The Beginnings of Theology as an Academic Discipline* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980)

_____. *Philosophy and Theology in the Middle Ages* (London: Routledge, 1993)

Evans, Michael, 'An Illustrated Fragment of Peraldus's *Summa* of Vice: Harleian MS 3244', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, vol. 45 (1982), 32-55

Ewald, Marie Liguori, *The Homilies of St Jerome, Volume 1 (1-59 on the Psalms)* (Washington, 1964)

Fahey, Michael and John Meyendorff, *Trinitarian Theology East and West: St Thomas Aquinas and St Gregory Palamas* (Brookline, 1977)

Fallon, Nicole, 'The Cross as Tree: The Wood-Of-The-Cross Legends in Middle English and Latin Texts in Medieval England', unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Toronto (2009)

Ferguson, C. D., *The Emergence of Medieval Biography: Guibert de Nogent, Peter Abelard and Giraldus Cambrensis as Alienated Autobiographers* (1982)

Fichtenau, Heinrich, *Heretics and Scholars in the High Middle Ages 1000-1200*, trans. Denise A. Kaiser (Pennsylvania 1998)

Fraioli, D. A., 'Heloise's First Letter as a Response to the "Historia" Calamitatum', *Mediaevistik* 19 (2016), 119-142

Frank, Jacqueline A., 'The Quadrige Aminadab medallion in the "anagogical" window at the royal abbey of Saint-Denis', *Gazette des beaux-arts*, vol. 133 (1999), pp. 219-234

Freeman, Charles, *AD 381: Heretics, Pagans, and the Dawn of the Monotheistic State* (New York, 2009)

Friedman, Russel L., *Medieval Trinitarian Thought From Aquinas to Ockham* (Cambridge, 2010)

_____. 'Peter Lombard and the Development of the 'Sentences' Commentary in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries', *Pietro Lombardo: atti del XLIII Convegno Storico Internazionale, Todi, 8-10 Ottobre 2006* (Todi, 2007), 459-478

Gatto, Alfredo, 'The Life and Works of Joachim of Fiore: An Overview', *A Companion to Joachim of Fiore*, ed. Matthias Riedl (Leiden, 2018)

Gameson, Richard, *The Role of Art in the Late Anglo-Saxon Church* (Oxford, 1995)

_____. 'The Anglo-Saxon Artists of the Harley 603 Psalter', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, vol. 143 (1990), 29-48

Gannon, A., *The Iconography of Anglo-Saxon Coinage: Sixth to Eight Centuries* (Oxford, 2003)

Geddes, Jane, *The St Albans Psalter: A Book for Christina of Markyate* (London, 2005)

Gee, Loveday Lewes, *Women, Art and Patronage from Henry III to Edward III: 1216-1377* (Woodbridge, 2002)

Gem, Richard D. H., 'The "Lewes group" of wall paintings: architectural considerations', *Anglo-Norman Studies VI* (1983), 236-7

Giese, Martina, Gerhard Lutz and Harald Wolter-Von Dem Kneseeck, 'Hildesheim: Centre of Medieval Art', *Medieval Treasures from Hildesheim*, ed. Peter Barnet, Michael Brandt and Gerhard Lutz (New York, 2013), 3-20

Giola, Luigi, *The Theological Epistemology of Augustine's De Trinitate* (Oxford, 2008)

Gittos, Helen, 'Is There Any Evidence for the Liturgy of Parish Church in Late Anglo-Saxon England? The Red Book of Darley and the Status of Old English', *Pastoral Care in Late Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. F. Tinti (Woodbridge, 2005), 63-82

_____. *Liturgy, Architecture and Sacred Places in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford, 2013)

Goldschmidt, Adolph, *Der Albanipsalter in Hildesheim und seine Beziehung zur symbolischen Kirchensculptur des XII. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1895)

Grabar, André, *Christian Iconography: A Study of Its Origins* (Princeton, 1968)

Green, V. G., *The Franciscans in Medieval English Life 1224-1348* (Paterson, 1939)

Greenwell, W., and C. H. Hunter Blair, *Catalogue of the Seals in the Treasury of the Dean and Chapter of Durham*, vol. I (1911-20)

Grodecki, Louis, *Les Vitraux de Saint-Denis: Étude sur le Vitrail au XII Siècle* vol. 1 (Paris, 1976)

Gross-Diaz, Theresa, *The Psalms Commentary of Gilbert of Poitiers: From Lectio Divina to the Lecture Room* (London, 1996)

Grossman, Heather E., and Alicia Walker, eds., *Mechanisms of Exchange: Transmission in Medieval Art and Architecture of the Mediterranean, ca. 1000-1500*, (Leiden, 2013)

