The Making of *L’Abreujamen de las estorias* (Egerton MS. 1500)

Federico Botana

*L’Abreujamen de las estorias* (British Library, Egerton MS. 1500) is one of the most remarkable diagrammatic chronicles produced in the late Middle Ages. It is illustrated with more than 1600 small busts (referred to as ‘heads’ in the manuscript), a cycle of sixteen scenes of the Crusades, and a few maps and diagrams. These illustrations are integrated into a complex layout combining genealogical schemata with synchronic tables (fig. 1). The layout is an essential element of the *Abreujamen*: it allows the reader to grasp events happening simultaneously in the various kingdoms of the then-known world, and to visualize the lines of succession of their rulers. The *Abreujamen* was produced in Avignon between 1321 and 1324. It consists of an Occitan version of the Latin *Compendium gestarum rerum* (*Compendium of Things Past*) written by Paolino Veneto (Franciscan friar, inquisitor, diplomat, apostolic penitentiary, and bishop). The *Abreujamen* presents the history of mankind from the creation of the world to the times of Clement V (1305-14) and emperor Henry VII (1308–13). An interpolation occurring on the penultimate folio includes the date 1322, providing a solid terminus post quem for the last sections of the text of the *Abreujamen*.

I am indebted to my colleagues at Reading and to the manuscript departments of the British Library, the Bibliothèque Municipale at Avignon, the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, and the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana. Abbreviations: AvBM = Avignon, Bibliothèque Municipale; BnF = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France; BNMV = Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana; MS. L₁ = London, BL Egerton MS. 1500; MS. L₂ = London, BL Add. MS. 17920; MS. M = BNMV, MS. Zanetti Lat. 399 (=1610); MS. P₁ = Paris, BnF MS. lat. 4939.
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This article is an account of the production of the *Abreujamen* based on internal evidence. The research presented below has been conducted as part of the project ‘Manuscript Egerton 1500: Histories and Genealogies’. This work has involved the participation of two literary scholars, Catherine Léglu (Principal Investigator) and Alexander Ibarz, who have produced substantial new research on the text and the contents of the *Abreujamen*. As an art historian, I have focused on the study of its layout and illustrations. Eg. MS. 1500 is a mine of information: it has preserved numerous written instructions for rubricators and illuminators, and its illustrations present varying degrees of completion. Instructions and half-finished miniatures, as I shall argue in this article, attest to the successive stages of production of the *Abreujamen*. Moreover, when considered together with documentary evidence, they contribute to a more accurate dating of the manuscript. Yet when it comes to early manuscripts of the *Compendium*, there is an even richer source of evidence: Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, MS. Zanetti Lat. 399 (= 1610), produced under the supervision of Paolino between c. 1320 and 1323 (fig. 2). Study of MS. Zanetti Lat. 399 reveals how the complex layout of the *Compendium* was conceived and reproduced in Eg. MS. 1500. And, above all, it helps us to understand Paolino’s involvement in the production of the *Abreujamen*, as well as the working methods of this extraordinary author.

**Paolino Veneto and his works**

‘This Venetian animal’ and ‘this fatuous Venetian’: this is how his literary rival, Giovanni Boccaccio, refers to Paolino in his *zibaldone* (commonplace book). Known today simply as Paolino Veneto, Paulinus of Venice or Paolino Minorita, this friar led an interesting life. A good number of original documents have survived attesting to his career and travels. He was born probably between 1275 and 1280, we can assume to an important Venetian family, given his rapid ascent within the Franciscan order. Between 1305 and 1307, he was Inquisitor in the Marchia Tarvisina (the Franciscan Province of north-east Italy). A testimony given in 1307 to an inquiry into the conduct of the inquisitors at Treviso offers a fascinating insight into Paolino’s character – or at least, into how he was perceived by his fellow friars: according to rumours, he allegedly spent the exorbitant sum of 300 *libre* on garments for himself in a period of only fifteen months; he was not only excessively delicate in his attire, but also...

---

6 Financed by the Leverhulme Trust and based at the University of Reading, Department of Modern Languages and European Studies (May 2011–April 2013).
10 See n. 5, above.
11 See Ghinato, *Fr. Paolino*.
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Fig. 2 BNAM, MS. Zanetti Lat. 396, ff. 2v–3r (photograph: by permission of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana).
in his eating and drinking habits; even worse, whilst staying at Conegliano, he enjoyed the company of two ioculatores, who played music for him every summer afternoon and evening.\textsuperscript{14} In brief, Paolino was apparently not respecting the Franciscan vow of poverty.\textsuperscript{15}

Paolino’s career was influenced by two powerful men: Robert of Anjou, king of Naples, and pope John XXII. Paolino probably met Robert for the first time in 1315, when he was in Naples conducting a diplomatic mission on behalf of the Venetian Republic.\textsuperscript{16} In January 1321, he was serving again as a Venetian envoy to the Angevin court, this time at Avignon, where Robert took up residence in 1319.\textsuperscript{17} Paolino remained afterwards at Avignon. In the prologue to the second redaction of Marino Sanudo’s \textit{Liber secretorum fidelium crucis}, Paolino is mentioned among the members of the commission appointed by John XXII to examine the first version of Sanudo’s work.\textsuperscript{18} The commissioners met in September 1321 in Paolino’s house, and we also learn in the prologue that he was then serving as Apostolic Penitentiary.\textsuperscript{19} In February 1322, John XXII sent Paolino to settle on behalf of the papacy some delicate matters in northern Italy, all of which he appears to have resolved from Venice, where he stayed at least until October of that year.\textsuperscript{20} The exact date of Paolino’s return to Avignon is unknown; but he was definitely there on 25 June 1324, when he was appointed bishop of Pozzuoli (his appointment coincided with Robert’s return to Naples).\textsuperscript{21} He was still at Avignon in October of that year; however, in January 1325, he was back in Venice conducting yet again a diplomatic mission on behalf of the pope.\textsuperscript{22} Paolino finally arrived at Pozzuoli in 1326; he died there in 1344, having become counsellor of king Robert.\textsuperscript{23}

The 1307 report, besides condemning Paolino’s penchant for luxury, states: ‘above all, he multiplied books, having them written and buying them’.\textsuperscript{24} This seems a fitting description: throughout his life he was a prolific author.\textsuperscript{25} Paolino’s writings, like his career, reveal a marked interest in the mechanisms of power. His earliest known works, \textit{Il Rettore}\textsuperscript{14} Ghinato, \textit{Fr. Paolino}, p. 93: ‘nam dicitur quod expenderat in quindecim menses bene CCC libras in vestibus pro se [...] Hoc tamen scio quod nimis delicatus fuit in vestibus, cibis et potibus [...] Vidi etiam quod ipse in tantum presumebat quod tenuit duos ioculatores ad sonandum instrumenta sua in loco Corneclani in estate a dicto nona usque ad vespras. In dicto loco coenaverunt dicti ioculatores, et post coenam iterum et pulsaverunt.’\textsuperscript{15} The other two Franciscan vows are obedience and chastity.

\textsuperscript{16} Ghinato, \textit{Fr. Paolino}, pp. 27-32.


\textsuperscript{19} Sanudo, \textit{Liber secretorum fidelium crucis}, pp. 1-2.

\textsuperscript{20} Ghinato, \textit{Fr. Paolino}, pp. 35-44 (for the documents, pp. 94-8).


\textsuperscript{22} Ghinato, \textit{Fr. Paolino}, pp. 47-51 (for the documents, pp. 100-5). Ghinato (op. cit, pp. 48-9) claims, without any evidence, that Paolino took his charge in July or August 1324, returning to Avignon before the end of the following October.


