

# The Use of Models in Medieval Book Painting



# The Use of Models in Medieval Book Painting

Edited by

Monika E. Müller

**CAMBRIDGE**  
**SCHOLARS**  

---

**P U B L I S H I N G**

The Use of Models in Medieval Book Painting,  
Edited by Monika E. Müller

This book first published 2014

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2014 by Monika E. Müller and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-5532-4, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-5532-7

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations .....	vii
Editor's Preface .....	ix
Introduction .....	xi
Monika E. Müller	
The Role of Prototypes and Models in the Transmission of Medieval Picture Cycles: The Case of the Beatus Manuscripts .....	1
Peter K. Klein	
The Models of the Illuminators in the Early Gothic Period.....	29
Laurence Terrier Aliferis	
Glass Painters and Manuscript Illuminators .....	57
Guido Siebert	
A Model Community? An Investigation into the Use of Models in the Work of William de Brailes.....	89
Cynthia Johnston	
Changing Workshop Policies: Passion Cycles by the Masters of Zweder van Culemborg .....	111
Miranda Bloem	
Tradition and Innovation in the Work of Jean Colombe: The Usage of Models in Late 15 <sup>th</sup> Century French Manuscript illumination .....	137
Christine Seidel	
Corporate Design Made in Ghent/Bruges? On the Extensive Reuse of Patterns in Late Medieval Flemish Illuminated Manuscripts .....	167
Joris Corin Heyder	
Contributors .....	203



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BAV	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Città del Vaticano
BL	British Library, London
BM	Bibliothèque municipale
BPU	Bibliothèque Publique et Universitaire, Geneva
BN	Biblioteca Nazionale/Biblioteca Nacional
BNF	Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris
BPL	Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Leiden (Netherlands)
BSB	Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich
HAB	Library of Herzog August, Wolfenbüttel
KBR	Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België – Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique (Brussels)
ÖNB	Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna
PML	Pierpont Morgan Library, New York
SB	Staatsbibliothek
SBPK	Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin
SUB	Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg
ULB	Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek
UL	University Library
WLB	Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Stuttgart





## EDITOR'S PREFACE

The study of copying processes and the art-historical and cultural backgrounds as to why certain miniatures and motifs were classed as models whereas others were not became increasingly of interest to me whilst working on the research project “Book culture and book painting in St. Michael of Hildesheim” at the Herzog August Library in Wolfenbüttel. Questions arose from the specific history of book painting in Hildesheim since the patronage of one of Northern Germany's most important medieval churchmen, Bishop Bernward (c. 960–1022). According to a famous passage in the chronicle *Vita sancti Bernwardi episcopi*, Bernward made great efforts to establish several scriptoria in Hildesheim. The lack of a strong local tradition was presumably the reason why he was left no choice but to procure patterns, models and even scribes from other, external centres of book production. Hence, 11<sup>th</sup> century book painting in Hildesheim shows an eclectic use of different models and patterns. Their remarkable variety was one of the primary impulses for me to more intensely study factors of copying processes in the Early and High Middle Ages.

However, it was a seminar held by Peter K. Klein at the Department of Art History at the University of Tübingen, dealing with aspects of the formation of models and pictorial traditions, that aroused my awareness of the topic at hand in the way it is. This is therefore the right place to express my gratitude to him for guiding me as my scientific supervisor and teacher.

The idea to offer a book focused on aspects of copying in medieval book painting became a plan when most of the contributors to this book proposed to give a talk at the International Conference of Medieval Studies at Kalamazoo in 2012. Equally important was the suggestion led by Cambridge Scholars Publishing and, in particular, Carol Koulikourdi, to publish a book about this topic – an offer I just could not refuse.

Therefore, as editor, I would like to thank all participants for their interest and commitment, in particular the authors for their intriguing contributions, as well as Cambridge Scholars Publishing and their collaborators for their kind support and their overwhelming dedication to this book.



# INTRODUCTION

MONIKA E. MÜLLER

Modern media such as photography, digital reproductions, the Internet, video clips, films and games determine our perception. However, Walter Benjamin's well-known idea of the "aura" of a work and its absence in reproduction<sup>1</sup> is all but obsolete and well worth being discussed in terms of the contrast between original and copy and the possibility of innumerable types of reproduction. In this field of artistic production – even if we intentionally ignore reproduction series such as the photographic opus of Andy Warhol – the term "copy" does not have a particularly positive connotation and it is not related to the concept of deciding according to the artist's own free will. Instead, meanings such as "to do something slavishly" or even "to suffer from the lack of not having any potential to create innovative items" promptly come to mind. In order to reconstruct the historical development of the concept of copying, we should remember that, since the 16<sup>th</sup> century, when the notion of genius and its aesthetic forms of expression began to prevail, copies have been considered inferior.<sup>2</sup> But what do terms such as original and copy actually stand for? And what was their meaning in past times, in particular in medieval book painting, an art genre well-known for being determined by processes of copying?

Original – a term which is indispensable when describing the opposite idea of model, pattern or copy – etymologically derives from the Latin word *origo* and means origin or source. Other facets of its meaning such as "being the result of a singular, i.e. unique process", "having been designed individually" or "having been performed by the artwork's proper creator" are also known, but are above all used to describe modern concepts of artistry.<sup>3</sup> In contrast, copy is a term which, deriving from the Latin word *copia* i.e. abundance or richness, describes the product of

---

<sup>1</sup> Benjamin, *Das Kunstwerk*, 14-18.

<sup>2</sup> Kaminski, "Imitatio", 268-274.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Augustyn and Söding, *Original*, 2.

reproduction processes.<sup>4</sup> The range of relations between original and copy varies between being the result of a very close or precise copy of certain patterns, whole miniatures, and cycles to a more selected and creative use of models similar to citations. Even Hans Swarzenski related two different categories of artists and functions with two varying kinds of copies.<sup>5</sup> He suggested that the first type “was only made for the sake of recording and reproducing works of art that have acquired prestige and popularity because of their artistic quality or their subject”, whereas the second type, the creative copy, was made by an artist who “is not satisfied, or even concerned with correct reporting and surface reproduction [...]”. What is extracted from the model and what is not, reveals the authority and freedom of the creative artist [...]”. Swarzenski’s considerations cannot be accepted without reservations particularly as we have to also consider the presumable political and cultural implications of precise copies in medieval art works. Even the particular working conditions and processes, not forgetting the general attitude towards contrary concepts such as tradition and innovation require a more complex approach. The latter was subject to criticism in particular in the Early Middle Ages,<sup>6</sup> but even the term “freedom” is obviously not appropriate to characterise the artists’ attitude towards tradition and patronage in the High and the later Middle Ages. Perhaps Swarzenski’s evaluation of copying processes reveals a more linear and classifying view of cultural and art-historical developments which are more specific for the research of past times. However, here “citation” and “copy” are not meant to signify divergent phenomena, but rather two different results of the same process, which mainly differ in the extent to what they render similar or modify the features of the origin. Certain elements have been copied while others have not. This is to say that a decision was made as to where and how intensely to follow the model and its motifs.

