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TWO PETALS OF A FLEUR
THE “COPENHAGEN FLEUR DES HISTOIRES” AND THE PRODUCTION OF ILLUMINATED MANUSCRIPTS IN BRUGES AROUND 1480

BY
HANNO WIJSMAN

The 4000 or so manuscripts which count Otto Thott (1703-1785) bequeathed to the Royal Library of Denmark contain a certain number of Southern Netherlandish illuminated manuscripts dating from the fifteenth century. Many of them originate from the collection of the Nassau family, which was partially dispersed at a sale in The Hague in 1749. But Thott’s collection had many sources. Among the Southern Netherlandish manuscripts that he had acquired by other means, there is a manuscript that has received relatively little attention until now. The neglect is unjust, as I would like to argue in this article.

1 I have presented some of the matters discussed in this article in a highly abbreviated form in Hanno Wijsman: Handschriften voor het hertogdom. De mooiste verluchte manuscripten van Brabantse hertogen, edellieden, kloosterlingen en stedelingen, Alphen aan de Maas 2006, p. 74-81. The research for this article has been made possible by the Interuniversity Attraction Poles Programme – Belgian Science Policy (phase V, nr. 10), the ‘Niels Stensen Stichting’ in Amsterdam, the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), and by the Faculty of Humanities of Leiden University. For their help in the preparation of this article I am much indebted to François Avril, Arnoud-Jan Bijsterveld, Ivan Boserup, Bernard Bousmanne, Anne van Buren, Martine De Reu, Jean-Michel Ennuyer, Marie-Thérèse Gousset, Jörn Günther, Jelle Haemers, Ilona Hans-Collas, Dirk Imhof, Léon van Liebergen, Hélène Loyau, Jim Marrow, Scot McKendrick, Jean Picardeau, Pascal Schandel, Emanuelle Toulet, Christiane Van den Bergen-Pantens, and Dominique Vanwijnsberghe. I am very grateful to Graeme Small for his invaluable help with improving the English of this article.


3 Although the manuscript has been included in several catalogues: N.C.L. Abrahams: Description des manuscrits français du moyen âge de la Bibliothèque Royale de Copenhague,
The manuscript was described as follows in the 1795 printed catalogue of the Thott bequest:

*Chroniques en brief des Empereurs Romains et Roix de France, intitulés des quarts Volumes de la Fleur des histoires*. Cod. amplus membran. rubris miniatis et literis initialibus deauratis, nonnullis etiam figuri-
ris eleganter pictis ornatus.4

As this entry makes plain, the volume deals with Roman and French history and forms part of a work known as the *Fleur des histoires*. The complex manner in which this huge universal history was compiled by Jean Mansel (1400/1401-1473/1474) cannot be treated here in any depth: we will simply refer to the work that has been done, and present the current state of knowledge of the manuscripts.5 The first modern study of the *Fleur des histoires* was published by Léopold Delisle in 1900; Guy De Poerck expanded and added further to that research in 1936.6 A recent partial edition of the text of the first version by Nicolas and Odette Orloff-Govaerts remains, unfortunately, unpublished, as do two dissertations on the subject.7


4 *Catalogi Bibliothecæ Thottianæ, Tomus septimus libros cum … ad annum MDXXX excusos tum manuscriptos continens*, Copenhagen 1795, p. 321 (nr. 568 2°).

5 *Grundriss der romanischen Literaturen des Mittelalters. Vol. X/2, La littérature historiogra-
phique des origines à 1500*, Heidelberg 1993, part II, p. 122-124; Robert Bossuat, Louis Pi-


7 Unpublished edition: Nicolas et Odette Orloff-Govaerts (eds.): *Jean Mansel, La Fleur des histoires, premier livre* (avec notes, index et glossaire), 3 volumes, Saint-Pierre-de-
Chignac – Le Royalet-sous-l’Alisier 1998. Copies are kept in the Royal Library of Bel-
The primary aim of this article is to present the Thott manuscript together with its accompanying volume, which the Royal Library of Denmark was able to acquire in 2008 from a French private collector (see ill. 1 and 2). From now on we can designate these reunited volumes as the (still incomplete) “Copenhagen Fleur des histoires”. Secondly, we will trace the history of the two volumes and replace them in their original context of manuscript production in Bruges in the late fifteenth century.