\textsuperscript{24} Ghinato, \textit{Fr. Paolino}, p. 93: ‘libros insuper multiplicavit scribi faciendo et emendo’.
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and the *Notabilium historiarum epithoma*, were both composed in the 1310s. *Il Retore* is a vernacular treatise on government, which he dedicated to Marino Badoer, Duke of Crete.\(^{26}\) The *Épitoma* is his first universal chronicle; it was soon followed by the *Compendium*, and, a few years later, by the *Satyrica ystoria*, his most comprehensive work.\(^{27}\) The *Compendium* is the only diagrammatic chronicle composed by Paolino, and has survived in three illustrated Latin manuscripts dating from his lifetime.\(^{28}\) The oldest is BNMV, MS. Zanetti Latino 399 (hereafter MS. *M*), the production of which probably began before 1321 (figs 2-5, 9, 11, 15, 17, 19, 39).\(^{29}\) The next manuscript, Paris, BnF, MS. lat. 4939 (hereafter MS. *P*), was executed in Naples about 1329 (fig. 20).\(^{30}\) The last manuscript is Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS. Vat. Lat. 1960, in which the *Compendium* was abridged to preface the *Satyrica ystoria*.\(^{31}\) This version of the *Compendium* was also produced in Naples, probably in 1332-35, whereas the appended *Satyrica ystoria* dates to c. 1335-39.\(^{32}\) The only extant vernacular manuscript of the *Compendium* is British Library, Eg. MS. 1500 (hereafter MS. *L*).

BL, Eg. MS. 1500 (MS. *L*): codicology and palaeography

MS. *L*, consists of sixty-seven parchment folios measuring today 29 x 38 cm. (the manuscript was trimmed at some point). It is assembled as follows: one bifolium, five sexternions (the last two leaves of the fifth sexternion have been cut out), one bifolium, and one quaternion. The *Abreujamen de las estorias* occupies the five sexternions (ff. 3-60); the bifolia (ff. 1-2 and 61-62) consist of notes on some the contents of the *Abreujamen*; and the quaternion (ff. 63-67) is a *Provinciale Romanae Curiae* (a list of the cardinal seats, provinces and dioceses).\(^{33}\) The manuscript has two medieval foliations in roman numerals; the first, i-ciiii, appears in the upper margins and starts on the present f. 1; the second, i-cii, occurs in the lower margins starting on f. 3.\(^{34}\) Thus thirty-seven folios are today missing from the manuscript. Two of these folios must be the last ones of the last sexternion which were probably left blank and cut out after the two roman numeral foliations had been penned,\(^{35}\) and three are the folios that have been lost from the *Provinciale*.\(^{36}\) The remaining thirty-two missing folios were originally inserted between the present folios 62 and 63 (in the old foliations, lxiii/lxii and lxxxxvi/lxxxxv), thus between the second bifolium of notes and the *Provinciale*.


\(^{29}\) On this manuscript, see Degenhart and Schmitt, ‘Marino Sanudo und Paolino Veneto’, pp. 21, 42-54.


\(^{32}\) As recently dated by Léglu. Degenhart and Schmitt (‘Marino Sanudo und Paolino Veneto’, p. 26) date ff. 1-47 to 1334-39, like the rest of the manuscript.


\(^{34}\) Because the manuscript has been trimmed, numerals are today only visible on some folios, including: ff. 62, lxiii (lower margin); lxii (upper margin).

\(^{35}\) The *explicit* of the *Abreujamen* occurs on f. 60, the antepenultimate folio of the last sexternion.

\(^{36}\) A complete bifolium between the present ff. 65 and 66, and a folio between ff. 66 and 67.
Twenty-eight of these folios have been found: they are the contents of British Library Add. MS. 17920, as discovered by Wilhelmina Wüstefeld.37 This manuscript contains the following Occitan texts: Dels miracles de Santa Maria Vergena (Of the Miracles of the Holy Virgin Mary), Delas vii filhal del diable (Of the Seven Daughters of the Devil), La ystoría de sainh Turpi (Pseudo-Turpin), and De las meravilhas de la terra de Ybernia (a translation of the Libellus de descriptione Hiberniae, a Latin work presented to John XXII by Philip of Slane, bishop of Cork, probably in 1324).38 Working in collaboration with Alexander Ibarz, I have been able to confirm in detail Wüstefeld’s argument. Add. MS. 17920 (hereafter MS. L,.) has the same two roman foliations as MS. L, – Ixxv–Ixxvi (lower margin) and Ixiii–Ixxxi (upper margin) – indicating that its contents were originally inserted between the present folios 62 and 63 of MS. L.39 MS. L. has been trimmed more drastically than MS. L, measuring today only 26.5 x 37 cm; but it is written in two columns, just like the notes on ff. 1–2 and 61–62 in MS. L, and these columns and their inner margins measure roughly the same in both manuscripts.40 Ibarz’s study of the script has led him to suggest that MS. L, was written by the scribe who wrote the two bifolia of notes and the Provinciale.41 In addition, both manuscripts suffered the same damage in the outer margins, and thus there cannot be any doubt that they originally formed part of the same codex. It is probable – and almost certain in the case of De las meravilhas de la terra de Ybernia – that the texts of MS. L, were not initially intended to compose a miscellany together with the Abreujamen, and that plans were changed during the production process.

MS. L, is written in a gothic rotunda which is typical of fourteenth-century southern France. Ibarz identified three main scribal hands in the manuscript (which he discusses in detail in the following article).42 The first hand in the manuscript, Manus Prima, completed ff. 3r to 31v; the second hand, Manus Secunda, wrote most of the text on ff. 32r–36; and the third hand, Manus Tertia, most of ff. 36v to 60v. Manus Secunda, in addition to writing all the texts in MS. L, and the two bifolia of notes and the Provinciale in MS. L, also penned the colophon of the Abreujamen (f. 60v) and filled gaps throughout the manuscript; therefore, Manus Secunda was the third and last scribe to write on MS. L, It has been suggested by literary scholars that the scribe of MS. L, was actually the translator of the texts copied into this manuscript, though there is no evidence to support such claims.43 In MS. L, Ibarz also identified two rubricators, the second of whom

37 See W. H. Wüstefeld, ‘Las Meravilhas de la terra de Ybernia. Una traduction occitane et son modèle’, Actes du premier congrès international de l’Association d’Etudes Occitanes (London, 1987), pp. 529–37 (pp. 533–4). The bifolium between the present ff. 28 and 29 was lost and the last two folios of the manuscript, which were probably blank, were cut off.
39 The numerals can still be seen in the lower margins of ff. 4 (lvii), 5 (lviii), 6 (lxix), 11 (lxviiii). Most of those in the upper margins have been lost, as they were closer to the edge of the folio (for example, on f. 18 we read lxx, which must have been lxxix before the manuscript was trimmed).
40 The text block is about 19 x 27 cm; the average width of the inner side margin is 3.5 cm.
42 Ibid.
43 See W. H. Wüstefeld, ‘Le manuscrit British Library Additional 17920 et son contexte socio-culturel’, in Critique et édition de textes. Actes du XVIIiè congrès international de linguistique et philologie romanes (Marseilles, 1986), pp. 100–10; and especially A. de Mandach, ‘Le Problème posé par la “koinê de l’occitan central”: le pape Jean XXII et deux anthologies de son temps comportant des textes occitans (B. M. Add. 19513 et 17920),’ in Mélanges d’histoire littéraire, de linguistique et de philologie romanes offerts à Charles Rostaing, 2 vols (Liège, 1974), vol. ii, pp. 637–51. Mandach proposed that this scribe was the Dominican theologian Armand de Belvezer, but Belvezer never wrote a work in Occitan, nor any secular text. In addition, Belvezer arrived at Avignon in 1327, and the evidence presented in this article strongly suggests that MS. L, was executed in 1324–5.
very probably was *Manus Secunda*. The three hands of MS. *L*, match scribal practices in dated manuscripts produced in Avignon and Toulouse in the first half of the fourteenth century. The first hand, according to Ibarz, shows consistent similarities with script in manuscripts produced for the papal curia around 1320.\(^{44}\)