## Research works

In research works about medieval book painting, the phenomenon of copying has until recently been considered mainly in terms of the reconstruction of pictorial sources used for the composition or iconography of miniatures, initials or decorative elements. Famous examples of this methodological approach were given by Richard

---

<sup>4</sup> Kaminski, “Imitatio”, 266.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Swarzenski, “The role of copies”, 7-13.

<sup>6</sup> See f.e. Charlemagne’s *Admonitio generalis* c. 80: Mordek and Zechiel-Eckes, *Admonitio*, 234.

Weitzmann and Herbert Kessler in their work about the Cotton Genesis<sup>7</sup>, or Arthur Haseloff who examined in particular psalters and liturgical manuscripts produced in the 13<sup>th</sup> century characterising them according to their place of origin as the so-called Thüringisch-Sächsische Malerschule.<sup>8</sup> In this regard, a lot of illuminated manuscripts belonging to a specific pictorial tradition or group are analysed – to mention only a few examples: the illustrated *Beatus Commentaries*,<sup>9</sup> the Codices picturati of the *Sachsenspiegel*<sup>10</sup> or even liturgical manuscripts executed in a late-mediaeval scriptorium such as the manuscripts of the Cistercian abbey Altenberg nearby Cologne.<sup>11</sup>

Nevertheless, only recently aspects causatively related to the phenomenon have been discussed such as the artistic-technical aspect of copying<sup>12</sup> or the artists' or patrons' intention to create an art work whose sources are identifiable. One of the most famous examples to deal with the question if the choice of the model was made deliberately is the *Utrecht Psalter* (Universiteitsbibliotheek, MS 32). For its production in a scriptorium during the episcopate of bishop Ebo of Reims around 820/35, it is presumed that not only antique patterns were copied, but also new pictorial schemes were invented.<sup>13</sup> Later on, during the 11<sup>th</sup> to 13<sup>th</sup> centuries, three further manuscripts were made according to the *Utrecht Psalter* or based on an already existing copy – the *Harley Psalter* (London, BL, Harley MS 603; c. 1010–1130),<sup>14</sup> the *Eadwine Psalter*

---

<sup>7</sup> Weitzmann and Kessler, *The Cotton Genesis*.

<sup>8</sup> Haseloff, *Thüringisch-sächsische Malerschule*.

<sup>9</sup> Neuss, *Die Apokalypse*; Williams, *The Illustrated Beatus*; Klein, *Der ältere Beatus-Kodex*; Idem, *Apocalipsis Carolingio*.

<sup>10</sup> Schmidt-Wiegand, *Der Wolfenbütteler Sachsenspiegel*.

<sup>11</sup> Helmfert, *Monastische Buchkunst*.

<sup>12</sup> Technical analyses and research work presented, for example, by Robert Fuchs and Doris Oltrogge (Cologne University of Applied Sciences) are obviously indispensable for further research in this field; see also examples published by Alexander (*Medieval illuminators*, 35-71). Moreover, impressions of a metal pin are preserved in the so called Stammheim Missal (Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, MS 64) above some of the full-page miniatures, so for example on fol. 111r (“visitatio sepulchri”), fol. 115v (“ascensionem”!), fol. 145v (“assumptionem ! sancte Marie”) and fol. 152r, 156r.

<sup>13</sup> For the discussion about the models used in the Utrecht Psalter, see Mütherich, “Der Stuttgarter Bilderpsalter”, 160-196; Swarzenski, “The role of the copies”, 7-13; Van der Hort, *The Utrecht Psalter*, 55-77; Dufrenne, “Les copies”.

<sup>14</sup> Van der Horst, “Nr. 28 Harley Psalter”, 28-29, with references to further literature.

(Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1; c. 1160),<sup>15</sup> and the *Paris Psalter* (BNF, MS lat. 8846; c. 1200).<sup>16</sup> Each of these manuscripts shows modifications and alterations compared to its model. Nevertheless, in an overall view of all four psalters, the original pictorial scheme is clearly recognisable in all three copies.<sup>17</sup> To explain why such a relatively large amount of copies were produced and why the pictorial patterns of the *Utrecht Psalter* or the *Eadwine Psalter* were still attractive for being copied decades and centuries after the original's, we should not only ponder on the option that the original was highly regarded and therefore possibly stimulated the desire to have a copy of one's own but also consider further aspects such as the drawings' function. This may include for example the original's importance as a structural element that gives readers a better orientation in the manuscript, furthermore it's presumable role as a guideline which very literally represents the Septuaginta text as the most used canonic text version. The latter is backed by the fact that the later illustrated copies of the *Utrecht Psalter* either have the psalm text of the Romanum rather than the Septuaginta<sup>18</sup> or they present several text versions together, such as the *Eadwine Psalter*<sup>19</sup> or the latest copy, the *Paris Psalter*.<sup>20</sup>

Furthermore, attempts have been made to understand whether the retrospective use of models is to be understood as expression of the patron's loyalty to a specific sovereign or policy or not – see for example Irmgard Siede analysing the use of Ottonian models in Italian book painting of the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>21</sup> Nevertheless, even if we assume that not only the illuminator but also the patron knew the original or

---

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Van der Horst, “Nr. 29 Eadwine-Psalter”, 226-227; Gibson, *The Eadwine Psalter*.

<sup>16</sup> Van der Horst, “Nr. 30 Paris Psalter”, 240; Morgan, “The Anglo-Catalan Psalter”.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> See the Harley Psalter, which has the text-version of the Psalterium Romanum: Van der Horst, “Nr. 28 Harley Psalter”, 28-29.

<sup>19</sup> The *Eadwine Psalter* contains all three of Jerome's Latin versions (Gallicanum, Romanum, Hebraicum), an Old English version interlined with the Romanum and an Anglo-Norman version with the Hebraicum: Van der Horst, “Nr. 29 Eadwine-Psalter”, 226-227.

<sup>20</sup> The *Paris Psalter* includes the prologues and collects to the psalms of the Eadwine Psalter, and the Gallicanum with an interlinear Latin gloss, the Romanum with four fragments of the interlinear Old English translation as well as the Hebraicum with an interlinear translation in Anglo-Norman: Van der Horst, “Nr. 30 Paris Psalter”, 240.

<sup>21</sup> Siede, *Rezeption ottonischer Buchmalerei*.

corresponding model, in most cases it is unknown whether or not other medieval beholders had the specific stylistic or compositional model in mind when they saw the corresponding copy. Therefore, it is not clear whether pictorial relations between patrons, their art works and further high-ranking people involved, which we reconstruct nowadays, were understood by every viewer in the past.