Günzel, Beate, *Aelfwine's Prayerbook (London, British Library, Cotton Titus D. xxvi+xxvii)* (London, 1993)

Hahn, Cynthia, *Strange Beauty: Issues in the Making and Meaning of Reliquaries, 400-1204* (Pennsylvania, 2012)

Hamburger, J., *The Rothschild Canticles: Art and Mysticism in Flanders and the Rhineland c. 1300* (Yale, 1990)

Hanson, R. P. C., *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God* (Edinburgh, 1988)

Häring, N. M., 'The Case of Gilbert de la Porrée, bishop of Poitiers (1142-1154), *Medieval Studies*, 13 (1951), 1-40

_____. ed., 'The *Eulogium ad Alexandram Papam tertium* of John of Cornwall', *Medieval Studies*, 13 (1951), 253-300

_____. *The Commentaries on Boethius by Gilbert of Poitiers* (Toronto, 1966

Härtel, Helmer, *Handschriften des Kestner-Museums zu Hannover* (Wiesbaden, 1999)

Hassig, Debra, *Medieval Bestiaries: Text, Image, Ideology* (Cambridge 1995)

Hausmann, Regina, *Die theologischen Handschriften der Hessischen Landesbibliothek Fulda bis zum Jahr 1600: Codices Bonifatiani 1-3, Aa 1-145a* (Wiesbaden, 1992)

Hay, David M., *Glory at the Right Hand: Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (Abingdon, 1973)

Heimann, A., 'The Last Copy of the Utrecht Psalter', *The Year 1200: A Symposium* (New York, 1975), 313-338

_____. 'Trinitas Creator Mundi', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 2 (1938-9), 42-52

Henderson, George, 'The Idiosyncrasies of a thirteenth-century Illustrator: The Old Testament Cycle in St John's College, Cambridge, MS K 26 revisited', *Tributes to Nigel Morgan, Contexts of Medieval Art: Images, Objects and Ideas*, ed. Julian M. Luxford and M. A. Michael (London, 2010), 109-124

_____. 'The Style and Function of the Cameos on the Frame of the Westminster Retable, *The Antiquaries Journal*, vol. 91 (Sep., 2011), 145-162

_____. 'MS K. 26 in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge: A Study of the Style and Iconography of its Thirteenth Century Illustrations' (Cambridge, unpublished PhD dissertation, 1959)

Henig, M., 'The Re-use and Copying of Ancient Intaglios set in Medieval Personal Seals, mainly found in England: An aspect of the Renaissance of the 12th century', *Good Impressions: Image and Authority in Medieval Seals* (London, 2008), 25-34

_____. *A Corpus of Roman Engraved Gemstones from British Sites*, BAR British series 8, 3rd edn. (Oxford, 2007)

_____. *Classical Gems: Ancient and Modern Intaglios and Cameos in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1994)

Henig, M. and T. A. Heslop, 'Three thirteenth-century seal matrices with intaglio stones in Castle Museum, Norwich', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 39 (1986), 305-309

Herbel, Oliver, 'Ratramnus of Corbie, Paulinus of Aquileia, and Aeneas of Paris as Sources for Bonaventure's Filioque Arguments in the Sentences', *Franciscan Studies*, vol. 65 (2007), 87-105

Heslop, T. A., 'Decoration and Illustration: The Psalm Illustrations' in *The Eadwine Psalter: Text, Image, and Monastic Culture in Twelfth-Century Canterbury* (London, 1992), 43-52

_____. 'English Seals from the Mid-Ninth Century to 1000', *Journal of the British Archeological Association*, 133, (1980), 1-16

_____. 'Seals' in *English Romanesque Art 1066-1200*, eds. George Zarnecki, Janet Holt and Tristram Holland (London, 1984), 298-319

_____. 'The Implication of the Utrecht Psalter in English Romanesque Art', *Romanesque Art and Thought in the Twelfth Century: Essays in Honour of Walter Cahn* (Princeton, 2008), 267-290

_____. 'The Seals of the Twelfth-Century Earls of Chester', *Journal of the Chester Archaeological Society*, 71 (1991), 197-97

_____. 'Christina of Markyate's Psalter', *The Cambridge Guide to the Arts in Britain*, vol. 2, *The Middle Ages*, ed. Boris Ford (Cambridge, 1988), 164-70

Higgit, John, *The Murthly Hours: Devotion, Literacy and Luxury in Paris, England and the Gaelic West* (London, 2000)

Hildburgh, W. L., 'A Medieval Bronze Pectoral Cross: Contributions to the Study of the Iconography of the Holy Trinity and of the Cross', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 14, no. 2 (1932), 79-102