The *Compendium gestarum rerum*: form and content

The *Compendium gestarum rerum* is essentially different from the other texts copied in MSS. *L* and *L*. It strongly relies on its visual components: its layout consisting of synchronic tables, and its extensive illustrative programme. Synchronic tables were invented in antiquity; after a period of apparent oblivion, their use in historical works was revived in the *Chronicon* of Hugh of Saint Victor (c. 1130), and in the *Compendium historiae in genealogia Christi* of Peter of Poitiers (late twelfth century).\(^{45}\) Diagrammatic chronicles reached an unprecedented complexity in fourteenth-century manuscripts. Paolino’s *Compendium* is one of the most intricate examples. The *Compendium* was conceived to be read in double-page spreads from left to right (hereafter ‘openings’). The layout, in essence, consists of parallel vertical columns serving the function of synchronous tables (figs 1, 2, 13). The subject of each column is indicated by titles written in red in the upper margins. The most important of these columns is the *Linea regularis*, which always occurs on the versos. The *Linea regularis* is the spine and time-line of the *Compendium*; in the prologue, Paolino explains that it is traced in black and red and that its contents are ‘rule and measure’ of a determinate time.\(^{46}\) The *Linea regularis* is inhabited by heads representing (in the following order): patriarchs and judges of the Old Testament; kings of Israel, Judea and Jerusalem; kings of Persia; Ptolemaic pharaohs; Roman emperors; Byzantine emperors; and medieval Emperors.\(^{47}\) Each head is accompanied by dates *anno mundi* (the year counting from the Creation of the World) for those living in Old Testament times, and *anno Domini* for those


\(^{46}\) MS. M, f. 1r (transcription by Vernet): ‘Sane omnium determinati temporis que in hoc opere sunt infra transversales lineae comprehensa, que infra protractas in longum lineas ponuntur rubro variata ac nigro coloribus quiusquaque capitulum quo in ephymate inveniri queant preponitur, regula atque mensura sunt: nam illis contemporanea’. MS. *L*, f. 3r (transcription by Ibarz): ‘E deu hom saber que aquelas cauzas que son dins las linhas, las quals son protrachas en lonc, variadas de roja e de negra color, e en las quals es prepausat capitol per lo qual puese esser trobadas las cauzas en aquest abreujamen, son regla e mezura... E totas las cauzas del temps determinat, las quals en aquesta obra son contengudas dins las linhas transversals quar son d’un metheis temps am lor’. On the prologues, see Vernet, ‘Une Version provençale de la “Chronologia magna”’; and Heullant-Donat, ‘Entrer dans l’histoire’, pp. 411-13.

\(^{47}\) MS. *L*, ff. 3r-5v, 6v-8v, 9v-11v, 11v-13v, 13v-15v, 16v-25v, 26v-36v, 37v-60v (respectively).
living after the birth of Christ. The beginning of each of the Six Ages of the World is marked by rubrics. Individual kingdoms – or republics, as for Venice – are represented with regnal lists consisting of columns punctuated by either crowned heads or just crowns, in both instances accompanied by the names of rulers (female names are written in red). The prologue specifies that regnal lists shall be traced in red; black ink, by contrast, shall be used to denote blood relationships. Blood ties, besides being represented in regnal lists, are shown in genealogical diagrams spreading out of columns. These are formed by heads or names contained in shapes evoking an arched niche, which are interconnected by curving lines (hereafter ‘floating niches’). Other columns include: the Linea contingencium or accidencia (listing brief mentions of events), the Linea doctorum et scriptorum (philosophers and theologians); the Linea Christi (ancestors of Christ); the Linea Pontificum (Jewish priests); and Summi Pontifices (a column for popes on the rectos mirroring the Linea regularis on the versos). In addition to synchronous tables, openings contain expositions (usually rubricated as Explicatio) on persons represented in the Linea regularis and other tables, and a series of texts relating to specific periods in history, including: a mythography (a treatise on pagan myths); the life and deeds of Alexander the Great; the Acts of the Apostles; lives of saints; and an account of the Crusades. In MS. L1, most of these texts occupy entire openings which interrupt the sequence of the synchronous tables. In MS. L1, by contrast, they are integrated into the synchronous tables, spreading across several openings.

Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, MS. Zanetti Latino 399 (MS. M)

Of the three early Latin manuscripts of the Compendium gestarum rerum, the closest to MS. L1 is MS. M (figs 2-5, 8-9, 11, 15, 17, 19, 39). MS. M is usually referred to as the Chronologia magna, and until now the Abreujamen has been considered merely an abbreviated version of the Chronologia. However, as demonstrated by Léglu and Ibarz, the content of some
passages does not completely match in the two manuscripts.\textsuperscript{57} MS. \textit{M} is larger than MS. \textit{L}., measuring 47 x 35 cm. It is made of ninety-nine parchment folios assembled into a single quire; in terms of structure, this makes MS. \textit{M} extraordinary among medieval western manuscripts.\textsuperscript{58} Eighty-eight of these folios consist of the \textit{Compendium} (1r-88r), two folios of a \textit{Provinciale Romanae Curiae} (93v-94v), and the remaining folios are either blank or contain notes and diagrams.

In MS. \textit{M}, the text is written in Italian gothic \textit{textualis}. Examination of the manuscript reveals that text blocks were executed in a variety of ink shades (from pale grey-brown to black), and apparently, with different pens. MS. \textit{M} contains numerous marginal and interlinear notes in cursive shorthand, which were penned by the same hand that added notes and diagrams at the end of the manuscript. Bernhard Degenhart and Annegret Schmitt have suggested that MS. \textit{M} is an autograph manuscript.\textsuperscript{59} For the text blocks, their proposal has received little consensus; the notes, however, have been convincingly proven to be by Paolino.\textsuperscript{60} Also in the hand of Paolino are numerous instructions for rubricators and illustrators scattered across the manuscript, which, contrary to common practice, were never erased after its completion.\textsuperscript{61} Their presence verifies Isabelle Heullant-Donat’s proposal that MS. \textit{M} is a ‘manuscrit sous contrôle d’auteur’.\textsuperscript{62} The differences in the execution of the text blocks would suggest that Paolino directed several scribes at work. This can only be corroborated with thorough palaeographic analysis – in the meantime, we may wonder why these scribes did not ensure that they produced a homogeneously written text.

MS. \textit{M} is partly illustrated with sketches attributed by Degenhart and Schmitt to a Venetian workshop who also illustrated two copies of Sanudo’s \textit{Liber secretorum} (Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, MSS. 9347-48 and 9404-05, dated to c. 1332).\textsuperscript{63} This workshop was responsible for some of the heads and all the narrative scenes in MS. \textit{M}, including a cycle of the Life of Christ, which is not reproduced in MS. \textit{L}, (figs 3-4).\textsuperscript{64} As noted by Degenhart and Schmitt, MS. \textit{M} also contains heads drawn in pen and ink by a French illuminator, who reworked some of the sketches executed by the Venetian workshop (figs 3, 5, 8-9, 11.


\textsuperscript{58} The structure of MS. \textit{M} is largely original. Examination of the flesh and hair sides suggests that this quire was initially formed by 50 bifolia. Folios 1-2, today assembled as an independent bifolium, were probably part of the quire, and must have had counterparts between ff. 97 and 98, which would have been cut off; f. 10 (today a single folio), probably had a counterpart between ff. 90 and 91. Folios 98-99 constitute an independent bifolium, but were probably appended to the quire when the manuscript was produced.

\textsuperscript{59} Degenhart and Schmitt, ‘Marino Sanudo und Paolino Veneto’, p. 25.


\textsuperscript{62} Heullant-Donat, ‘\textit{Ab origine mundi}’, vol. i, pp. 97-9.


\textsuperscript{64} Besides a few heads, the illustrations in MS. \textit{M} which are not included in MS. \textit{L}, are: allegorized chessboard (f. 12r); life of Christ (ff. 21r-26r); scenes of martyrdom (f. 24v); life of Mary Magdalene (f. 25v).
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*Fig. 3. BNMV, MS. Zanetti Lat. 399, detail of f. 62v (photograph: by permission of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana).*
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Fig. 4. BNMV, MS. Zanetti Lat. 399, detail of f. 22r (photograph: by permission of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana).
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Fig. 5. BNVM, MS. Zanetti Lat. 399, detail of f. 62v (photograph: by permission of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana).