Jean Mansel and his universal history

Jean Mansel was born in 1400 or 1401 as the son of an office-holder at the court of Burgundy. He also remained all his life in the service of the dukes of Burgundy Philip the Good and Charles the Bold. Based in the city of Hesdin, he held several important financial offices in Hesdin and in Artois. However, nowadays, he is better remembered as the author of his historiographical work.

It has logically been assumed that Jean Mansel made his work for the duke in whose service he worked. It is nonetheless odd that the text in most of the surviving manuscripts of the work does not contain a dedication to the duke. Furthermore, the copy of the Fleur des histoires in the library of the duke, the oldest surviving manuscript, bears neither a frontispiece with a book presentation to the duke, nor the duke’s arms anywhere, as do other important ducal acquisitions from this period. These arguments led De Poerck to conclude that the first version of the Fleur des histoires was neither ordered by the duke nor presented to him. The first statement may be true, but


\[8\] Copenhagen, KB, Acc. 2008/74. The previous owner of the manuscript, Mr. Jean-Michel Ennuyer, Cosne-sur-Loire, France, was kind enough to deposit the manuscript in the Royal Library, Copenhagen, for a period of several months in 2005, in order to have them studied together. In 2006-2007, the two manuscripts were exposed in one and the same showcase during an exhibition in the Museum for Religious Art in Uden (Netherlands), for which I would once again like to express my sincere gratitude to the owner of the first volume, to Ivan Boserup, Keeper of manuscripts and rare books at the Royal Library of Denmark, and to Léon van Liebergen, Director of the Museum for Religious Art in Uden. In December 2008 the two volumes of the “Copenhagen Fleur des histoires” were definitively reunited.


\[10\] De Poerck 1936, p. 80.
in place of the second I would like to make a different suggestion, as others have done before me.

The *Fleur des histoires* was composed in the years 1446-1451. It seems impossible to imagine a fifteenth-century author compiling such a huge work without planning to present it to someone, if only to be rewarded for it and to get the work known. It is more than probable that Jean Mansel wrote his compilation with the intention of offering it to Philip the Good. After all, Mansel was in the service of this duke for all his life. Moreover when Mansel started his work on the project, Philip had just begun to take a keen interest in manuscript acquisition. Philip’s taste for texts and (illuminated) manuscripts can be dated from 1445 onwards.\(^\text{11}\)

Thus it seems highly likely that Jean Mansel wrote the text for Philip the Good and offered it to him.\(^\text{12}\) Why the text and the ducal copy bear no special ownership marks remains a problem, however.\(^\text{13}\) Perhaps the compilation did not interest the duke very much at first (or at least the author feared this might be the case), leading Mansel to have a copy made which could be presented to an alternative addressee in the event of a refusal? After all, the making of a richly illuminated manuscript represented quite an investment. In any case, the presence of what seems to be the oldest copy of the first version of the *Fleur des histoires* in the ducal library at the death of Philip the Good in 1467, as well as the existence of other prestigious copies that bear the dedication to the duke within their text, remain strong arguments.\(^\text{14}\) We must conclude that even if Philip the Good may not have


\(^{12}\) See also Nicole Reynaud’s conclusions in François Avril and Nicole Reynaud: *Les Manuscrits à peintures en France 1440-1520*, exhib. cat., Paris 1993, p. 84-87.


\(^{14}\) A copy of the first version, though dated around 1480, illustrated with no less than 283 miniatures and containing the dedication to Philip the Good is for example Geneva,
shown much interest in the text, it is probable that Mansel wrote it for him.

A few years later, in 1454, Jean Mansel finished another compilation, the *Histoires romaines abrégées*. The sole surviving manuscript was made for Philip the Good. Not only does it contain his arms, but in 1460 the ducal administration paid the Hesdin miniaturist Loyset Liédet for the illumination of the two volumes. Jean Mansel himself, not as the author, but as financial office-holder of the duke in Hesdin, was involved in the settlement of the transaction. Later still, probably in the years 1464-1467, Jean Mansel finished a second version of his *Fleur des histoires*. It is usually divided into four volumes, into the second of which the *Histoires romaines abrégées* were integrated.