Similarly, sources only seldomly mention the circumstances of the manuscripts' production.<sup>22</sup> Since the research work of Wilhelm Voege,<sup>23</sup> Julius Schlosser,<sup>24</sup> or in particular of Robert W. Scheller,<sup>25</sup> recently reinforced by several contributions from Harald Wolter-von dem Knesebeck about the *Musterbuch of Wolfenbüttel* (Library of Herzog August, Cod. Guelf. 61.2 Aug. 8°),<sup>26</sup> one widely accepted hypothesis prevails according to which artists used model drawings or sketch books with the aim of facilitating the production of copies and the creation of new picture cycles. As the repertoire and tradition of evidence is much broader since the 13<sup>th</sup> century – scholars have been particularly inclined to consider the issue when the miniatures were created in Later Medieval times.

However, down to this day, this aspect of art production has rarely been questioned, apart from Ernst Kitzinger's delicate hints in his study on the role of miniature painting in mural decoration of 1975,<sup>27</sup> followed by Robert W. Scheller in his painstaking study "Exemplum. Model-Book Drawings and the Practice of Artistic Transmission in the Middle Ages (c. 900–c. 1450) of 1995. Scheller even pointed out that "the investigator generally turns to the lost model hypothesis as a last resort when all other explanations have proved fruitless [...] When using the model hypothesis one must always be mindful of other factors which are known to have played a part in the transmission of art in the Middle Ages".<sup>28</sup>

In addition, the importance of the so-called autonomous drawing – a term coined by Bernhard Degenhart<sup>29</sup> in order to denominate a drawing

---

<sup>22</sup> With focus on codicological and in particular on illuminated sources, but also on tax lists of the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries and guilds to which illuminators belonged in the later Middle Ages: Alexander, *Medieval Illuminators*, 4-34.

<sup>23</sup> Voege, *Eine deutsche Malerschule*, 378.

<sup>24</sup> Schlosser, *Die Kunst des Mittelalters*, 74-76, 82-86.

<sup>25</sup> Scheller, *Survey of Medieval Model Books*, 1963; Idem, *Exemplum*; cf. also Springer, *Modelle und Muster*.

<sup>26</sup> Wolter-von dem Knesebeck, "Felder der Ausdifferenzierung"; Idem, "Bilderwelten".

<sup>27</sup> Kitzinger: *The Place of Book Illumination*.

<sup>28</sup> Scheller, *Exemplum*, 27.

<sup>29</sup> Degenhart, "Autonome Zeichnungen", 93-107.

without anything other than its aesthetic and artistical function – in contrast to the model drawing and its use, belong to a field of research which still is not discussed to its deserved extent.<sup>30</sup> This is all the more true when we reflect the differences between single presumable autonomous drawings, collections of model drawings – such as the Wolfenbüttel example – and model books such as the *Musterbücher of Reinau* (Vienna, ÖNB, Cod. Vindobon. 507; c. 1200)<sup>31</sup> and *Göttingen* (8° Cod. MS Uff. 51 Cim.; 15<sup>th</sup> century).<sup>32</sup> Although the model books of Reinau and Göttingen show regular ordered iconographic patterns and motifs, the *Musterbuch of Wolfenbüttel* preserves biblical or representative scenes mirroring only a limited order of an approximately iconographical differentiation. Therefore, already at this early stage of consideration, it is quite clear that the function of these “books”<sup>33</sup> must have been different for simple pragmatic reasons: decorative or inner relations of the single parts of the copy-ready drawings are only recognisable in the *Musterbuch of Göttingen* and *Reinau*, whereas the scenes in the *Musterbuch of Wolfenbüttel* are depicted more or less like pieces of a puzzle. An artist planning to use these patterns would have been forced to virtually piece them together instead of having the possibility to copy whole compositions or complete scenes.

However, the problem behind a recently proposed hypothesis by Ludovico Geymonat, that the precise function of the *Musterbuch of Wolfenbüttel* is all but known, should be discussed in a new way. He suggests the *Musterbuch of Wolfenbüttel* could have been withdrawn

---

<sup>30</sup> However, see the contributions in the intriguing exhibition catalogue *Pen and parchment. Drawing in the Middle Ages*, by Melanie Holcomb, New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art 2009.

<sup>31</sup> For the *Musterbuch of Reinau*: Unterkircher, *Reiner Musterbuch*, 10-17. – Recently Wolfgang Augustyn and Ulrich Söding focused, in the introduction of their volume (*Original*, 4-7), on the definition of basic terms such as precise copy versus creative copy. The thorough contributions of this anthology examine a wide range of art genres and cover many important aspects such as copying in architecture and sculpture as well as in mural, glass and book painting or graphics. Therefore, it obviously would have gone beyond scope to also discuss the famous model hypothesis.

<sup>32</sup> For the *Musterbuch of Göttingen*, produced around 1450 and – remarkable to mention – until now not studied in due measure, Scheller omitted its analysis: [www.gutenbergdigital.de/gudi/dframes/mubu/mubufset.htm](http://www.gutenbergdigital.de/gudi/dframes/mubu/mubufset.htm) (last access 1.12.2013).

<sup>33</sup> It is essential to remember that all these examples consist of just a view pages, so the term “book” itself, commonly used in research works, does not seem to be very precise.



almost immediately after its creation to the eyes of contemporaneous artists and illuminators by depositing the parchment folios containing the drawings in a monastic library.<sup>34</sup> So, perhaps the discussion about the term “Musterbuch” itself should be revived. Should we use the term only to describe its use in a workshop? Would it not be more accurate to call such collections or series of drawings a sketchbook when it had a rather mnemonic function lacking any direct pragmatic use?

### **Copying according to medieval scholars and artists**

Although there is a tradition of some visual evidence in copying processes – model drawings, sketch books, underdrawings and signs of tracing – there are no written sources dating back to the Early Middle Ages or Carolingian period about the artists’ own views on copying as a method of art production. Therefore, it should be justifiable to focus on other sources or statements, which reflect the cultural and intellectual attitude towards copying in a broader sense: i.e. in the fields of rhetoric and literature or other established systems aiming at the presentation of theoretic concepts in ancient and Medieval times.

As there did not yet exist a Christian literary tradition in Early Christian times, Jerome and Augustine wondered whether it was appropriate to use pagan models in order to improve the language and style of their works. Jerome drew an allegoric comparison by saying that the wisdom of the pagans was beautiful, but morally corrupt and therefore similar to a prisoner of the Old Testament whose hair and fingernails had to be cut before being used.<sup>35</sup> In other words, Christian authors intentionally used models from different cultural backgrounds, alien to their own origin. Medieval writers such as the Carolingian scholar Alkuin also commented on this question and stressed the benefit of copying other models.