Hinton, David A., *Gold and Gilt, Pots and Pins: Possessions and People in Medieval Britain* (Oxford, 2005)

Hippeau, C., *Le Bestiaire Divin de Guillaume le Clerc de Normandie* (Caen, 1852)

Hohler, Christopher, 'The Red Book of Darley', *Nordiskt Kollokvium I Latinsk Liturgiforskning* 2 (Stockholm, 1972), 39-47

Holdsworth, Christopher J., 'Christina of Markyate', *Medieval Women: Essays Presented to R. M. T. Hill on the Occasion of her 70th Birthday*, ed. Derek Baker, Studies in Church History, 12 (Oxford, 1978), 185-204

Hollengreen, Laura Holden, ed., *Translatio, Or the Transmission of Culture in the Midde Ages and the Renaissance: Modes and Messages*, ed. (Turnhout, 2008)

Hoogewerff, G. J., 'Vultus Trifons: Emblema diabolico immagine improba della santissima Trinità', *Rendiconti della Pontifica Accademia Romana di Archeologia*, 19 (1942-3), 205-45

Hurtado, Larry W., *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids, 2003)

Jaeger, C. S., 'The Prologue to the *Historia Calamitatum* and the "Authenticity Question"' in *Euphorion: Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte*, vol. 74 (Heidelberg, 1980), 1-15

James, M. R., 'Pictor in Carmine', *Archaeologia* 94 (1951), 141-66

_____. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Manuscripts in the Library of Lambeth Palace*, vol. II (Cambridge, 1932)

_____. *The Ancient Libraries of Canterbury and Dover* (Cambridge, 1903)
_____. *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of Corpus Christi College*, vol. II (Cambridge, 1912)

_____. *Descriptive Catalogue of Manuscripts in the Library of St John's College, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1913)

Jeffrey, David L., and Brian J. Levy, *The Anglo-Norman Lyric: An Anthology* (Toronto, 1990)

Juel, Donald H., 'The Trinity and the New Testament', *Theology Today*, vol. 54, no. 3 (Oct., 1997), 312-324

Kantorowicz, Ernst H., 'The Quinity of Winchester', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 29, no. 2 (Jun., 1947), 73-85

Karkov, Catherine E., 'Reading the Trinity in the Harley Psalter', *Crossing Boundaries: Interdisciplinary approaches to the art, material culture, language and literature of the early medieval world: essays presented to Professor Emeritus Richard N. Bailey OBE, on the occasion of his eightieth birthday* (2017), 90-6

_____. *The Art of Anglo-Saxon England* (Woodbridge, 2011)

Kauffmann, C. M., *Biblical Imagery in Medieval England, 700-1550* (London, 2003)

Kelly, J. N. D., *Early Christian Creeds*, 3rd ed. (London, 1972)

_____. *Early Christian Doctrines*, 5th ed. (London, 1977)

Kemp, Brian Richard, and Tim Tatton-Brown, 'The Date of the Cloister of Salisbury Cathedral', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, vol. 161 (2008), 94-103

Kendall, Calvin B., 'From Sign to Vision: The Ruthwell Cross and *The Dream of the Rood*' in *The Place of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Catherine E. Karkov, Sarah Larratt Keefer and Karen Louise Jolley (Woodbridge, 2006)

Ker, N. R., 'From 'Above Top Line' to 'Below Top Line' in N. R. Ker, *Books, Collectors and Libraries: Studies in the Medieval Heritage*, ed. Andrew G. Watson (London, 1985), 70-74

_____. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford, 1990)

Kessler, H. L., 'Turning a Blind Eye: Medieval Art and the Dynamics of Contemplation', *The Mind's Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages*, ed. J. F. Hamburger and A. M. Bouché (Princeton, 2006), 413-39

Kidd, Judith, 'The Winchester Quinity Reconsidered', *Studies in Iconography*, vol. 7-8 (1981-2), 21-33

Kidd, Peter, 'Contents and Codicology', *The St Albans Psalter (Albani Psalter)* ed. Jochen Bepler, Peter Kidd, and Jane Geddes (Simbach am Inn, 2008), 41-156

Kluge, Eiker-Henner W., 'Roscelin and the Medieval Problem of Universals', *Journal of the History of Philosophy* vol. 14, no. 4 (1976), 405-414

Koopmans, Rachel M., 'The Conclusion of Christina of Markyate's *Vita*', *Journal of Ecclesiastic History*, vol. 51, 4 (2000), 663-698