The manuscripts of the *Fleur des histoires*

We should not let ourselves be misled by any modern lack of enthusiasm for the work. Léopold Delisle called the *Fleur des histoires* a ‘vaste et assez indigeste compilation’. As is so often the case, the negative opinion of nineteenth and twentieth-century philologists has tended to direct scholarly attention to other texts which are perceived to be
more poetical or literary in nature. The text might indeed lack originality, and of course the huge size of the *Fleur des histoires* is also a practical reason for the little work that has been done on it. But it cannot be emphasized enough that this modern preference for ‘belles lettres’ over historiography tends to skew our understanding of the fifteenth-century literary world. Chronicles, universal or contemporary, had an enormous importance in the later Middle Ages. They formed the core of princely and noble libraries, and should be considered as texts that really gave a structure to the ‘Weltbild’ of the worldly elite.

The two versions of the *Fleur des histoires* enjoyed considerable success. A large number of manuscripts survives. In 1936, De Poerck listed 53 manuscripts (many of them consisting of several volumes). Since then, a substantial amount of additional information can be added to this list, not least concerning four manuscripts which were listed by De Poerck as lost, and which he designated by the letters A, B, C and D. To my knowledge manuscript C has not reappeared since then (it is still only known by the eighteenth-century description in the sales catalogue of the collection of the Duc de la Vallière). But manuscripts A, B, and D have resurfaced.

Manuscript A, which De Poerck terms ‘Ex Phillipps Barrois 107’, has been acquired in 2008 by the Royal Library of Denmark and will be treated in detail in this article. Manuscript B, ‘Ex Olschki’ was already bought in 1904 by Henry Walters, and is now part of the rich manuscript collection of the Walters Art Museum in Baltimore. Manuscript D, ‘Ex Dietrichstein’, was sold at Sotheby’s in 1997 and is now in the

---


19 Catalogue des livres de la bibliothèque de feu M. le Duc de la Vallière. Première partie, contenant les manuscrits, les premières éditions, les livres imprimés sur vélin et sur grand papier … dont la vente se fera dans les premiers jours du mois de Décembre 1783 (chez Guillaume de Bure fils aîné), Paris 1783, vol. III, p. 44 (nr. 4563) and vol. IV, p. 34 (nr. 4563).

Schoenberg Collection.\textsuperscript{21} This is the missing final volume of the set in the Schottenstift in Vienna, so it should be added to De Poerck’s nr. 4.\textsuperscript{22}

As for his nr. 11, De Poerck accurately states that the manuscript cited by Delisle as having formerly belonged to the collection of Prof. Lammens was acquired by the Royal Library of Belgium in 1855. It is a third volume of the second version. Moreover, in 1970 the same library managed to buy the matching second volume, unknown to De Poerck, complete with its fifteenth-century binding.\textsuperscript{23}

A volume containing part of book 3 of the second version is now in the Public Library of New York.\textsuperscript{24} Two manuscripts of the \textit{Fleur des histoires}, a complete set of the second version and another single volume, were sold at Christies in 2000.\textsuperscript{25} A manuscript formerly kept in Middelburg, but which was lost in 1940, was described as a \textit{Fleur des histoires romaines} and may therefore have been part of Jean Mansel’s text.\textsuperscript{26} A manuscript in Oxford requires further examination before