Referring to highly appreciated literary models in order to enhance more authority to their own thoughts had obviously become a strategy widely adopted by Early Christian and medieval authors. Theologians such as Cassiodor or Pope Gregory the Great mentioned the so-called

---

<sup>34</sup> See Geymonat, “Mechanism of Exchange”, with reference to further literature. – The place of origin and the history of the Wolfenbüttel Musterbuch are vividly discussed. Only since the early 15<sup>th</sup> century there is evidence of its presence in the Cistercian abbey of Marienthal (Helmstedt / Lower Saxony): Milde, “Wolfenbütteler Musterbuch”, 157.

<sup>35</sup> For this brief survey see Kaminski, “Imitatio”, 246-256; von Moos, “Das argumentative Exemplum”.

*auctoritates* in their writings. Especially based on the innovative method of scholasticism, it eventually became common practice among scholars to explicitly mention references and authorities. Obviously, they referred to highly regarded or even canonic sources in order to support their arguments and, in addition, they occasionally intended to compete with their intellectual ancestors and models.<sup>36</sup>

The situation changed slightly in the 12<sup>th</sup> century when scholars such as the philosopher and poet Bernardus Silvestris (1085–1160/1178) or the Cistercian monk Alanus ab insulis (c. 1120–1202) thought about concepts of *Natura* in terms of an allegorical figure and a divinely inspired power. Alanus ab insulis described *Natura* as transforming a species or genus into individual specimens with the aid of a die:

“Accordingly he [God] appointed me as his substitute, his vice-regent, the mistress of his mint, to put the stamp on the different classes of things so that I should mould the image of things, each on its own anvil but that [...] the face of the copy should spring from the countenance of the exemplar and not be defrauded of any of its natural gifts”.<sup>37</sup>

Bernardus Silvestris spoke of Genius – i.e. the tutelary deity of classical antiquity who shapes the individuals of a species – as “in artem et officium pictoris et figurantis addictus” – the guardian spirit being pledged to the skill and work of a painter and figure shaper. Moreover, Bernardus called the materialised forms the die-stamps of ideas, “idearum signacula” and “impressio ydearum”.<sup>38</sup> So, even if both authors focussed on concepts such as the relation between original and copy in terms of an image or a simulacrum, they were more or less successors of antique philosophical ideas and predecessors of a discussion which became vivid only in the later Middle Ages and in particular during the so-called Renaissance of the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>39</sup>

However, among artists and painters it took longer before amendments and theoretic considerations were recorded in writing. Theophilus presbyter, an anonymous Benedictine monk who is believed to be

---

<sup>36</sup> Cizek, “Imitatio”, 17-20; De Rentiis, “Rückgriff”, 83-92; Curtis, *Europäische Literatur*, 481; Pochat, “Imitatio”, 21; cf. also Müller, “Von der künstlerischen Vorlage”, in print.

<sup>37</sup> Quoted by Scheller, *Exemplum*, 14.

<sup>38</sup> For this quotation and comment: cf. *ibid.*

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Chance, *The Genius Figure*, 88-114, focused on Alanus ab insulis; for the Aristotelian coinage of this concept: Kruse, “Menschenbilder und Menschenbildner”, 115-133, in particular 115-119; Modersohn, “Hic loquitur Natura”, 91-102.

identifiable with Roger of Helmarshausen,<sup>40</sup> was among the first who gave subtle hints in the first quarter of the 12<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>41</sup> In the prologue of book I of the *Schedula diversarum artium*, the longest and most complex preface of his opus which also includes ideas about the Christian world order and the conception of work, art and the artist's status,<sup>42</sup> Theophilus underlined the necessity to study the Arts and memorise the instructions of his treatise. But in book I which deals explicitly with book and mural painting, he neither mentioned the need to use model drawings, nor did he give instructions on how to proceed with planning a drawing or miniature. It is not until the second book of the *Schedula diversarum artium* dealing with the manufacture of glass, that he described the preparation of a sketch on a wooden plate.<sup>43</sup>

On the contrary, Cennino Cennini (c. 1370–1440), the Italian painter and author of the handbook *Il libro dell'arte*, described the way to use the so-called *carta lucida* by which the painter or draughtsman could copy motifs and figures from the work of important masters.<sup>44</sup> He also demanded that the student follow models and patterns and also copy indefatigably with pleasure the best master pieces they could find.<sup>45</sup>

Nevertheless, a change in the way people perceived art production by copying became visible in the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Leon Battista Alberti, in his treatise *Della pittura* of 1436, favoured the concept of depicting from nature. Even if he did not actually depreciate the copying of other painters' works, he made his point very clear using particular vocabulary: "Some [i.e. painters] copy figures of others painters [...] our painters will certainly be in great error if they do not know that anyone painting [...] will paint things taken from nature sweetly and correctly".<sup>46</sup> In arguing so,

---

<sup>40</sup> This hypothesis has actually been discussed again since the Congress "The *Schedula diversarum artium* – a handbook of medieval art?" organised by Andreas Speer and Hiltrud Westermann-Angerhausen at the University of Cologne in 2010, see the proceedings edited by Andreas Speer, *Zwischen Kunsthandwerk und Kunst*.

<sup>41</sup> See Freise, "Roger von Helmarshausen"; Gearhart, *Theophilus' On Diverse Art*: cf. and the contributions in Andreas Speer, *Zwischen Kunsthandwerk und Kunst*.

<sup>42</sup> Dodwell, *The various arts*, 1–4; Hanke, "Kunst und Geist"; Reudenbach, *Praxisorientierung*; Idem, "Ornatus materialis".

<sup>43</sup> For chap. II, 17 in the *Schedula divarum artium* see Dodwell, *The various arts*, 47–49, and the contribution of Guido Siebert in this volume.

<sup>44</sup> Ilg, *Buch von der Kunst*, 15 (Cennino Cennini, *Il libro dell'arte*, cap. 23).

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 (cap. 27); for Cennini's demand to study the Nature: cap. 28; Ilg, *Buch von der Kunst*, 18; Degenhart, "Autonome Zeichnungen", 122.

<sup>46</sup> Spencer, *Leon Battista Alberti* (book III, § 10–12), 93. – It should be underlined that even sculptors and painters of the 12<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> centuries were fascinated by copying from nature, see f.e. the contribution of Laurence Terriers Aliferis in this

he actually set the seal on a change in the evaluation of painting from nature versus copying. In his treatise however, rather than discussing terms such as original or copy, he stressed the importance of concepts such as “invention”, “istoria” and “painting from nature”.