Kress, Berthold, 'A Relief by Peter Dell (1548) After a Drawing by Paul Lautensack, and the Origins of the Term "Gnadenstuhl"', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 73 (2010), 181-194

_____. *Divine Diagrams: The Manuscripts and Drawings of Paul Lautensack (1477/8-1558)* (Leiden, 2004)

Kumler, Aden, *Translating Truth: Ambitious Images and Religious Knowledge in Late Medieval France and England* (New Haven, 2011)

La Piana, Giorgio, 'Joachim of Flora: A Critical Survey', *Speculum*, 7 (1932), 257-282

Lacy, N. J., *Lancelot-Grail: The Old French Arthurian Vulgate and Post-Vulgate in translation*, vol. 1 (London, 1993)

Lasko, Peter, *Ars Sacra, 800-1200* (Middlesex, 1972)

Le Glay, André, *Catalogue descriptif et raisonné des manuscrits de la bibliothèque municipale de Cambrai* (Cambrai, 1831)

Lee, Harold, 'The Anti-Lombard Figures of Joachim of Fiore: A Re-Interpretation' in *Prophecy and Millenarianism: Essays in Honour of Marjorie Reeves* (Harlow: Longman, 1980), 127-142

Leitshuh, Friedrich and Hans Fischer, *Katalogue der Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Bamberg*, vol. 1 (Bamberg, 1897)

Lewis, Suzanne, 'Giles de Bridport and the Abingdon Apocalypse', *England in the Thirteenth Century*, ed. W. M. Ormrod, *Proceedings of the 1984 Harlaxton Symposium* (Woodbridge, 1986), 107-119

_____. '*Tractatus adversus Judaeos* in the Gulbenkian Apocalypse', *Art Bulletin*, vol. 69, (1986) 343-66

_____. *The Art of Matthew Paris in the Chronica Majora*, (Berkeley, 1987)

Ligteenberg, R., 'Over den Oosprung en de eerste beteekenis van den Genadestoel', *Collectanea Franciscana Nerlandica*, III/I, 1932, 1-35

Lipton, Sara, *Dark Mirror: The Medieval Origins of Anti-Jewish Iconography* (New York, 2014)

_____. *Images of Intolerance: The Representation of Jews and Judaism in the Bible moralisée* (Berkeley, 1999)

Little, E., *Bernard of Clairveaux: Studies Presented to Dom. J. Leclercq* (London, 1973)

Lowden, John, *The Making of the Bible Moralisées*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia, 2000)

Luscombe, David, *Peter Abelard* (Oxford, 2002)

_____. *The School of Peter Abelard: The Influence of Abelard's Thought in the Early Scholastic Period* (Cambridge, 1969)

Madsen, Gamble Leigh, 'Medieval Visions of the Godhead: Peter Lombard's Commentary on Psalm 109', unpublished PhD dissertation, University of South California (2004)

Mâle, Emile, *L'Art Religieux du XIIe siècle en France: Étude sur les origines de l'iconographie du Moyen Age* (Paris, 1922)

_____. *Religious Art in France: The Twelfth Century, A Study of the Origins of Medieval Iconography* trans. Marthiel Mathews (Princeton, 1978)

Marebon, John, *The Philosophy of Peter Abelard* (Cambridge, 1997)

_____. 'The Platonisms of Peter Abelard' in *Aristotelian Logic, Platonism and the Context of Early Medieval Philosophy in the West* (Aldershot, 2000), 109-129

_____. 'The Rediscovery of Peter Abelard's Philosophy', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 44, 3 (2006), 331-351

Martin, Christopher J., 'The Development of Logic in the Twelfth Century', *The Cambridge History of Medieval Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2010), 129-145

Mayr-Harting, Henry, *Ottonian Book Illumination: An Historical Study* (London, 1999)

McCulloch, Florence, *Medieval Latin and French Bestiaries* (Chapel Hill, 1962)

McGinn, Berhard, 'Image as Insight in Joachim of Fiore's *Figurae*', *Envisioning Experience in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Dynamic Patterns in Texts and Images*, ed. Giselle De Nie and Thomas F. X. Noble (Abingdon, 2012), 93-118

_____. *The Calabrian Abbot: Joachim of Fiore in the History of Western Thought* (New York, 1985)

McGowan, Andrew B., 'Tertullian and the Trinity', *God in Early Christian Thought: Essays in Honour of Lloyd G. Patterson*, ed. Andrew B. McGowan, Brian E. Daley and Timothy J. Gaden (Leiden, 2009), 61-82

McKitterick, Rosamond, 'Continuity and Innovation in Tenth-Century Ottonian Culture', *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Margaret Gibson* (London, 1991), 21-2