\textsuperscript{21} Catalogue Sotheby’s (London) 17 June 1997, lot 59; Longboat Key (Florida, USA), L.J. Schoenberg Collection, 98. See: http://dewey.library.upenn.edu/sceti/ljscollection/index.cfm
\textsuperscript{22} Vienna, Schottenstift, 139-140.
\textsuperscript{23} Brussels, KBR, 21252 + 21253 (De Poerck’s nr. 11) with Brussels, KBR, IV 669. Before arriving at its present location this manuscript was sold in Paris (Drouot) on 9/10 April 1927, lot 23; Giraud-Badin, 28 January 1935, lot 15; New York, The Groliers Club, 12 May 1964, lot 115 (Parke-Bernet Sale); Sotheby’s, 9 July 1969, lot 41. The Royal Library of Belgium bought it from the Brussels bookseller Tulkens in 1970. See \textit{Cinq années d’acquisitions 1969-1973}, exhib. cat., Brussels 1975, p. 93-99 (nr. 46).
\textsuperscript{25} The complete four volume set dates from around 1500 and was sold at Christie’s (London), 11 July 2000 as lot 88. It was formerly part of the collections Baron Du Lude, Foyle, Daillon, Robinson, Phillipps (nr. 4415). The single volume, dated in 1474, was sold at Christie’s (London), 11 July 2000 as lot 86 and also at Sotheby’s on 3-12-1951 as lot 20. It was formerly part of the collections Foyle, Du Chastel, Diane de Poitiers, Bragge, Peckover. See the catalogues and the Schoenberg database: http://sceiti.library.upenn.edu/sdm/.
firm conclusions can be reached. A last interesting manuscript is one containing the abbreviated version of the *Chroniques de Hainaut* which Jean Mansel made in order to include it in the second version of his *Fleur des histoires*. A manuscript containing only this text, illuminated by the Master of the Vienna *Chroniques d’Angleterre*, recently came to the surface.

No further information has come to light concerning De Poerck’s nr. 18 (reported in the nineteenth century to be part of the collection of count Jean d’Oultremont, at the castle of Warfuzée, near Liège), nor his nr. 45 (owned in the 1930s by Victor Degrange). But a loose folio of a frontispiece, unknown to De Poerck and cut from a manuscript containing the second version of the *Fleur des histoires*, was acquired by Antiquariat Jörn Günther in 2004. The way in which the fine but stiff human figures and their faces, hair, and skin tone, and also the animals and landscape are treated point to the miniaturist Loyset Liédet, but the miniature is quite atypical of his oeuvre, making a firm attribution difficult. The border decoration is also unlike that of other manuscripts illustrated by Liédet. However, what makes this possible attribution highly interesting is that we know that Liédet illuminated Jean Mansel’s *Histoire romaine* for Philip the Good, and at least one manuscript of the second version is also illustrated in his

---

29 *Cinquantième anniversaire de l’indépendance nationale. Exposition de l’art ancien au Pays de Liège* (catalogue d’exposition), Liège 1881, p. 50 (nr. 328). It might be possible to identify the manuscript as Bruxelles, KBR, IV 669, but evidence is lacking.
30 It is apparently the first folio of a first volume that contained the second version (in four volumes) of the *Fleur des histoires*. See Collecting Miniatures. *Brochure nr. 9*, Dr. Jörn Günther – Antiquariat, Hamburg 2006, nr. 45. I am indebted to Jörn Günther for sending me pictures and a description.
31 Compare for example the miniature on Brussels, KBR, IV 106, f. 53v or the motifs in the borders of Paris, BnF, fr. 2643 and 2644.
32 Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 5087 and 5088. Another manuscript in Philip the Good’s collection, containing the fourth volume of the second version of the *Fleur des histoires*, is also painted in a style akin to Loyset Liédet’s: Brussels, KBR, 9233. See Lyna 1989, p. 95-97 (nr. 263).
Moreover, fellow townsman Jean Mansel and Loyset Liédet knew one another personally.

**Description of the two volumes of our manuscript**

Copenhagen, KB, Thott 568 2° contains the final part of Jean Mansel’s first version of his *Fleur des histoires*. The text covers the reign of the Roman emperor Domitian (81-96) up to the reign of king Charles VI of France (1380-1422). Incipit: *Après la mort titus de debonnaire tint l’empire son frère domitien qui regna xv ans...* (ill. 2). Its accompanying first volume, Copenhagen, KB, Acc. 2008/74, begins at the Creation and breaks off in the first century BC. Incipit: *Comme il appartient a chascun roy avoir en son royaulme trois lieux principaulx, cestassavoir...* (ill. 1).