## **Copying – cultural backgrounds, artefacts, diachronic tendencies**

When discussing the different ways of copying processes during the Middle Ages, various aspects should be considered. This includes the organisation of workshops, the availability of models and patterns, their transfer, and the question: which message – if any – was intended with the selection of a particular model. Due to the wide range of these questions, it is not possible to pursue all issues. The starting point for the following considerations is the situation in Carolingian times when instructions, very important for the aspects in question here, were issued by Charlemagne and his advisors. Charlemagne ordered in both his edicts – the *Admonitio generalis* (789) and the *epistola de litteris colendis* – that liturgical and biblical texts as well as texts belonging to the *Artes liberales* – i.e. for the learning of the subjects of the Trivium (grammar, logic, and rhetoric) and of the Quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy) – were to be copied correctly. The efforts of Charlemagne’s reform aimed – as it is well-known – to improve the quality of the above texts as well as the knowledge of Latin, the Arts and Theology.<sup>47</sup> Certainly it is not beyond the importance of these edicts to assume that, as a consequence, the sensibility towards the production of correct and authentic texts was generally on the increase.<sup>48</sup> With regard to liturgical manuscripts (i.e. Gospels, Pericopes, Bibles, etc.) which often were lavishly illuminated and presumably produced in a much higher quantity during the reign of Charlemagne than they are preserved nowadays, several aspects come immediately to mind: On the one hand,

---

volume and Wittekind, “Bauornamentik als Kunsttheorie?”. However, copying from nature clearly corresponds with the concept of mimesis rather than the idea of copying existing art works.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Mordek, Zechiel-Eckes, *Admonitio generalis*, Cap. I, Nr. 22, p. 53-62 (*Admonitio*), cap. I, Nr. 29, pag. 78 f. (*Epistola de litteris colendis*); cap. I, Nr. 30, p. 80 (*Epistola generalis*); Fleckenstein, *Alcuin im Kreis der Hofgelehrten*.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. generally for the cultural background of the Carolingian period and Charlemagne’s reform focused on the “correctness” of texts and the restoration of education and learning (i.e. both divine and humane) in the dioceses and monasteries: McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reform*, 1-8; Brown, *The Carolingian Renaissance*; Reudenbach, “Rectitudo”, 283-292.

some lavishly illuminated manuscripts such as the *Godescalc Pericopes*, produced around 780 in a scriptorium at the court of Charlemagne in Aachen and therefore representative of the Early Carolingian period, shows with their theologically complex miniatures a high degree of creative potential while models seem to be used only in a deliberative and limited way.<sup>49</sup> Therefore, the artist's work cannot be described as "slavishly copying preexisting direct models". On the other hand, in the manuscripts produced around 810 – see for example the *Gospels of Lorsch* (Alba Iulia, Biblioteca Batthyáneum, Ms. R. II. 1)<sup>50</sup> – illuminators must have used models intensely. So, it is quite obvious that the decoration of these codices reflect a contemporaneous trend to produce seemingly many and uniform but somewhat sumptuous illuminated manuscripts,<sup>51</sup> quite likely meaning these manuscripts were the result of Charlemagne's efforts to reform liturgy and to improve education and erudition during his reign. In the first instance, the use of models guaranteed the swift production of high quality and correct manuscripts. In the second instance, it is beyond doubt that the use of models of Antiquity and early Christian Times and patterns of Byzantine origin reflect efforts typical of the Art production of Carolingian times i.e. the idea to amend the own erudition and culture through the use of older and therefore venerable models.<sup>52</sup>

In Ottonian times, the illuminated liturgical manuscripts show significant signs of orientation following the Carolingian style and iconography. One of the most famous examples is the *Majestas Domini* preserved in the abovementioned *Gospels of Lorsch* (pag. 36 / fol. 18v)<sup>53</sup> which was copied with slight alterations not only in the Gero-Codex (Darmstadt, HLUB, MS 1948, fol. 5v; c. 969) and the Sacramentary of Petershausen (Heidelberg, UB, Cod. Sal. IXb, fol. 41r; c. 980), but also in the *Guntbald Gospels* of 1014 (Hildesheim, Dom-Museum, DS 33, fol. 21v).<sup>54</sup> These examples clearly show the authority that the Carolingian model had already gained in Ottonian times.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Reudenbach, *Godescalc-Evangelistar*; Crivelli, *Godescalc-Evangelistar*.

<sup>50</sup> Koehler, *Hofschule*, 88-99; Exner, *Guntbald-Evangeliar*, 74-84; Bierbrauer, "Bilder", 79-88; Müller, "Von der künstlerischen Vorlage", in print.

<sup>51</sup> Bierbrauer, "Bilder", 79.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. for art-historical and cultural aspects of the Carolingian reform: Blume, "Wissenschaft"; Müller, "Antike"; Reudenbach, "Rectitudo"; for the concept of the "translatio artium" in Carolingian times: Worstbrock, "Translatio artium", 16-17.

<sup>53</sup> Koehler, *Hofschule*, 93-94; Bierbrauer, "Bilder", 79-88.

<sup>54</sup> Exner, *Guntbald-Evangeliar*, 72, 74-84.

<sup>55</sup> For the assignment of authority to certain models: Müller, "Von der künstlerischen Vorlage", in print.

However, the process by which certain miniatures obtained a respectable status and were used as models even centuries later can also be seen in other cases. The sumptuous miniatures of the *Stammheim Missal* (Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, Ms. 64) executed around 1170/80 in the scriptorium of the Benedictine abbey of St. Michael in Hildesheim, most probably served as a model for the decoration of other manuscripts such as the *Gospels of Duke Henry the Lion* (Wolfenbüttel, Library of Herzog August, Cod. Guelf. 105 Noviss. fol.) and the so-called *Golden Kalendarium of Hildesheim* (Wolfenbüttel, Library of Herzog August, Cod. Guelf. 13 Aug. fol.).<sup>56</sup> In order to produce the miniatures of the Gospels of Duke Henry the Lion, structural criteria must have been crucial for the selection of the Stammheim's Creation miniature as a model: Its circle of the cosmos and the incorporated medallions with the labours of the seven Creation Days obviously offered the adequate formal pattern required for the illustration of theological complex contents in the miniature of the Majestas Domini in the Gospels of Henry the Lion.<sup>57</sup> In the *Golden Kalendarium of Hildesheim* – a fragment of a liturgical manuscript executed around 1250 in the scriptorium of St. Michael in Hildesheim for the St. Servatiusstift of Quedlinburg – the Calendar with its arcades and a large part of the holy names are known to have been copied from the *Stammheim Missal* with only slight alterations.<sup>58</sup>

In the context of our discussion, psalters of the 13<sup>th</sup> century belong to one of the most copious groups of illuminated medieval manuscripts. As mentioned above, this is thanks to Arthur Haseloff who ordered more than 20 manuscripts because of their iconographic and stylistic characteristics.<sup>59</sup> In doing this, he prepared the ground for the observation that – apart from a large intersection of style, iconography and layout which could be achieved only by knowing the same repertoire of motifs and miniatures –

---

<sup>56</sup> Compare the contributions of Renate Kroos, *Niedersächsische Bilderhandschriften*, 112-115; Wolter-von dem Knesebeck, "Hildesheimer Kalendarium", 21-25; Müller, "Von der künstlerischen Vorlage", in print.