_____. *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 1990)

Mellinkoff, R., *The Mark of Cain* (London, 1981)

Mews, C. J., 'Nominalism and Theology Before Abelard: New Light on Rosclin of Compiègne', *Vivarium* vol. 30, no. 1 (1992), 4-33

_____. 'Peter Abelard's Theologia Christiana and Theologia Scholarium re-examined', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et medieval*, 52 (1985), 109-158

_____. 'The Council of Sens (1141): Abelard, Bernard and the Fear of Social Upheaval', *Speculum*, vol. 77, no. 2, (Apr., 2002), 342-382

_____. 'The Development of the *Theologia* of Peter Abelard' in *Petrus Abaelardus 1079-1142: Person, Werk und Wirkung* ed. Jean Jolivet, David Luscombe and Lambert Marie de Rijk (Trier, 1980), 183-198

_____. *Abelard and His Legacy* (Aldershot, 2001)

_____. *The Lost Love Letters of Heloise and Abelard: Perceptions of Dialogue in Twelfth-Century France* (New York, 1999)

Mews, Constant J., and Clare Monagle, 'Peter Lombard, Joachim of Fiore and the Fourth Lateran Council', *Medioevo: Revista di Storia Della Filosofia Medievale*, 35 (2010), 81-122

Mills, Robert, 'Jesus as Monster', *The Monstrous Middle Ages*, ed. Bildhauer and Mills (Cardiff, 2003), 28-54

Molinier, Auguste, *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèque Publiques de France, Tome XVII, Cambrai* (Paris, 1891)

Monagle, Clare, 'The Trial of Ideas: Two Tellings of the Trial of Gilbert of Poitiers', *Viator*, vol. 35 (2004), 113-130

Montague, G. T., *The Holy Spirit: Growth of a Biblical Tradition* (New York, 1976)

Moody, Catherine M. (ed.), *Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and Their Interpreters* (Philadelphia, 1999)

Moore, R. I., *The First European Revolution, c. 970-1215* (Oxford, 2000)

Moorman, J. R. H., *The Franciscans in England* (Oxford, 1974)

Morgan, Nigel, *Early Gothic Manuscripts, 1190-1250: A Survey of Manuscripts Illuminated in the British Isles,* vol. I (London, 1982)

_____. 'Pictured Sermons in Thirteenth-Century England', in *Tributes to J. G. Alexander: The Making and Meaning of Illuminated Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts, Art and Architecture* (London, 2006), 323-340

Morgan, Nigel, Suzanne Lewis, Michelle Brown and Aires Augusto Nascimento, *Apocalypsis Gulbenkian* (Barcelona, 2002)

Morgan, Nigel, and Michelle P. Brown, *The Lambeth Apocalypse: Manuscript 209 in Lambeth Palace Library, A Critical Study* (London, 1990)

Morin, Germain, 'Les Monuments de la prédication de saint Jérôme, *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses* 1 (1896), 393-434

_____. ed., *Sancti Hieronymi Presbyteri Tractatus sive Homiliae in Psalmos, in Marci evangelium aliaque varia argumenta* (Maredsoli, 1897)

Morris, John, 'Wall Painting in St Anselm's Chapel in Canterbury Cathedral Church', *Archaeologia*, vol. 52 (1890), 389-392

Munns, John, *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Norman England: Theology, Imagery, Devotion* (London, 2016)

Muratova, Xenia, 'Les miniatures du manuscript fr. 14969 de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris (Le Bestiaire de Guillaume le Clerc) et la tradition iconographique franciscaine', *Marche romane* 28 (1978), 141-48

Mütherich, Florentine, 'Ottonian Art: Changing Aspects', *Romanesque and Gothic Art: Studies in Western Art, Acts of the 20th International Congress of the History of Art* (Princeton, 1963), 27-39

Newman, Barbara, 'Contemplating the Trinity: Text, Image, and the Origins of the Rothschild Canticles', *Gesta*, vol. 52, no. 2 (Sep., 2013), 133-159

Nielsen, L. O., *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century* (Leiden, 1982)

Nilgen, Ursula, 'Die Bilder über dem Altar: Triumph- und Apsisbogenprogramme in Rom und Mittelitalien und ihr Bezug zur Liturgie', *Kunst und Liturgie im Mittelalter: Akten des internationalen Kongresses der Bibliotheca Hertziana und des Nederlands Instituut te Rome, Rom, 28-30 September 1997*, ed. Nicolas Bock (2000), 75-89