The first volume is a manuscript on vellum of 254 folios. The original foliation starts at f. I on the frontispiece page and ends at f. CCLVI. The manuscript is not entirely complete. Two folios of text are missing between f. III² XIX (99) and f. CII (102), which means that folios C (100) and CI (101) must have been cut out at some point in the history of the manuscript. Secondly, on folio CCLVIv (256v) the text suddenly breaks off at *En ce temps Arestonicus le bastard d’Aise la Mineur après la mort*. This is almost at the end of the chapter entitled *De la guerre des Romains contre la riche cité de Numance*. Almost twenty chapters are missing as a result, containing mainly an account of Roman history at the time of Julius Cesar. A clumsy later hand added below the last line *de Brutus*, which is neither original nor correct. In the lower margin we read in red capital letters *Ci fini la Fleur des histoires*, which is also a later addition (ill. 5). Apparently the last part of the manuscript was removed at some point, and someone tried to mask this loss. Finally, it is very probable that the volume contained a table at the beginning, as almost all the manuscripts of the *Fleur des histoires* do.

So the volume has suffered: some text is missing, and it is possible that one of the two missing folios C (100) and CI (101) contained a

---

34 Copenhagen, KB, Acc. 2008/74: 254 parchment folios (395 x 295 mm), written in two columns (writing frame 266 x 188 mm) at 38 lines; quires of four bifolios.
35 The missing text can be found in Orloff-Govaerts, I 1998, p. 220-225. It contained two beginnings of chapters: *De Amasias, roy de Juda* and *De Ozias, roy de Juda, et des prophètes de son temps*.
small miniature. At present the manuscript opens with a frontispiece page containing a large miniature (ill. 1). The surface is unfortunately a little worn, but the scene is very refined. In a wide landscape God the Father has just created Adam and Eve, who stand naked among animals of many kinds. Eve clings to Adam’s arm, while Adam seems to show gratitude and respect to God. Among the animals we recognise a lion, a camel, a deer, a goat, and an owl.

The borders are densely decorated with blue-golden acanthus leaves, wild strawberries, bunches of grapes, and several varieties of red and blue flowers. The six-lines-high initial, blue on a golden background, is decorated with trails ending in red and blue three-lobbed leaves.37 Below, in section 5, I will examine the style of miniature and borders more closely.

Several marginal notes were added in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries.38 A parchment note glued to the inner face of the cover reads: *Le f. 101 manq. et q[uel]q[ues] f. à la fin. Col[la]t[ionné].* [monogram] XII-1954. Apparently someone wrote in December 1954 that folio 101 was missing (but seems to have forgotten f. 100), as well as several folios at the end. He signs with a monogram that could include TPR. The present twentieth-century binding of Lavallière morocco over wood, stamped with the arms of Chandon de Briailles is signed by the well known bookbinder Creusevault. It has replaced an older half vellum binding, which was described in sales catalogues of 1901 and 1910. The binder has added one modern vellum fly leaf at the beginning and one at the end.

The accompanying final volume, Thott 568 2o, is a manuscript on vellum of 317 folios, preceded by four folios with a table of contents listing 104 chapters, and two blank folios.39 The explicit on f. 322v (f. CCCXVIIv) reads as follows: *Et tant d’aultres malefices que c’est horreur de recorder et encore est la chose en doubte Dieu par la grace y vueille mettre*

37 The rest of the manuscript contains many other painted initials five, four, and two lines in height, and also numerous painted paragraph signs.
38 f. 85v (LXXIXv), f. 125 (f. CXIX), f. 144 (f. VIxx XVIII), f. 157 (f. VIIxx XI) pen trial, f. 250 (f. CCXLV). The notes on the first three of the mentioned leaves seem to be by one and the same hand, that of a reader who was interested in ecclesiastical and religious matters.
39 323 parchment folios (383 x 272 mm), written in two columns (writing frame 247 x 176 mm) at 29 lines; quires of four bi-folios. The quire consisting of ff. 300 (f. CC IIIxx XV) – 307 (f. CCCII) seems to have been wrongly put in place even before the original foliation was written.
paix et virion a sa loenge de luy au salut des ames et au proufit commun du royaume de france. Amen. The original foliation in Roman numerals starts at the beginning of the text, after the table of contents. A modern foliation in Arabic numerals was added (but not on every folio), and includes the table of contents.40

The script of this volume is larger and more sophisticated than that of the other codex (ill. 3 and 4). The written lines are far fewer in number (29 vs. 38). This volume is far more richly illustrated, with six half page miniatures41 (ill. 2, 6, 9, and 10) and fourteen small column miniatures (ill. 7 and 8). On three folios, full borders were painted: f. 7 (f. I), 108v (f. CIIv), f. 127v (f. CXXIv). On the other folios containing miniatures, the border of the outer margin was decorated, regardless of whether the miniature is painted in the first or the second column, or is even painted over two columns. The borders seem painted by different hands, two of which are responsible for most of them. One of these is the same as the decorator of the border in the other volume. The three full borders are inhabited by hybrid creatures and birds (ill. 2 and 6).