<sup>57</sup> Wolter-von dem Knesebeck, "Göttliche Weisheit", 147-162.

<sup>58</sup> See literature in note 56 and Kroos, *Sächsische Buchmalerei*. – A point of view only rarely considered until now is that the estimation of a person of high rank such as Bishop Bernward of Hildesheim († 1022), canonised in 1192/3, could have been a determining factor when assigning prestige to art works related to him. That means, the importance and political power of such personalities could have been transferred to art works executed under their authority. Later on, these art works partly served as models for further copies, see Müller, "Nr. 26 Goldenes Hildesheimer Kalendarium", 342; Eadem, "Von der künstlerischen Vorlage", in print.

<sup>59</sup> Haseloff, *Thüringisch-sächsische Malerschule*.

almost each manuscript shows its singular character by parts of a unique decoration, i.e. iconographically singular full-page miniatures, initials, etc.<sup>60</sup>

These considerations could be easily extended to other manuscripts of the Later Middle Ages – such as the Hours, which will be focused on in several contributions of this volume. Another aspect worth mentioning is the process of copying in the context of the Benedictine book culture of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. As Robert Suckale pointed out in his painstaking study of two manuscripts of Abbot Peter I. from the Benedictine monastery of Metten (Bavaria) – both preserved in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek of Munich (CIm 8201 and 8201d) – tendencies are discernible which aimed to relate the own period to the glory of remote eras.<sup>61</sup> One of the most impressive examples here is the copy of one miniature of the *Uta-Codex* (Munich, BSB, CIm 13601, fol. 3v; c. 1020)<sup>62</sup> which shows Christ crucified in the midst of the personifications Ecclesia and Synagoga and motifs related to the topic of death and resurrection.<sup>63</sup> The prestige of the miniature of the *Uta-Codex* must have been so great and stable that the decision was made to copy it for the illustrated theological *compendium of Metten* (CIm 8201, fol. 97v). On a material level, this copy from the early 15<sup>th</sup> century is a simple version which iconographically and formally corresponds to a precise copy.

This phenomenon, i.e. retrospective tendencies in the book production of monasteries in Late Medieval Times, can be traced back to other monk communities such as the Cistercians. If we look at the choir books of the Cistercian Abbey of Altenberg (Düsseldorf, ULB, D 32–36) produced in the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> centuries, there is strong evidence that the monks tried to engage a famous member of the congregation of Saint Augustine in Aosta (Northern Italy) named Claudio Rufferio in order to make him embellish the enormous choir books with his narrative and figurative initials.<sup>64</sup> The Altenberg monks themselves used a somewhat retrospective style which

---

<sup>60</sup> Compare for example the picture prologues and full-page miniatures of many psalters of the thüringisch-sächsische Malerschule which often concludes a similar cycle of miniatures showing scenes of the life of Jesus whereas other miniatures such as series of apostles or a diptych with Mary and Jesus (Donaueschingen Psalter: Stuttgart, WLB, Cod. Don. 309; c. 1235) or single motifs such as Abraham's bosom (Older Psalter of Wöltingerode: Wolfenbüttel, HAB, Cod. Guelf. 521 Helmst.; c. 1220) are unique representations in this group.

<sup>61</sup> Suckale, *Klosterreform und Buchkunst*, 132–139.

<sup>62</sup> Cohen, *The Uta Codex*; Klemm, "Nr. 18 CIm 13061"; see also the contributions of Karl-Georg Pfändtner in *Der Uta-Codex*.

<sup>63</sup> See Suckale, *Klosterreform und Buchkunst*, 121–123

<sup>64</sup> See Hemfort, *Monastische Buchkunst*, 33–58, 99–104, 122–142, 200–204.

already in the 15<sup>th</sup> century was established to ornate the minor initials. Moreover, different ornamental motifs were taken from several manuscripts<sup>65</sup> in order to decorate the choir book D 36 in an obviously eclectic way. One reason for doing so was probably that D 36 is one of the last manuscripts to have been produced in this series of luxury illuminated liturgical books of Altenberg.

## Factors of copying

Even these few considerations about manuscript groups and artistical constellations have lead us to the question concerning which factors were responsible for the preference to copy certain iconographic or even stylistic features. Availability and appropriateness of specific iconographic or structural demands<sup>66</sup> seem to have been important reasons to use one model or pattern instead of another. However, the term “availability” is slightly ambiguous and does not merely refer to being accessible and local or to the direct disposability of models etc. by a scriptorium or workshop “model collection”. It also comprises the issue of a patron who had access through his network to distant centres and contacts to high-ranking persons from whom he could acquire the desired models even if that sometimes meant substantial effort.<sup>67</sup>

Furthermore, in the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> centuries the production of manuscripts increased greatly,<sup>68</sup> working processes changed in such a way that then any more laymen contributed to the execution of manuscripts than monastic illuminators and scribes did in earlier times.<sup>69</sup> As a codicological and art-historical consequence, more complexly designed miniatures of an otherwise rather modestly decorated codex were executed on separate parchment folios, in part by special qualified illuminators, and in order to integrate them in the codex only shortly before the making of the binding.<sup>70</sup> Moreover, a new kind of decoration, the Channel Style, was developed in this period in order to ornate manuscripts of a certain quality with motifs such as decorative scrolls, foliage, small animals, nude

---

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 48-52, 203-204.

<sup>66</sup> See the above discussion of the Creation miniature in the Stammheim Missal and the Gospels of Henry the Lion.

<sup>67</sup> Müller and Reiche, *Einführung*.

<sup>68</sup> Rouse and Rouse, *Manuscripts and their makers*.

<sup>69</sup> Alexander, *Medieval Illuminators*, 95-120, in particular 97.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. for example the Gospels of 1194: Wolfenbüttel, HAB, Cod. Guelf. 65 Helmst. or in particular the production of psalters in the 13<sup>th</sup> century, in which single pages are very often attached or integrated into the sequence of quires.



figures, and genre scenes comprising hunting or harvest or even grotesque creatures and masks. The advantage of this new decoration style was that its rich but nevertheless limited repertoire was to be copied and modified very quickly and without great effort.<sup>71</sup>

The need for having quick access to a higher quantity of iconographic patterns in order to illustrate more voluminous picture cycles as, for example, the prologue in the *Psalter of Queen Ingeborg* resulted not only in the invention of new iconographic schemes but also in an increasing use of an illustration technique which Florens Deuchler called the “use of moduli”<sup>72</sup>, i.e. the repeated use of similar motion patterns (“Bewegungsformeln”) or the repetition of entire figures in a new scenic context. The technique itself had already been used in Ottonian times. One famous example is the frontispiece miniature in the *Bible of Bishop Bernward of Hildesheim* (993–1022). It was most probably Bernward himself who arranged the use of a particular iconography and a composition related to the crucifixion and one of its auxiliary figures in order to depict himself as the donator in the shape of the apostle John and an iconographically rather enigmatic female figure, most probably the Virgin Mary.<sup>73</sup> The same technique was even used for the production of rich illuminated manuscripts such as the *Bible moralisée*.<sup>74</sup> Copying only singular motifs or parts of iconographic schemes remained en vogue later on in the 15<sup>th</sup> century when the production of certain types of manuscripts and, in particular, of lavishly illuminated Hours increased even more.