Fig. 6. AvBM, MS. 23, detail of f. 38v (photograph: Institut de recherche et d’histoire des textes; by permission of the Bibliothèque Municipale d’Avignon).

Fig. 7. AvBM, MS. 23, detail of f. 132r (photograph: Institut de recherche et d’histoire des textes; by permission of the Bibliothèque Municipale d’Avignon).

Fig. 8. BNVM, MS. Zanetti Lat. 399, detail of f. 6r (photograph: by permission of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana).
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17, 19). This French artist appears to have been executing important commissions at the time. He drew figures in an evangelary *ad usum romanum*, AvBM, MS. 23 (figs 6–7). Given the high quality of this evangelary, it has been assumed that it was commissioned for the cathedral of Avignon, Notre-Dame-des-Doms, in 1320 or shortly afterwards, since in that year John XXII decided to replace the cathedral’s liturgical books with new ones following Roman usage. In comparison to the French illustrator, the Venetian artist executed only a small number of heads in MS. M. He fully illustrated the list of Venetian Doges; but outside their column, the heads drawn by this artist appear only sporadically and in a limited number of columns and genealogies.

As to the dating of MS. M, a solid *terminus ante quem* is supplied for most of the text blocks by the entry on the canonization of Thomas Aquinas, sanctioned by John XXII on 18 July 1323, occurring on the last folio (88r). A *terminus post quem* is more difficult to establish. It is a reasonable assumption that the production of MS. M was initiated in Venice. We find evidence supporting this in the cycle of the Life of Christ on ff. 21v–23r, which was sketched before the text was written on those folios (fig. 4). Therefore, the production of MS. M could have begun before Paolino moved to Avignon (so prior to January 1321), or alternatively, whilst he was in Venice in 1322. However, I am less inclined towards the latter possibility, since one year and a half seems too short a period to produce such a complex work. The uneven appearance of the text blocks is, on the one hand, evidence that the text was completed in several stages. On the other, it indicates that the scribes of MS. M were not copying a prototype, but adding information in a piecemeal fashion. The manner in which the Venetian sketches are distributed in MS. M shows that, at least in the earlier stages of production, bifolia were not illustrated in the sequence in which subjects appear in the manuscript, but probably as their placement was decided.

---

65 Degenhart and Schmitt, ‘Marino Sanudo und Paolino Veneto’, pp. 27–8, 90. This illustrator was probably from northern France, as suggested by his fluid line style and the instructions written in pencil for some of his figures (garson; femme; sarasin). Another illustrator, probably Neapolitan, added heads to the scheme of the classical deities on f. 6r.


68 The column runs between ff. 58v and 88r.

69 His heads are distributed as follows: six descendants of Esau (f. 2v); five descendants of Inachus and Iobes (f. 3r); four descendants of Priam (f. 6v); one king of Assyria (f. 11r); thirteen rulers of Syria (ff. 17v, 18v); one Jewish priest and ten members of the Jewish royal lineage (ff. 18v–19r); five Roman emperors, all reworked by the French illustrator (19v–24v); popes St Peter, Constantine, and Celestine V (f. 23r, 59r, 85r); St Cyriacus (f. 31r); six kings of France and four members of the French royal family (ff. 50v, 56v, 67v, 71v, 82v, 88r); a Lombard warrior (f. 28v); Charlemagne (also reworked by the French illustrator) and his progeny (f. 62v) (fig. 3), St Francis (f. 81r); seven members of the Hungarian royal family (ff. 70r, 83r); one count of Tripoli (f. 75v); six Byzantine emperors (ff. 82v, 83v, 85v) and seven heads in the contiguous column *Status Ecclesie* (ff. 82v, 83v); two kings of Armenia (ff. 84v, 87v); Charles of Anjou and his progeny (f. 84v); Robert of Anjou (f. 88r).

70 This can be fully appreciated in the original with a magnifying lens, under raking light.

71 Heullant-Donat, ‘*Ab origine mundi*’, vol. i, p. 58.

72 In the past, scholars have argued that the maps of Jerusalem and Acre in MS. M reproduce those of a lost atlas by Pietro Vesconte which was presented to John XXII by Sanudo with the *Liber secretorum* thus establishing September 1321 as a *terminus post quem* for MS. M. However, there is evidence that Paolino was supplied by another source and that he could have acquired the maps before January 1321. See M. Di Cesare, ‘Il sapere geografico di Boccaccio tra tradizione e innovazione: L’*imago mundi* di Paolino Veneto a Pietro Vesconte’, in R. Morosini (ed.), *Boccaccio Geografo: Un viaggio nel Mediteranneo tra la città* (Florence, 2010), pp. 86–7.
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The making of the *Abreujamen* according to its layout

By comparing the layouts of MS. *L*, and MS. *M*, significant deductions can be made about the production of the two manuscripts and their respective datings (figs 1-2). In MS. *M*, we can clearly see how the most sophisticated graphic features of the *Compendium* were worked out from a basic system of vertical columns. An example is the lineage of Irari, son of Nimrod. In MS. *M* (f. 3r) *Yararis filius Nenroth* was written inside the column of the kings of Babylon; a few inches below we discover three other columns representing the lines of succession of the kings of Sicily, Crete and Italy, headed respectively by Siculus, Cres, and Italus (fig. 9). The surface of the parchment was scraped between the column of Babylon and those of the three other kingdoms, and connecting lines were clumsily traced between the upper and lower columns to show that the three kings were sons of Irari. In contrast, in MS. *L* (f. 4v) we find a scheme neatly traced in the shape of an inverted ‘Y’ (fig. 10), the descender of which contains the head of Irari, and the ascenders those of Italus and Cres (Sicily is not included in MS. *L*). More evidence is found in the regnal table of Judah, at the level of king Jehoiakim. It was necessary to indicate that, from this point onwards, the table did not include any ancestors of Christ, since the lineage was transmitted through his son Jecochia and not by Zedekiah who inherited the crown. In MS. *M* (f. 10v) we can see two parallel diagonal ink lines connecting the head of king Jehoiakim in the *linea regularis* with the column of the ancestors of Christ containing the head of his son, Jecochia (fig. 11). These lines were traced over those demarcating the *linea regularis*. In contrast, in MS. *L* (f. 11v) the segments of the *linea regularis* comprised between the diagonal lines were never traced (fig. 12). Both instances, Irari and Jehoiakim, verify that the scribe who inked the layout of MS. *M* was not copying a model, whereas the scribe responsible for that section in MS. *L* appears to have done so, and it is reasonable to assume that his model was MS. *M*.

However, there is no evidence to suggest that the layout of all the sections in MS. *L*, was modelled on MS. *M*. In both manuscripts, the layout changes after the account of the life of Christ, but differently in each case. In MS. *M*, the most sophisticated graphic elements, such as the genealogical schemata formed by floating niches, disappear completely after folio 24, and the layout reverts to the basic system of vertical columns. In MS. *L*, the layout changes more dramatically. From folio 18 onwards (so two folios into the second sexternion), black ink disappears from the genealogical diagrams and only red ink is used for the entire tabulation. More significantly, only the *Linea regularis* and *Summi Pontifices* (popes) remain columns; regnal tables take now the form of double vertical lines punctuated by heads contained in floating niches – a device invoking framed pictures hanging from a vertical pole (fig. 13).