Most of the initials in the volume are champ initials. The large initials accompanying the large miniatures, however, are different. The first three large miniatures, all on folios with full borders, are accompanied by painted initials in bright, fancy colours, lacking the use of gold. The text below the last two large miniatures begins with an initial of the same kind as the one used on the frontispiece page of the first volume. The fourth one is a champ initial, similar to those found elsewhere in the manuscript (ill. 2, 6, 9, and 10).

The subjects of the twenty miniatures are as follows:
• f. 7 (f. I): Emperor Domitian inspecting the building of the Pantheon in Rome (ill. 2)
• f. 108v (f. CIIv): Charlemagne and his army in battle against the count of Hainaut (ill. 6)

---

40 As everywhere in his article, the folio numbers of the Thott volume are given first after the modern (incomplete) Arabic foliation and second, between brackets, after the original Roman foliation, which differs by five or six numbers. The folio numbers in the accompanying first volume are given here in the original Roman foliation and, between brackets, in the corresponding Roman number for easier reading.
41 On f. 7 (f. I); f. 108v (f. CIIv); f. 127v (f. CXXIv); f. 258 (f. CCLIII); f. 275 (f. CCLXIX); f. 290 (f. CC III IV).
• f. 123v (f. CXVIIv): Roland killing the giant Fernagu in a duel (ill. 7) \textsuperscript{42}
• f. 127v (f. CXXIv): The Battle of Roncevaux Pass; in the background Roland is blowing his horn
• f. 187v (f. C IIIXv): King Louis VII having beheaded a citizen of Sens, because inhabitants of his town had murdered the abbot of Saint-Pierre-le-Vif
• f. 196v (f. C IIIIXv): The young king Philip II Augustus (‘dieudonné’) of France in battle
• f. 203v (f. C IIIIXv): King Philip II Augustus landing in France on his return from the Holy Land
• f. 213v (f. CCVIIv): King Richard I (‘Coeur de Lion’) of England arriving at the castle of Challeu (Chalus-Chabrol), during the siege of which he would later be killed (1199) (ill. 8)
• f. 223 (f. CCXVII): Dauphin Louis (later Louis VIII of France), bearing a crown as nominal king of England, and the king of England (1216-1217)
• f. 225 (f. CCXIX): The coronation of the nine-year-old Louis IX of France (Saint Louis), witnessed by his mother Blanche of Castile (1226)
• f. 244 (f. CCXXXIX): King Louis IX of France (Saint Louis) dying in the presence of his sons while on his way to the Holy Land (1270) \textsuperscript{43}
• f. 246 (f. CCXLI): King Philip III (‘the Bold’) of France with his army, chasing Saracens
• f. 258 (f. CCLIII): Philip II, count of Artois, slain by the Flemish at the Battle of the Golden Spurs or Battle of Courtrai (1302)
• f. 264 (f. CCLIX): Marriage between king Philip V’s eldest daughter Jeanne, countess of Burgundy and Artois, and Eudes IV, duke of Burgundy (1318)
• f. 275 (f. CCLXX): Edward III of England landing with his army on the Continent: beginning of the Hundred Years War (1338)
• f. 284 (f. CCLXXIX): The Battle of Crécy (1346) (ill. 9)
• f. 290 (f. CC IIIXV): King John II (‘the Good’) of France taken prisoner by the English at the Battle of Poitiers (1356) (ill. 10)
• f. 297 (f. CC IIIXX): Coronation of King Charles V (‘the Wise’) of France and of his wife, Jeanne of Bourbon (1364)

\textsuperscript{42} This miniature was omitted in Bruun 1890, p. 228-231.
\textsuperscript{43} This miniature was omitted in Bruun 1890, p. 228-231.
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- f. 301 (f. CC III\textsuperscript{XIX} XVI): Treaty of Brétigny between King John II (‘the Good’) of France and King Edward III of England (1360)
- f. 311 (f. CCCVIv): Fighting between the French and English armies

The Thott volume is bound in red morocco over pasteboards with gilt-tooled decoration, and is stamped \textit{Histoire tres ancienne de France – manuscrite} on the spine. This eighteenth-century binding is typical of those made for Robert Harley, first Earl of Oxford (d. 1724), or his son, Edward Harley (1689-1741), especially those made by Jane Steel.\textsuperscript{44} This point indicates that the manuscript probably entered the large English Harley Library in the early eighteenth century.