## Aspects of terminology – citation and intertextuality

Due to the lack of written sources, it is not always easy to decide whether the model was supposed to be recognised in the copy by either the patron, the commissioner or the viewer. Unfortunately, even in book illumination – a genre very closely linked to all kinds of copying – it is seldom possible to reconstruct the historic context of its production. That means, the term citation should be used with care and especially in cases

---

<sup>71</sup> Cahn, “St. Albans and the Channel Style”, 187–230; Nilgen, “Frankreich”, 159–161; Müller, “Einflüsse aus West und Ost”, in preparation.

<sup>72</sup> Deuchler, *Der Ingeborgpsalter*, 125–127.

<sup>73</sup> For this interpretation see Jäggi, “Stifter, Schreiber”, 68–70, Plate XI, fig. 20.

<sup>74</sup> In general for this sumptuously illuminated manuscript: Lowden, *The making of the Bibles moralisées*; cf. Ibid. (p. 158, fig. 59) in particular one example in the *Bible moralisée* of the British Library (Harley 1527, fol. 27r, third medallion), in which Christ’s healing of a paralytic is depicted according to an iconographic scheme suitable for the representation of the koimesis i.e. the Virgin’s death.

in which the painter's or the commissioner's intention was quite certainly that the citation's source should be recognised.<sup>75</sup> Having the possibility and knowledge to identify a copy or a copied motif should be a basic condition, indispensable for its definition as citation. As Art History does not have a specific term to describe the phenomenon and its structural and semantic consequences, it is necessary to refer to other disciplines. One concept particular adequate seems to be the idea of intertextuality proposed by Julia Kristeva.<sup>76</sup> A close or recognizable relation between original and copy permits us to characterize this kind of connection as intertextuality which is understood as a relation of different texts. That means a so-called hypotext, which in Art is the basic composition and iconography of a new art work (picture, miniature, sculpture, architecture, etc.), is related to a so-called hypertext, i.e. citations, elements or motifs taken from other art works – the hypertext is part of the hypotext.<sup>77</sup> Perhaps the use of this terminology will enable us to describe the different levels of copying processes in more detail and the thus resulting different levels of meaning.

## The contributions

There are far too many issues to be able to delve into at any great depth. However, the contributions of this volume about copying processes in medieval book painting from the 10<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> centuries aim to shed new light on these topics and in particular on long-established research positions in order to stimulate further discussions.

The editor's introduction informs the reader about the main subject matter and some aspects of the historical and cultural background. The articles are ordered with regard to the chronology of their subject. The more they deal with book painting of the later Middle Ages, the more they also tend to consider relations between various genres of art.

Peter K. Klein examines in his article about the illustrated Apocalypse Commentary of Beatus of Liébana, an Asturian priest and monk († c. 798),

---

<sup>75</sup> Cf. a similar discussion in the research field of architecture about the problem as to whether the citation of only a few characteristics or even a single criterion is sufficient to denominate copied motifs as "citation": Krautheimer, "Introduction to an "Iconography" of Medieval Architecture; Freigang, "Überlegungen zum Begriff der Imitatio".

<sup>76</sup> Kristeva, "Bachtin", 345-375. – Cf. Kaminski ("Imitatio", 265) who stressed the change in the general evaluation of the copy due to the principle of dialogue proposed by Michael Bakhtin and adopted by Kristeva.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Genette, *Palimpseste*, 14-15; Broich, Pfister, "Intertextualität".

the question as to whether the character of the models had any impact on the relatively uniform decoration of the Beatus manuscripts. He demonstrates the misunderstandings and deviations which occurred when copying and the conflation of motifs of different branches and pictorial traditions in the Beatus manuscripts focusing on the Saint-Sever Beatus – also one of the group's most famous manuscripts.

Laurence Terrier Aliferis, in her study about book painting around 1200 in France, shows that illuminators did not copy the antique style directly from antique or Byzantine art works, as sculptors and goldsmiths of the Meuse area did in the 12<sup>th</sup> century, but in particular from contemporaneous sculpture of the large French Cathedrals. Even if the way of transfer is often not known, the existence of sketchbooks of models has to be assumed. What is striking is the sources cited by Aliferis through which the naturalism of art objects around the middle of the 12<sup>th</sup> century was praised by beholders.

Guido Siebert emphasises that the concept of glass painters working as illuminators and vice versa has rarely been questioned until now. Even though authors of art technical handbooks such as Theophilus presbyter in his *Schedula diversarum artium* did not specifically say anything regarding this topic, there is evidence in art works that the concept of the existence of workshop associations, i.e. the collaboration of artists specialised in various art genres, should be discussed with new impact.

Cynthia Johnston questions in her contribution about William de Brailes, the only identifiable illuminator in the context of Oxford's vast book production of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, if models were really necessary when concepts such as collaboration and proximity characterise a workshop's organisation. Johnston offers an explication for the lack of any preserved model book of the de Brailes's workshop which is also famous for an abundant amount of initials – a kind of decoration which could not have been executed efficiently without the support of any visual or mnemonic medium.

Miranda Bloem examines in her article the passion cycles of the Masters of Zweder van Culemborg and their changing workshop policies. She shows how the cycles are divisible in two groups with a different, independent set of iconography and composition and questions the use of more modern models (Limbourg brothers, Jan van Eyck) in contrast to a long established pictorial tradition. On determining the used models, Bloem proposes new, convincing and more precise dates for the Hours of the Masters of Zweder van Culemborg.

Christine Seidel's contribution focuses on questions concerning the working practice and use of models in the Hours made by Jean Colombe

and his workshop (15<sup>th</sup> century). She examines different kinds of preliminary drawings and working procedures such as underdrawings in ink or silhouette tracings and the drawing process of both backgrounds and foregrounds in different times. According to Seidel, relations can be seen between the degree of the decoration's complexity, the presumable client and his financial prosperity, and also between panel painting and book illumination.

Joris Corin Heyder's study deals with the extensive reuse of patterns in late medieval Flemish illuminated manuscripts and questions the use of patterns, as well as their esteem and the unprecedented extensive employment and exchange of patterns between illuminator and workshops. According to Heyder patterns were less used as a possibility to save time and efforts during production processes but rather as a medium of distinction and quality protection.