What can be deduced from these changes in layout? A plausible explanation is that inking the tabulation had proven to be too time-consuming in the first section; but different solutions were adopted in each manuscript. In the case of MS. *L*, the solution was probably not proposed by Paolino. The pole-and-picture model is the most common type of genealogical diagram in manuscripts produced at the time in France, Italy and elsewhere in Western Europe (though in these manuscripts figures are usually contained within medallions, instead of floating niches). But this model was not adopted in any other manuscript of Paolino’s *Compendium* produced during his lifetime. Moreover, had Paolino been directly involved in

---

73 This is not fully accurate; in 1 Chronicles 3:16 both sons become kings.
74 On the ancestors of Christ, see n. 52, above.
75 For example, Peter of Poitiers’s *Compendium* and English royal rolls; see Melville, ‘Geschichte in graphischer Gestalt’; Monroe, ‘13th- and Early-14th Century Illustrated Genealogical Manuscripts in Roll and Codex’.
76 Paolino used columns and floating niches in MS. *M* and MS. *P*, and grids in Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS. Vat. Lat. 1960.
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Fig. 9. BNMV, MS. Zanetti Lat. 399, detail of f. 3r (photograph: by permission of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana).

Fig. 10. Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 4v.

Fig. 11. BNMV, MS. Zanetti Lat. 399, detail of f. 10v (photograph: by permission of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana).

Fig. 12. Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 11v.
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the decision to alter the layout of MS. \( L_1 \), it is reasonable to assume that folios 17v-60v would have followed more closely the specifications in his prologue: red lines to signify succession in power in regnal lists and succession in priesthood in the Linea doctorum et scriptorum; and black lines to indicate blood descent without transmission of power.\(^77\)

These changes in layout strongly suggest that Paolino did not have full control over the production of MS. \( L_1 \), and that other persons – the head of the scriptorium, or, perhaps, the translator – were taking important decisions in his place. At the same time, it raises the possibility that MS. \( M \) was not available when the scribes of MS. \( L_1 \) inked the layout of the sections following the birth of Christ. This leads us back to the dating issue. Had the production of MS. \( M \) begun in Venice before Paolino moved to Avignon, then work on MS. \( L_1 \) could have started in 1321. Were this the case, it is reasonable to assume that by the time Paolino left Avignon in 1322, the layout and the text would have been completed in the first section of MS. \( M \), thus those in the first section of MS. \( L_1 \) could have by then been finished too. Since we can be reasonably certain that MS. \( M \) is the authorial prototype of the Compendium, we may infer that Paolino took this manuscript with him to Venice to continue his work. If so, he might have provided the translator and the scribes of the Abreujamen with notes and perhaps with rough sketches of genealogical trees so that production of MS. \( L_1 \) could continue during his absence. In the following two sections of this article, this hypothesis shall be tested in light of further internal evidence: instructions for rubricators and illuminators, and the illustrations of the Abreujamen.

The making of the Abreujamen according to its instructions for rubricators and illuminators

MS. \( L_1 \) contains a number of written instructions for rubricators and illuminators. Such instructions, supposedly, were erased after completion, yet they have survived in many medieval manuscripts.\(^78\) Examination of the parchment of MS. \( L_1 \), does not show any erasures in areas in which we may expect to find other instructions, suggesting that only those visible today were inserted.\(^79\) By comparison to MS. \( L_1 \), MS. \( M \) contains a far greater number of instructions for rubricators and illuminators; these are written in pale ink with a thin pen, and, as reported above, they can be ascribed to Paolino.\(^80\) In MS. \( L_1 \), we discover instructions written by the same hand intended for titles and female names (both re-written in red afterwards), as well as for illustrations.\(^81\) Despite having been trimmed, the upper margins of MS. \( L_1 \) have preserved instructions for titles of synchronic tables, including those for: Consules Romani; Regnum Macedonorum; Reges Britanie; Doctores et scriptores; Linea contingencium, \( \ldots \)

---

\(^77\) See above at n. 50.


\(^79\) I examined places in MS. \( L_1 \), in which we find instructions in MS. \( M \) with raking light and, where possible, with ultra-violet light.


\(^81\) This handwriting is characterized by economy: ‘a’ consists of an inclined upright usually with a small bowl; ‘b’ is written with a single stroke, with a short ascender and a rounded lobe; ‘c’ has a flat instroke which forms a continuous line when ligated with another ‘c’; the ‘n’ is semi-cursive, consisting of a half limb and a limb with a slightly raising tail; the short ‘s’ has a straight stem and slightly-curved top; the ‘t’ has a curved stem and almost no ascender; the ‘x’ has a curved first diagonal and a straight second diagonal.
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contingencia or accidental; and De gestis sanctorum (fig. 14). These instructions seem to be in Paolino’s hand, and the same abbreviations were used in MS. M (fig. 15). The instructions for female names that can be ascribed to Paolino appear in ff. 3–17r, including that for the prophetess Huldah, which can be compared to the same instruction in MS. M (figs 16–17).

We discover iconographic directions for illustrators in Paolino’s handwriting in two places in MS. L1. The first is the column of Venetian doges on ff. 34v and 35v; here, next to each magister militum (the five military officers who ruled Venice between 737 and 742), we can read sine frissio, heavily abbreviated. The word frissio refers in this instance to the brim of the ducal biretta (today usually called corno), a detail of which Paolino, a Venetian citizen, must have been particularly aware. In MS. M, sine frissio was written only once, next to the head of the first magister (f. 59v). In MS. M, the five magistri were represented bareheaded; in MS. L1, instead, the first magister (f. 34v) wears a coif, whilst the others (f. 35v) wear biretta with gilded brims, just like the doges represented in the same column. Thus the last four instructions seem to have been overlooked by the illustrator. The second place is the Linea regularis imperatorum Alemanorum (f. 40v). Here, we read sine corona (without a crown) below the head of Louis IV (fig. 18). These sine corona are numerous in MS. M, and can be seen as well in a later version of the Compendium, MS. P1, dated to c. 1329 (figs 19–20). Louis IV is one of the six medieval emperors in the Linea regularis whose gilded crowns were scraped after their heads had been completed – the same happened in MS. M to four of these emperors. So this instruction could have been intended as a correction. However, in MS. M only two out of many sine corona were written next to heads whose crowns were scraped, in every other instance, the instruction appears next to a head drawn without crown, including Louis IV (fig. 19). Therefore, as with sine frissio, this instruction may have been overlooked by the illustrator, but in this case a correction was made at the end.

MS. L1 contains instructions for rubricators and illustrators by two other hands. Those for rubricators appear in the upper margins; some were intended for titles of synchronic tables, others for rubrics heading expositions. The first hand only appears in the first sexternion; rubricators appear in the upper margins; some were intended for titles of synchronic tables, Compendium P1, MS. M, etc. These instructions seem to be in Paolino’s hand, and the same abbreviations were used in MS. M (fig. 15). This hand also inserted instructions for two corrections on f. 38v. The first, iste

---

82 MS. L1, ff. 12v, 18r, 24v, 26r, 40v, 41r, 52r.
83 MS. M, ff. 5v, 6v, 25v, 29v, 32v, 33v, 35v, 50v, 51v.
84 Huldah and Judith (f. 11v); Esther (f. 12v); Mary, wife of Zebedee, and Mary, wife of Alpheus (f. 17v).
85 On the magistri militum, see A. Da Mosto, I dogi di Venezia (Venice, 1939), p. 34. Military rule was established after the murder of Orso Dandolo; the magistri militum were: Leo, Felix, Deusdedit, Julianus, and Iohannis. Paolino’s list does not completely match: Dominicus, Felix, Julianus, Deusdedit, and Iohannis.
86 Probably deriving from the medieval Latin word frissium, meaning the border decorated with Phrygian work (gold embroidery and gems) of a papal mitre or tiara. See C. Du Cange et al., Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis, 10 vols (Graz, 1954), vol. iii, col. 613. A fifteenth-century account of the ceremony of the Marriage of the Sea (the ceremony of the investiture of the doge) describes the doge wearing ‘la bireta de zetonino rosso cum uno frisso d’oro a circho’ (Milan, Archivio di Stato, Cart. Dipl., Venetiis, die XXIII, 1476, Mag. IIII. et ex. principi Domino duci Mediolani; cited in Pompeo Molmenti, V enice: Its Individual Growth from the Earliest Beginnings to the Fall of the Republic, trans. H. F. Brown, 6 vols (1906–07), vol. i, pp. 213–14). Corno derives from the expression ‘biretta col’corno’ (biretta with a horn).
87 Known as Louis ‘the child’, he was the last Carolingian ruler of East Francia.
88 MS. L1: Louis IV, Conrad I, and Henry I (f. 40v); Rudolph I (f. 57v); Adolph (f. 58v); Albert I (f. 59v). MS. M: Henry I (f. 67v); Rudolph (f. 84v); Adolph (f. 85v); Albert (f. 86v).
89 Rudolph (f. 84v); Albert (f. 86v).
90 Instructions by the first hand: de hereda (f. 3r); explicatio del temps de la captivitat (f. 11v); explicatio de xerze, explicatio de duci (f. 12v); linea contingencium (ff. 12v, 15v). By the second hand: de gestis sanctorum (ff. 20v, 21v, 22v); regis ungarie (59v). The first has an oblique ductus; the second is more cursive, with more ample strokes and pronounced loops.
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*Fig. 14.* Eg. MS. 1500, detail of fol. 40r.