\textit{The commissioner and the subsequent owners of our manuscript}

A coat of arms was painted on f. I of the first volume, and on f. 7 (f. I), f. 108v (f. CIV) and f. 127v (f. CXIV) of the final volume of our manuscript (ill. 1, 2, and 6). In the first volume, the arms are surmounted by a crest: a dog’s head (\textit{tête de chien}). The arms read as \textit{d’or à la croix de gueules, cantonné de seize alérions d’azur, deux et deux à chaque canton}. These have since long been recognised as the arms of the Montmorency family. This has led to the affirmation that Anne de Montmorency (1492-1567), connétable de France, could have been a former owner.\textsuperscript{45} However, there are no further indications to substantiate the claim.

These arms are not those which originally appeared in the volume, for they have been painted over others.\textsuperscript{46} The original arms, of which


\textsuperscript{45} Thierry Crépin-Leblond: \textit{Livres du connétable. La bibliothèque d’Anne de Montmorency}, exhibit. cat, Ecouen 1991, nr. 47.

\textsuperscript{46} The over-painting of arms was a common practice at the time. Usually the previous arms were first carefully erased, but some pigment and especially metal (silver) always remained in the parchment and can help us now to recognise the erased arms. An example of a manuscript where arms were carefully erased but never replaced by others is Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, ms. 91 (\textit{Histoire des seigneurs de Gavre}; miniature and borders by the Master of he Harley Froissart), where one can discern the remainders of the arms of William Lord Hastings.
only traces are visible, can be reconstituted as those of the Hornes-Gaasbeek family: écartelé; aux 1 et 4, d’or à trois huchets de gueules virevoltés d’argent (Hornes); au 2, d’azur au lion d’argent (Gaasbeek); au 3, d’hermine à la bande de gueules chargée de trois coquilles Saint-Jacques d’or (Hondschoote) (ill. 13).

The over-painting is visible on all four folios, although not at first sight. On f. I of the first volume, careful observation of both sides of the leaf shows the three ‘huchets’ in the third quarter and the ‘bande’ and the silver of the ‘hermine’ in the fourth (ill. 1 and 11). On the frontispiece folio of the final volume, the erasing and the over-painting seem to have been done very carefully. Some traces of the arms underneath remain, but nothing recognisable. On f. 108v (f. CIIv) the Montmorency arms are damaged by humidity and some traces are visible. Much clearer, however, is the off-print that the former arms left on the recto of the facing leaf f. 109 (CIII). Here we discern without any difficulty the lion of the first quarter and traces of the ‘huchets’ and the ‘bande’ in the other quarters (ill. 6 and 12). On f. 127 (f. CXXI), traces of the silver in the ‘hermine’ of the fourth quarter are clearly visible.

The over-painted arms belong to the Hornes-Gaasbeek family, more specifically to Philippe de Hornes, lord of Gaasbeek and Bancigny (1423-1488). Philippe de Hornes grew up at the Burgundian court in the heyday of duke Philip the Good, who reigned from 1419 to 1467. As a young man, in 1442-1443, Philippe de Hornes was serving the duke’s wife, Isabella of Portugal. From 1445 onwards he served the duke himself, first as a chamberlain, later also as councillor. He continued to serve Charles the Bold, Philip the Good’s son and successor, who reigned between 1467 and 1477. When, in January 1477, Charles was slain below the walls of Nancy, the Burgundian territories fell into turmoil. Philippe de Hornes remained a firm pillar of Charles’s daughter, the young Duchess Mary of Burgundy (reigned 1477-1482). He joined her council in March 1477. After Mary’s sudden death in 1482, Philippe de Hornes became embroiled in the severe tensions that rose between the Flemish cities and ducal power. Already in the 1450s Philip had fought for the duke against the rebellious city of Ghent. In 1482 the Flemish banned Philip for 50 years from the county of Flanders because they held him responsible for murdering the Ghent bailiff Jan van Dadizeele. In an attempt to be recognised in Flanders as regent for Mary’s heir, Philip the Fair, Maximilian of Austria (Mary of Burgundy’s widower) removed Philippe
de Hornes from his council. But in the war which followed between Maximilian and the Flemish towns, the lord of Gaasbeek still proved a loyal lieutenant. In the end, this loyalty was to prove fatal to him. Although the sources seem to contradict one another, he apparently survived the siege of the city of Kortrijk in January 1488, but was probably wounded during the hostilities of the following months and died in August 1488.47