Noel, William, 'The Utrecht Psalter in England: Continuity and Experiment', *The Utrecht Psalter in Medieval Art: Picturing the Psalms of David* eds., K. Van der Horst, William Noel and W. C. M. Wüstefeld (Turnhout, 1996), 120-165

_____. *The Harley Psalter* (Cambridge, 1995)

O'Gorman, Richard, 'The Gospel of Nicodemus in the Vernacular Literature of Medieval France' in *The Devil's Rights and Redemption in the Literature of Medieval England* (Woodbridge, 1995), 103-131

Okasha, E., *A Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions* (Cambridge, 1971)

Osborn, Eric *The Emergence of Christian Theology* (Cambridge, 1993)

Pächt, Otto, C. R. Dodwell and Francis Wormald, *The St Albans Psalter* (London, 1960)

Palazzo, Eric, *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Madeleine Beaumont (Minnesota, 1998)

_____. *Le Sacramentaries de Fulda: étude sur l'iconographie et la liturgie à l'époque ottoniene* (Paris, 1990)

_____. '*Missarum Sollemnia*: Eucharistic Rituals in the Middle Ages', trans. John H. Arnold, *The Oxford Handbook of Christianity*, ed. John H. Arnold, 238-253

Panofsky, Erwin, 'Once More "The Friedsam Annunciation and the Problem of the Ghent Altarpiece"', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 20, no. 4 (Dec., 1938), 419-442

_____. 'The Friedsam Annunciation and the Problem of the Ghent Altarpiece', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 17, no. 4 (Dec., 1935), 432-473

Paris, Gaston, and Alphonse Bos, *Trois Versions rimée de l'Evangile de Nicodème par Chrétien, Andre de Coutances et un anonyme*, Société des anciens textes français, vol. 22 (Paris, 1885)

Park, David and Stephen Heywood, 'Romanesque Wall Paintings Discovered in Norfolk', *Minerva*, vol. 8, no. 2 (1997), 8-9

Park, David, 'Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Norman? Wall Paintings at Wareham and Other Sites in Southern England', in *Early Medieval Wall Painting and Painted Sculpture in England*, ed. S. Cather, D. Park and P. Williamson (Oxford, 1990), 225-47

_____. 'The "Lewes group" of paintings in Sussex', *Anglo-Norman Studies VI*, ed. R. A. Brown (Woodbridge, 1984), 200-235

Parker, John Henry, *Expositions on the Book of Psalms,* vol. V (Oxford, 1853)

Parsons, David, '*Sacrarium*: Ablution Drains in Medieval Churches', *The Anglo-Saxon Church: Papers on History, Architecture and Archaeology in Honour of Dr H. M. Taylor* (London, 1986), 105-20

Pearman, Sara Jane, 'The Iconographic Development of the Cruciform Throne of Grace from the Twelfth to the Sixteenth Century', unpublished PhD dissertation (Case Western Reserve, 1974)

Pelikan, Jaroslav, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol. 1, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)* (Chicago, 1971)

Pettazzoni, R., 'The Pagan Origins of the Three-Headed Representation of the Christian Trinity', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 52 (1989), 14-33

Pevsner, Nikolaus, *The Buildings of England: Hampshire and the Isle of Wight* (London, 1967)

Pfaff, Richard W., *The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History* (Cambridge, 2009)

Poirel, Dominique, *Livre de la nature et débat trinitaire au XIIe siècle: Le "De tribus diebus" de Hugues de St-Victor* (Turnhout, 2002)

Powell, Morgan, 'Making the Psalter of Christina of Markyate (The St Albans Psalter)', *Viator*, 36 (2005), 293-335

_____. 'The Visual, The Visionary and Her Viewer: Media and Presence in the Psalter of Christina of Markyate', *Word and Image*, 22 (2006), 340-62

Quirk, R. N., 'The Winchester New Minster and its Tenth Century Tower', *Journal of the British Archeological Association*, 3, 24 (1961), 16-54

Raw, Barbara C., *Anglo-Saxon Crucifixion Iconography and the Art of Monastic Revival* (Cambridge, 1991)

_____. *Trinity and Incarnation in Anglo-Saxon Art and Thought* (Cambridge, 1997)

Reeves, Marjorie and Beatrice Hirsch-Reich, *The Figurae of Joachim of Fiore* (Oxford, 1972)

Reeves, Marjorie, *The Influence of Prophecy in the Later Middle Ages: A Study in Joachimism* (London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993)

Reinsch, R., *Le Bestiaire: Das Thierbuch des normannischen Dichters Guillaume le Clerc* (Leipzig, 1982)

Rickerby, Stephen and David Park, 'A Romanesque "Visitatio Sepulchri" at Kempley', *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 133, no. 1054 (Jan., 1991), 27-31