*Fig. 15.* BNMV, MS. Zanetti 399, detail of f. 32v (photograph: by permission of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana).

*Fig. 16.* Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 11v.

*Fig. 17.* BNMV, MS. Zanetti Lat. 399, detail of f. 11v (photograph: by permission of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana).

*Fig. 18.* Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 40v.

*Fig. 19.* BNMV, MS. Zanetti Lat. 399, detail of f. 66v (photograph: by permission of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana).

*Fig. 20.* BnF, MS. lat. 4939, detail of f. 76r (photograph: by permission of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France).
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dicitur habere coronam (this one, it is said, has a crown), was intended for the head of Odo, tutor of Charles the Simple, king of France (the correction was carried out, and three points were added to Odo’s beret). The second reads iste lineae fiant de rubro (make these lines red). It was written next to two faint pen-and-ink lines connecting the regnal table of France, and therefore the head of Charles the Bald (represented here as a king) with his head in the Linea regularis, where he is portrayed as emperor.

The instructions still visible in MS. L, not only constitute evidence of the making process of the manuscript; they also shed light on the involvement of Paolino in this process. Those in his handwriting appearing in the upper margins were probably penned in the very first phase of production – that is, once the five sexternions had been assembled and were ready for ruling. These instructions were probably not only intended for rubricators; they also served to indicate the position of the synchronic tables. The reason why not all the instructions for synchronic tables were written by Paolino may be that at this stage their placement had not yet been completely decided. The other instructions appearing in the upper margins of the first sexternion are, we can assume, by the first scribe, who wrote most of the text on ff. 3r–32r. Those appearing with titles written by the second rubricator are very probably by the third scribe (Manus Secunda), since they are likely to have been the same person.91

These instructions, presumably by the first and the third scribe, verify that Paolino did not oversee the production of the Abreujamen alone. On the one hand, he could have communicated instructions to scribes either orally or with notes written on other supports. On the other hand, the fact that only ff. 3v–17r contain instructions for female names in Paolino’s handwriting may indicate that he became less engaged in the project after the completion of this section. There is further evidence supporting this claim. In MS. M and MS. L,  the abbreviation accn (of accidencia) was used as an instruction for the title contingencia (figs 14–15). In MS. M and MS. P, the title is always contingencia or Linea contingencium, but never accidencia (fig. 15). Yet in MS. L, the title contingencia is replaced by accidencia after f. 17r, so the scribe appears to have followed the instruction literally (fig. 14). As to Paolino’s iconographic directions (occurring in the middle of sexternion III and at the beginning of sexternion IV) these were probably inserted before heads were sketched, thus probably after the layout had been inked, and names labelling heads had been written. Since there is evidence that the layout was inked at several stages, we may assume that these instructions were inserted during the second half of the production process.92 Moreover, the fact that the heads of the same four emperors had their crowns scraped in MS. M and MS. L, may indicate that corrections were carried out at the same time in both manuscripts. Were this the case, since we know that Paolino took MS. M with him when he left Avignon in 1324, he would have overseen the production of the Abreujamen to its very last phase.93

The making of the Abreujamen according to its illustrations

The illustrations of the first sexternion of MS. L, were completed after the text blocks had been transcribed, and titles, rubrics, and names labelling heads had been written.94 However,

91 See pp. 7–8, above.
92 In sexternions IV and V, the upper margins are demarcated by a horizontal line, which was omitted in sexternions II and III. The shades of red ink used for the tabulation also change in each sexternion.
93 First, some passages and illustrations in MS. P, (Naples, c. 1329) were copied from MS. M (for instance, the genealogy of classical deities on f. 15r). Second, Paolino sketched a mythological diagram in MS. M (f. 88v) which was reproduced in the Genealogia deorum by Paolo da Perugia, librarian of king Robert. See T. Hankey, ‘Un nuovo codice delle Genealogie deorum di Paolo da Perugia’, pp. 78–85.
94 This was the most common practice; see Alexander, Medieval Illuminators, p. 40. The tabulation red lines are visible through the paint film of a few heads in the first sexternion, and in the same gathering we can clearly see script overlapping these lines.
for sexternions III-V, there is evidence that text was added after the illustrations had been executed.\(^95\) The illustrations of the *Abruyamen* present varying degrees of completion. The first sexternion (ff. 3-14) is illustrated with heads fully finished in opaque painting (figs 1, 10, 12, 16, 21), with the exception of four line drawings coloured with washes, and two pen-and-ink sketches.\(^96\) In the second sexternion (ff. 15-26), the first illustrated folios (15v-17r) combine fully painted heads with heads with clothes and hair finished in opaque paint and faces only sketched in pale ink. Those in ff. 17v-26v are fully painted, but the technique is slightly different from that used for the first sexternion, as here faces are modelled with more contrasting shades (figs 24-25). The third sexternion (ff. 27-38) is illustrated with half-finished heads like those appearing on ff. 15v-17r (figs 13, 35). But in this sexternion, faces were modelled with washes, with the exception of the Saracen kings, who are finished in black pigment, and three heads sketched in pen-and-ink with almost no colouring.\(^97\) In the fourth sexternion (ff. 39-50), male heads are executed just like those illustrating the preceding sexternion, but here, uncoloured pen-and-ink sketches are more numerous than in the preceding gathering (fig. 38).\(^98\) In this sexternion, female heads are fully finished in opaque painting (fig. 37), as are the scenes of the Crusades, which are embellished with gold and silver leaf (fig. 31). This quire also includes maps of Acre and Jerusalem (which were probably coloured by the illuminators who painted the Crusade scenes).\(^99\) The fifth and last sexternion (ff. 51-60) is illustrated like the previous gathering, but here, female heads are less delicately finished and white male heads are tinted in a more careless manner, some with a pigment that has oxidized.

Two distinct artistic personalities can be identified in the fully painted miniatures of MS. *L*\(^5\). The first was, in every likelihood, an experienced miniaturist who worked with at least one assistant. He was responsible for the execution of all the fully painted heads in the first and second sexternions (figs 1, 10, 12, 16, 21, 24-25). This artist appears to have possessed a remarkable ability for creating physiognomic diversity, which can be particularly appreciated in the genealogical scheme of classical deities (fig. 21). His three-quarter profiles present three basic shapes (rounded, triangular and oval), which he adapts by changing their inclination and shapes of noses, chins and foreheads, and by combining them with a variety of hair styles, beards, and headwear. For this reason, I have named this illuminator the Versatile Master. The second artistic personality was responsible for the cycle on the Crusades and the female heads in the fourth and fifth sexternions (figs 31, 37). His female heads, whether represented frontally or in three-quarter profile, all present the same facial type and stern expression. Likewise, his painting technique is more limited than the Versatile Master’s. Because of his fierce ladies and battle scenes, I have baptised this illuminator the Belligerent Master.