## Works cited

- Augustyn, W. and Söding, U. (ed.) 2010, *Original – Kopie – Zitat. Kunstwerke des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit. Wege der Aneignung – Formen der Überlieferung* (Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Kunstgeschichte in München 26), Passau: Klinger Verlag.
- . 2010, "Original – Kopie – Zitat. Versuch einer begrifflichen Annäherung", *Original – Kopie – Zitat*, 1-14.
- Benjamin, W. 1963, *Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit*, Frankfurt/ M.: Suhrkamp.
- Bierbrauer, K. 2000, "Die Bilder und die Kanontafeln des Lorsch Evangeliiars und ihre Nachwirkung", *Das Lorsch Evangeliar. Biblioteca Documentară, Alba Iulia, Ms R II 1. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Codex Vaticanus Palatinus Latinus 50*, commentary, ed. by H. Schefers, Luzern: Faksimile Verlag, 79-88.
- Blume, D. 2009, "Wissenschaft und Bilder vom Hof Karls des Grossen zur Klosterreform", *Karolingische und Ottonische Kunst*, ed. by B. Reudenbach, München-Berlin-London-New York: Prestel, 520-552.
- Broich, U. and Pfister, M. (ed.) 1985), *Intertextualität. Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Brown, G. 1994, "The Carolingian Renaissance", *Carolingian culture: emulation and innovation*, ed. by R. McKitterick, Cambridge: University Press, 1-51.

- Cahn, W. 1975, "St. Albans and the Channel Style in England", *The Year 1200. A Symposium*, ed. by François Avril, New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 187-230.
- Cizek, A. N. 1994, *Imitatio et tractatio. Die literarisch-rhetorischen Grundlagen der Nachahmung in Antike und Mittelalter*, Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Cohen, A. S. 2000, *The Uta Codex. Art, philosophy, and reform in the eleventh-century Germany*, University Park, Pennsylvania State Univ. Press.
- Crivello, F., Denoël, Ch., and Orth, P. 2011, *Das Godescalc-Evangelistar. Eine Prachthandschrift für Karl den Großen*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Curtis, E. R., 1948, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*, Bern.
- De Rentiis, D. 1997, "Zum Rückgriff auf Grundprinzipien der klassisch-römischen imitatio auctorum und zur Bedeutung des imitatio-Begriffs im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert", *Das Mittelalter* 2/1, 83-92.
- Degenhart, B. 1950, "Autonome Zeichnungen bei mittelalterlichen Künstlern", *Münchener Jahrbuch für bildende Kunst*, 3. s., 1, 93-158.
- Deuchler, F. 1967, *Der Ingeborgpsalter*, Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Dodwell, Ch. R. (ed.; transl.) 1986, *The various arts. De diversis artibus*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Exner, M. 2008, *Das Guntbald-Evangeliar. Ein ottonischer Bilderzyklus und sein Zeugniswert für die Rezeptionsgeschichte des Lorsch-Evangeliers*, Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner.
- Fleckenstein, J. 1993, "Alkuin im Kreis der Hofgelehrten Karls des Großen", *Science in Western and Eastern Civilization in Carolingian Times*, ed. by P. L. Butzer and D. Lohrmann, Basel: Birkhäuser, 3-21.
- Freise, E. 1981, "Roger von Helmarshausen in seiner monastischen Umwelt", *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 15, 180-293.
- Gadol, J. 1969, *Leon Battista Alberti. Universal Man of the Early Renaissance*, Chicago-London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gearhart, H. 2010, *Theophilus' On Diverse Arts: The Persona of the Artist and the Production of Art in the Twelfth Century*, Ph. D. diss., University of Michigan 2010.
- Genette, G. 1993, *Palimpseste. Die Literatur auf zweiter Stufe*, Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.
- Geymonat, L. V. 2012, "Drawing, Memory and Imagination in the Wolfenbüttel Musterbuch", *Mechanisms of Exchange: Transmission in Medieval Art and Architecture in the Mediterranean, c. 1000-1500*, ed. by H. E. Grossman and A. Walker, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 220-285.

- Gibson, M. T, Heslop, T. A., Pfaff, R. W. 1992, *The Eadwine Psalter. Text, Image, and Monastic Culture in Twelfth-century Canterbury*, London: Modern Humanities Research Ass.
- Haseloff, A. 1897, *Eine thüringisch-sächsische Malerschule des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Studien zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte, 9), Strassburg: Heitz.
- Hemfort, E. 2001, *Monastische Buchkunst zwischen Mittelalter und Renaissance. Illumierte Handschriften der Zisterzienserabtei Altenberg und die Kölner Buchmalerei 1470–1550*, Bergisch-Gladbach: Altenberger Dom-Verein.
- Ilg, A. (ed.) 1970, *Das Buch von der Kunst oder Tractat der Malerei des Cennino Cennini da Colle di Valdesia*, reprint 1871, Osnabrück: Otto Zeller Verlag.
- Jäggi, C. 1995, “Stifter, Schreiber oder Heiliger?”, *Für irdischen Ruhm und himmlischen Lohn. Stifter und Auftraggeber in der mittelalterlichen Kunst*, ed. by H.-R. Meier, C. Jäggi, and Ph. Büttner, Berlin: Reimer 1995, 65-75.
- Kahsnitz, R. 1993, “Inhalt und Aufbau der Handschrift. Die Bilder”, *Das Kostbare Evangelium des Heiligen Bernward*, ed. by M. Brandt, München: Prestel, 18-55.
- Kaminski, N. and De Rentiis, N. 1998, “Imitatio”, *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik*, ed. by Gert Ueding, vol. 4, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 235-303.
- Kitzinger, E. 1975, *The Place of Book Illumination in Byzantine Art*, Princeton, N.J.: Art Museum, Princeton Univ., 99-143.
- Klein, P. K. 1976, *Der ältere Beatus-Kodex: Vitr. 14-1 der Biblioteca Nacional zu Madrid. Studien zur Beatus-Illustration und der spanischen Buchmalerei des 10. Jahrhunderts*, Hildesheim: Olms.
- . 2012, *Apocalipsis Carolingio de Valenciennes. Libro de estudios*, Madrid: Orbis Mediaevalis.
- Klemm, E. 2004, “Nr. 18 Clm 13061”, *Eadem: Die ottonischen und frühromanischen Handschriften der bayerischen Staatsbibliothek*, Textband und Tafelband, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Koehler, W. 1958, *Die karolingischen Miniaturen*, vol. 2, Die Hofschule Karls des Großen. Text, Berlin: Cassirer.
- Krautheimer, R. 1942, “Introduction to an ‘Iconography’ of Medieval Architecture”, *Journal of Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 5, 1-33.
- Kristeva, J. 1972, “Bachtin, das Wort, der Dialog und der Roman”, *Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik. Ergebnisse und Perspektiven*, vol. 3, ed. by J. Ihwe, Frankfurt/M.: Athenäum, 345-375.