Riedl, Matthias (ed.), *A Companion to Joachim of Fiore* (Leiden, 2018)

Rigold, S. E., 'Seals and Titles', *British Numismatic Journal*, vol. 44 (1974), pp. 99-106

Rosemann, Philipp W., *Peter Lombard* (Oxford, 2004)

Rosewell, R., *Medieval Wall Paintings in English and Welsh Churches* (Woodbridge, 2008)

Roth, Cecil, *A History of the Jews in England*, 3rd ed., (Oxford, 1964)

Rudolph, Conrad, 'Inventing the Exegetical Stained-Glass Window: Suger, Hugh and a New Elite Art', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 93 (2011), 399-422

Runciman, Steven, *The Eastern Schism: A Study of the Papacy and Eastern Churches during the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Oxford, 1955)

Salonius, Pippa, 'Arbor Jesse – Lignum vitae: The Tree of Jesse, the Tree of Life, and the Mendicants in Late Medieval Orvieto', *The Tree: Symbol, Allegory and Mnemonic Device in Medieval Art and Thought*, ed. Pippa Salonius and Andrea Worm (Turnhout, 2004), 213-242

Sandler, Lucy Freeman, *Gothic Manuscripts 1285-1385* (London, 1986)

Saxl, Fritz, 'A Spiritual Encyclopaedia of the Middle Ages', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 5 (1942), 82-142

Schapiro, Meyer, 'Cain's jawbone that did the first murder', *Art Bulletin*, 24, 3 (1942), 205-212

Schiller, Gertrude, *Iconography of Christian Art*, vol. II, trans. J. Seligman (London, 1972)

Schmeller, J. A., *Abhandlungen der philosophisch-philologisch Klasse der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Munich, 1849)

Schofield, Philipp R., *Seals and Their Context in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 2015)

Schuster, Esther-Luisa, *Kunst und Kanonisation: Visuelle Strategien der Kultvermittlung für ottonische Bischöfe in Köln und Hildesheim im 12. Jahrhundert* (Regensburg, 2016)

Shinners, John, and William J. Dohar (eds.) *Pastors and the Care of Souls in Medieval England* (Indiana, 1998)

Siecienski, Edward, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (Oxford, 2010)

Simson, Otto V., 'Über die Bedeutung von Masaccios Trinitatsfresko in S. Maria Novella', *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen*, 8 (1996), 119-159

Sommer, Johannes, *Das Deckenbild der Michaeliskirche zu Hildesheim* (Hildesheim, 1966)

Spatz, Nancy K., 'Approaches and Attitudes to a New Theology Textbook: The Sentences of Peter Lombard', *The Intellectual Climate of the Early University: Essays in Honour of Otto Gründler*, ed. Nancy van Deusen (Kalamazoo, 1997), 27-52

Spencer, Leith, *English Preaching in the Late Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1993)

Srawley, J. H., 'The "De Sacramentis": A Work of St Ambrose', *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 44, (1943), 199-200

Stratford, Neil, Pamela Tudor Craig and Anna Maria Muthesius, 'Archibishop Hubert Walter's tomb and its furnishings', *Medieval Art and Architecture at Canterbury Before 1200*, British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, vol. 5 (1982), 71-93

Strickland, Debra Higgs, 'The Jews, Leviticus and the Unclean in Medieval English Bestiaries', in *Beyond the Yellow Badge: Anti-Judaism and Anti-Semitism in Medieval and Early Modern Visual Culture*, ed. Mitchell B. Merback (Leiden, 2007), 203-232

_____. *Saracens, Demons and Jews: Making Monsters in Medieval Art* (Princeton, 2003)

Suntrup, Rudolph, 'Te-igitur Initialen und Kanonbilder in Mittelalterlichen Sakramentarhandschriften', *Text und Bild: Aspekte des Zusammenwirkens zweier Künster in Mittelaltar and früher Neuzeit*, ed. Christel Meier and Uwe Ruberg (Weisbaden, 1981), 278-382

Sutherland, Annie, *English Psalms in the Middle Ages, 1300-1450* (Oxford, 2015)

Swanson, R. N., *The Twelfth Century Renaissance* (Manchester, 1999)

Swete, H. B., *On the History of the Doctine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, (Cambridge, 1876)

Talbot, C. H., *The Life of Christina of Markyate: A Twelfth Century Recluse* (Oxford, 1959)

Tatton-Brown, Tim, 'The Fabric of Westminster Chapter House: Filling in the Gaps from Salisbury', *Westminster Abbey Chapter House: The History, Art and Architecture of "A Chapter House Beyond Compare",* ed. Warwick J. Rodwell and Richard Mortimer (London, 2010), 91-101