Each of these two illuminators has been associated by Francesca Manzari with a group of miniatures in manuscripts produced in Avignon at the time.\(^100\) In the first group are included those in Paris, BnF, MS. lat. 17336, a pontifical executed, according to François Avril, sometime between 1305 and 1314.\(^101\) Manzari merely suggested that its miniatures present ‘some analogies’ with those in the genealogies in MS. *L*\(^5\). However, in terms of style and

---

95 This is particularly evident on ff. 32v-36r, the text of which, according to Ibarz, was the last to be completed in the manuscript; see pp. 7–8, above.
96 Folios 4v and 11v, and 7r (respectively).
97 Folios 35v and 37v, and 31v and 35v (respectively).
98 Folios 41r, 42v, 43v, 44v.
99 The treatment of water, for example, is the same in the maps and in the scene of the Crusades on f. 51v.
100 Manzari, *La miniatura ad Avignon*, pp. 76 (for the attribution) and 33-34, 53-72 (for each group of manuscripts).
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Fig. 21. Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 7r.
Fig. 22. BnF, MS. lat. 17336, f. 35v (photograph: by permission of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France).
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*Fig. 23.* Detail of fig. 22.

*Fig. 24.* Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 19v.

*Fig. 25.* Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 23r.

*Fig. 26.* Detail of fig. 22.

*Fig. 27.* Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 17r.

*Fig. 28.* Detail of fig. 22.
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execution, the similarities with those by the Versatile Master are significant. In the miniature representing the coronation of an emperor in the pontifical we discover the same repertory of facial types appearing in MS. *L*₁ (fig. 22). Moreover, the resemblance between the pope and the emperor depicted in this miniature and those in the second sexternion of MS. *L*₁ is striking (figs 23–26). The female head decorating the lower margin is closely comparable to the mother of Joseph in the genealogy of Christ in MS. *L*₁ (figs 27–28). What is more, in both manuscripts the underdrawing of figures whose paint film has been lost or become translucent reveals consistent similarities (figs 28, 32). In brief, there are enough reasons to go one step further than Manzari and to propose that the principal illuminator of MS. lat. 17336 is our Versatile Master.

As to the second illuminator of MS. *L*₂, the Belligerent Master, Manzari proposed that his work was ‘close’ to the workshop of the *Liber visionis Ezechielis*. This proposal is not as convincing as that concerning the first illuminator. The human figures ascribed to the *Liber visionis* workshop present heavy contour lines and seem static in terms of expressions and movement. By contrast, the line work by the Belligerent Master is looser, and his figures are more dynamic and expressive. In another evangelary *ad usum romanum* (AvBM, MS. 24), there is an historiated initial which, in my opinion, was executed by our Belligerent Master.

This manuscript also contains two grotesques with human heads convincingly ascribed by Manzari to the illuminator of MS. lat. 17336, our Versatile Master (fig. 29). The initial is the only illustration in the manuscript which is not in the style of the Versatile Master (fig. 30). It represents the Birth of St John the Baptist; despite their happier expressions, the faces of Elizabeth and the new-born Baptist are closely comparable to those of the women and children depicted in the Crusade scenes of MS. *L*₁, and the line work seems to be the same (fig. 31). It is known that this evangelary comes from the cathedral of Avignon, Notre-Dame-des-Doms. Like MS. 23 (mentioned earlier), it was probably commissioned as a result of the initiative taken in 1320 by John XXII to replace liturgical books by new ones *ad usum romanum*.

Though this may not be obvious at simple glance, the Versatile and the Belligerent Masters were also responsible for the heads with unpainted faces and the pen-and-ink sketches scattered throughout MS. *L*₂. With a few exceptions, those in the third and the fourth sexternions can be associated with the Versatile Master. The evidence for this attribution is found in the genealogy of Christ (f. 17r). The paint film of the head representing Mary, the

---


105 See p. 14, above.
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**Fig. 29.** AvBM, MS. 24, detail of f. 7r  
(photograph: Institut de recherche et d’histoire des textes; by permission of the Bibliothèque Municipale d’Avignon).

**Fig. 30.** AvBM, MS. 24, detail of f. 139r  
(photograph: Institut de recherche et d’histoire des textes; by permission of the Bibliothèque Municipale d’Avignon).

**Fig. 31.** Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 46r.
wife of Alpheus, has become translucent enough to reveal the preliminary drawing (fig. 32). Her features were sketched in the same manner as one of the unpainted faces on the same folio, Ismeria, mother of Elisabeth (fig. 33). The same pen lines can be seen in the heads that have partially lost their paint film in the first and second sexternions. What is more, the male faces left unpainted on f. 17r are strikingly similar in terms of technique and style to those in sexternions III-IV (figs 34-35), and to four heads executed only in line in sexternion I (ff. 4v, 11v), which were probably added after heads had been painted in this quire.

The Belligerent Master was responsible for the male heads in the fifth sexternion and those in the other three sexternions which are not in the style of the Versatile Master. This proposal cannot be verified with technical evidence and relies solely on stylistic analysis. The three-quarter profiles of men in the fifth sexternion and those of women in the fourth and fifth sexternions present consistent physiognomic analogies: almond-shaped eyes with extended outer corners; the base of the nose is sketched with a concave line without defining the alae; and both men and women look in an exaggerated manner out of the corners of their eyes (figs 36-37).

If MS. L contains such a large number of half-finished illustrations and sketches, we can assume this is because the Versatile and the Belligerent Masters could not complete the project as originally planned. The manner in which heads in their respective styles are distributed in the manuscript, especially in sexternion IV, may suggest that the two illuminators shared the commission, a hypothesis supported by the presence of miniatures by the two artists in AvBM, MS. 24 (figs 29-30). Two illuminators and their respective assistants working simultaneously would have considerably accelerated the production of MS. L. If so, the first three sexternions could have been assigned to the Versatile Master, the fifth to the Belligerent Master, and it would have been decided that in the fourth sexternion the Versatile Master was to execute the male heads, and the Belligerent Master the female heads.

However, if Versatile and Belligerent did indeed work in collaboration, this would have only occurred at the stage when the preliminary drawing was carried out on sexternions III, IV, and V. There are enough reasons to suppose that the Versatile Master completed ff. 3-17r as a discrete unit, and that at that time no other illustration work was being carried out in the manuscript. As mentioned above, the differences in execution between the heads illustrating folios 3-17r and those appearing on ff. 17v-26v are notable. The half-finished heads on ff. 15v-17r may indicate that there was a pressing reason to complete the first section, and that the Versatile Master ran out of time (perhaps because of another engagement). Moreover, as mentioned above, the layout changes on f. 17v, and from here onwards the Linea contingencium becomes accidencia. Taken together, these observations suggest that an interruption occurred in the production of the Abreujamen once text and illustrations had been completed up to f. 17r.

The Versatile Master very probably did not participate in the last phases of production of MS. L. The sketches drawn by the Versatile Master in sexternions III and IV were, in all likelihood, completed by the Belligerent Master or by his assistants. All the clothes in sexternions III-IV are finished in his line style, and the tiaras of the popes depicted in these gatherings resemble more those in sexternion V than those in sexternion II (figs 13, 25). More revealingly, in every sexternion we find heads sketched in pen and ink in the style of the Belligerent Master, but with almost no colouring (fig. 38). These heads, in total twenty-five, can be identified as last-minute additions to the illustrative programme. They all are

108 Enoch (f. 3r); Aurelian (f. 32v); Constantine, emperor of Constantinople (f. 25v).
109 In sexternion II, tiaras are conical (fig. 25), whereas in sexternions III-V tiaras are dome-shaped and have a decorative vertical band. In sexternion III, popes wearing tiaras alternate with popes wearing mitres (fig. 13).
110 Alchimena and Electra (f. 7r); Liberius (f. 26r); Arnold (f. 31v); Carloman I (f. 35v); Leo V, Christopher, and Anastasius (f. 41r); Péter, Aha, Péter, Andrew, and Henry ‘the dead’ (f. 42v); László (f. 43v); Béla (f. 44v); Géza (f. 49v); László and his brother (f. 51v); Béla (f. 53r); Emeric (f. 53v); Stephen (f. 56r); Urban IV and Clemens III (f. 57v); Ayton (f. 57v); Charles (f. 59v).
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**Fig. 32.** Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 17r.