Taylor, H.M., 'The Position of the Altar in Anglo-Saxon Churches', *Journal of the Society of Antiquaries*, vol. 53 (1973), 52-8

Thompson, Augustine, 'The Debate on Universals Before Peter Abelard', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, vol. 33, no. 3 (1995), 409-429

Tikkanen, J. J., *Die Psalterillustration im Mittelalter*, 3 vols. (Helsingfors, 1895-1900), III (1990)

Tondelli, Leone, Majorie Reeves and Beatrice Hirsch-Reich, *Liber Figurarum: Il libro delle Figure dell'abate Gioacchino da Fiore* (Torino, 1953)

Tonnochy, A. B., *Catalogue of British Seal-dies in the British Museum* (London, 1952)

Torre, Michael, 'St John Damascene and St Thomas Aquinas on the Eternal Procession of the Holy Spirit', *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 38 (1994), 303-27

Tristram, E. W., *English Medieval Wall Painting: The Twelfth Century* (Oxford, 1944)

Tselos, Dimitri, 'English Manuscript Illustration and the Utrecht Psalter', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 41, no. 2 (1959), 137-149

_____. 'The Influence of the Utrecht Psalter in Carolingian Art', *The Art Bulletin*, vol. 39, no. 2 (1957), 87-96

Tudor-Craig, Pamela, 'Nether Wallop Reconsidered', *Early Medieval Wall Painting and Painted Sculpture in England* (Oxford, 1990), 89-104

Vallance, A., *English Church Screens* (London, 1936)

Van Belleghem, Maickel and Lloyd de Beer, 'The Construction and Conservation History of the Hildesheim Portable Altar', *Matter of Faith: An Interdisciplinary Study of Relics* (London, 2014), 126-136

Van der Horst, K., 'The Utrecht Psalter: Picturing the Psalms of David' in *The Utrecht Psalter in Medieval Art: Picturing the Psalms of David*, eds., K. Van der Horst, William Noel and W. C. M. Wüstefeld (Turnhout, 1996), 22-84

Van der Horst, K., William Noel and W. C. M. Wüstefeld, eds., *The Utrecht Psalter in Medieval Art: Picturing the Psalms of David* (Turnhout, 1996)

Van Deusen, Nancy (ed.), *The Place of the Psalms in the Intellectual Culture of the Middle Ages* (New York, 1999)

Wainwright, Arthur, *The Trinity in the New Testament* (London, 1967)

Walsh, P. G., *Explanation on the Psalms: Psalms 101-150*, vol. 3, *Ancient Christian Writers, no. 51* (New Jersey, 1991)

Wannenmacher, Julia Eva (ed.), *Joachim of Fiore and the Influence of Inspiration: Essays in Memory of Marjorie E. Reeves (1905-2003)* (Farnham, 2013)

Watson, Andrew G., *Catalogue of Dated and Dateable Manuscripts c. 700-1600 in the Department of Manuscripts: The British Library*, vol. 1 (London, 1979)

Watt, David S., *St Mary's Church, Houghton-on-the-Hill, Norfolk: Conservation Plan* (unpublished report for the Friends of St Mary's, Houghton-on-the-Hill, June 2001)

Webster, Leslie, Janet Backhouse and D. H. Turner, *The Golden Age of Anglo-Saxon Art, 966-1066* (London, 1984)

Wetter, Evelin, 'Arbor vitae and Corpus Christi: An Example of Chasuble Iconography from Late-Medieval Central Europe in the Context of the Mass', *Prague and Bohemia: Medieval Art, Architecture and Cultural Exchange in Central Europe*, ed. Zoë Opacic (Leeds, 2009), 199-214

Williams, Rowan, *Arius: Heresy and Tradition* (Grand Rapids, 2001)

Williamson, P., *The Medieval Treasury* (London, 1986)

Wormald, Francis, 'Late Anglo-Saxon Art: some Questions and Suggestions', *Studies in Western Art*, ed. M Meiss (Princeton, 1963), 19-26

_____. *Collected Writings, I: Studies in Medieval Art, 6th to the 12th centuries*, ed. J. J. G. Alexander, T. J. Brown and Joan Gibbs (London, 1984)

_____. *The Utrecht Psalter* (Utrecht, 1953)

Zier, Mark Allen, 'Peter Lombard and the *Glossa ordinaria* on the Bible', *A Distinct Voice: Medieval Studies in Honour of Leonard Boyle, O. P.*, ed. Jacqueline Brown and William P. Stoneman (Notre Dame, Ind., 1997), 629-641