**Fig. 33.** Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 17r.

**Fig. 34.** Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 17r.

**Fig. 35.** Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 33v.
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Fig. 36. Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 40v.

Fig. 37. Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 43v.

Fig. 38. Eg. MS. 1500, detail of f. 42v.

Fig. 39. BNMV, MS. Zanetti Lat. 399, detail of f. 70 (photograph: by permission of the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana).
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accompanied by names written by the third scribe (*Manus Secunda*).\(^{111}\) Eighteen appear inside diagrams clumsily traced (obviously not part of the initial layout);\(^ {112}\) five were drawn outside their respective columns;\(^ {113}\) and nine of them and their floating niches were sketched on scraped areas of parchment.\(^ {114}\) Likewise, the crowns of demoted emperors were probably scraped at this stage, since their hair was redrawn in the same manner as the last-minute additions, and, apparently, with the same pen (fig. 18).\(^ {115}\)

These last-minute additions constitute evidence supporting the argument that Paolino oversaw the final phase of production of the *Abreujamen*. Of twenty-five, fourteen occur in the regnal table of Hungary.\(^ {116}\) With one exception, these fourteen additions correspond to entries which seem to have been inserted in MS. *M* after most of the text blocks and names labelling heads had been written.\(^ {117}\) These entries do not include heads, but consist of names and crowns, in some instances, accompanied by short passages of text. These names, crowns and texts are executed in a distinctive reddish-brown shade of ink, indicating that they all were added in a single campaign (fig. 39).\(^ {118}\) This is too much of a coincidence; therefore, there are very strong chances that Paolino made additions to the Hungarian regnal lists in MS. *M* while he was still in Avignon, and that he oversaw the last corrections to the illustrations of MS. *L*.

**Conclusion**

We can assume that MS. *L* was initially intended as a luxury manuscript, with a laboriously executed tabulation, and a large number of illustrations in miniature painting. As production advanced, the making of the manuscript became increasingly less careful, as revealed by the sloppy manner in which the tabulation was inked in the last sexternions, and the number of sketches and half-finished miniatures. This suggests that there were pressing reasons to complete the project. Paolino was probably personally involved in the early stages of production of MS. *L*. This is supported by the inclusion throughout the manuscript of instructions in his handwriting for titles of synchronic tables, and by those for female names appearing in the first section. The two sets of iconographic directions by Paolino were, most likely, inserted well into the second half of the production process, and there is evidence to

---

\(^{111}\) See pp. 7–8, above.

\(^{112}\) Liberius (f. 26r); Arnold (f. 31v); Carloman I (f. 35v); Péter, Aba, Péter, Andreas, and Henry ‘the dead’ (f. 42v); László (f. 43v); Béla (f. 44v); Géza (f. 49v); László and his brother (f. 51v); Béla (f. 53r); Emeric (f. 53v); Stephen (f. 56r); Aytón (f. 57v); Charles (f. 59v).

\(^{113}\) Leo V, Christopher, and Anastasius (f. 41r); Urban IV, and Clemens III (f. 57r).

\(^{114}\) Péter, Aba (Aba Samuel), Péter, Andrew (András or Endre), and Henry ‘the dead’ (f. 42v); László (Ladislas) (f. 43v); Béla (f. 44v); László and his brother (f. 51v).

\(^{115}\) See p. 19, above.

\(^{116}\) Péter, Aba, Péter, Andrew, and Henry ‘the dead’ (f. 42v); László (f. 43v); Béla (f. 44v); Géza (f. 49v); László and his brother (f. 51v); Béla (f. 53r); Emeric (f. 53v); Stephen (f. 56r); Charles (f. 59v).

\(^{117}\) MS. *M*: Péter, Aba, Péter, Andrew, and Henry ‘the dead’ (f. 70v); László (f. 71v); Béla (f. 73v); Géza (f. 76v); László, and his brother (f. 79v); Béla (f. 80r); Emeric (f. 81r); Stephen (f. 83r). Charles (MS. *L*, f. 59v) is not portrayed in MS. *M*; however, in MS. *M* the Hungarian lineage is not represented after f. 84v.

\(^{118}\) Léglu suggested that the source of these entries is Simon of Kéza’s *Gesta Hungarorum*, which is known to have been used by Paolino in his *Satyrica ystoria*: Catherine Léglu, ‘Lost in Translation: Hungarians and Fauns in the Occitan translation of Paolino da Venezia’s *Compendium* (British Library MS. Egerton 1500)’, paper presented at the colloquium ‘Língua Francesa on the Middle Ages: Non-Native Vernacular Use in Medieval European Culture’ (Jesus College, Oxford, June 2012). Paolino could have had access to a copy of the *Gesta* in Venice or in Avignon. See L. Veszprémy, ‘La tradizione unno-magiara nella “cronaca universale” di Fra’ Paolino da Venezia’, in S. Graciotti and C. Vasoli (eds.), *Spiritualità e lettere nella cultura italiana e ungherese del basso medioevo* (Florence, 1995), pp. 355-75 (pp. 357-8, 370).
suggest that he oversaw the completion of the manuscript. The departure of Paolino from Avignon in 1324 seems, therefore, a convincing terminus ante quem for the production of the Abreujamen, and may as well explain the hurry in which the manuscript appears to have been completed. After Paolino’s departure, it is reasonable to assume that the third scribe (Manus Secunda) continued to transcribe texts into the quires today forming MS. L2, in order to complete the codex as it was then intended (but probably not as planned when the production of the Abreujamen began).

As to when the production of MS. L1 started, this is more difficult to prove, but we have some significant clues. There are ample grounds for supposing that the production of MS. M begun before January 1321, and no evidence to suggest that this happened after February 1322. Taking this into account, it seems highly likely that MS. L1, was started in 1321. By the time this occurred, the first section of MS. M might have been only partially completed; afterwards, work was probably carried out simultaneously on both manuscripts, MS. M being ahead of MS. L1, but at some points only just so. Alternatively, the production of MS. L1, could have been undertaken once Paolino returned to Avignon, so in late 1322 or some months afterwards. Were this the case, MS. L1, would have been executed in around one year and a half at most, which seems quite improbable given the hiatuses in the production process suggested by internal evidence. The first interruption appears to have occurred once f. 17r had been completed. This hiatus could well have taken place in 1322, during Paolino’s absence. By the time he left Avignon in February 1322, all the text would have been transcribed in this section, and its illustrations could have been on the way to completion. Paolino, with little doubt, took MS. M with him to Venice, and this may have caused considerable problems to the makers of the Abreujamen. Granted, he could have provided them with notes and sketches, yet these would have not constituted sufficient material to continue working during his absence. So after the Versatile Master completed the illustration of ff. 3r-17r, work would have resumed but carried on sporadically, coming to a complete standstill probably when the first scribe left the project. With Paolino’s return to Avignon, the second scribe (Manus Tertia) would have resumed writing text in MS. L1, and the Versatile Master would have completed the illustrations in sexternion II. However, as Paolino was appointed bishop and prepared to leave Avignon, it would have been necessary to speed up production. The third scribe (Manus Secunda) would have then joined the project and another illuminator, the Belligerent Master, would have been called in. But by the time the remaining sexternions had been sketched, the Versatile Master appears to have abandoned the project. His departure, in all likelihood, presented another obstacle for the timely completion of the illustration campaign, so it would have been then decided that in sexternions IV and V only the female heads and the Crusade scenes were to be completed in miniature painting.

The evidence presented in this article strongly suggests that Paolino was not the only person to oversee the production of the Abreujamen, and that other men took important decisions, most probably the scribes. But who were they? Thorough palaeographical study of MS. L1 and MS. L2, may help to answer this question. But the most puzzling question is for whom the Abreujamen was intended. Pope John XXII and his cardinals seem unlikely candidates for a vernacular compilation, even though there is evidence to suggest that the manuscript was produced by scribes and illuminators working for the papal curia. The following two articles in the Electronic British Library Journal shed light on this fascinating question.119
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