Following Philip’s death, the notary Adriaan van den Bliekt drew up an inventory of his estate, dated 20 August 1488, which included his library. In a list of books are mentioned thirteen manuscripts and one printed book which were kept in a ‘rond coffer in de camere beneden’ and one liturgical manuscript, a ‘misboec’, kept in a different chest ‘dat men seegt toebehoerende der capellen op tslot Gaesbeke’ – said to belong to the chapel of Gaasbeek Castle.48 This might not seem to be a large collection, but it is not Philip’s entire library. We have evidence that he owned at least a few other volumes which were apparently not included in the inventory (perhaps because they were kept in one of his other residences). For instance, the inventory lists only one volume (of three or four) of the Fleur des histoires, only two (of three) volumes of Froissart, and only one volume (of two) of Valerius Maximus’s Faits et dits mémorables. There can be no doubt that he had all three volumes of the Froissart and both volumes of the Valerius Maximus, for the manuscripts still exist as sets and they all bear Philip’s arms.49 As for the Valerius Maximus, a very rare contract

49 Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus, M 15.4, 15.5, 15.6 (fr 5); Paris, Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, 5194 and 5195. In these manuscripts the arms of Philippe de Hornes are over-painted by those of Montmorency, as in our two volumes of the Fleur des histoires. See Anne Dubois: La Bibliothèque de Philippe de Hornes, seigneur de Gaesbeek et
between the patron and the scribe-librarian Colard Mansion is even known.\textsuperscript{50}

This inventory also mentions: \textit{Een ander in parkemente gescreven, overdeect met gruenn fluele ghefigureert, gheintituleert “Cy commence la table des rubrices du premier volume de la fleur des histoires, etc.”}. The description matches the first volume of our manuscript. We now know that it was originally bound in green velvet. We also find evidence here to confirm that the volume originally contained a table of contents, which has since been lost.

Now that we have established the earliest owner and commissioner of the two volumes as Philippe de Hornes, it remains to be seen how the manuscript passed to the unknown member of the Montmorency family who has over-painted the Hornes arms with his own. In the exhibition catalogue of 1991, as we have seen, it is suggested that the Thott volume belonged to Anne de Montmorency (1492-1567), connétable de France.\textsuperscript{51} Anne was a son of Guillaume de Montmorency (d. 1531), a brother of Jean I de Montmorency, lord of Nivelles (1422-1477). The Quaritch catalogue of 1902 suggested that the matching first volume bears the arms of the same Jean I de Montmorency, lord of Nivelles (1422-1477). This was a nice hypothesis, but like the other it overlooked the fact that the arms had been over-painted. As we will see, the Hornes and Montmorency families became inextricably linked in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Philippe de Hornes, born in 1423, was a scion of an important noble lineage named after the domain of Horn, near Roermond in modern Dutch Limburg. His parents were Jean de Hornes (d. 1436) and Marguerite de la Trémouille. Philip was at first betrothed to Marguerite de Heinsberg, a niece of Jean de Hornes (d. 1505), bishop of Liège, but he finally married Jeanne de Lannoy (d. ca. 1474), daughter of Jean de Lannoy (1410-1493). From this first marriage Philip had four sons: Arnould (d. 1505/06), who married Marguerite de Lannoy; Jean, who married Adrienne van Ranst; François, lord of un Valère Maxime executé dans l’atelier de Colard Mansion, Bert Cardon, Jan Van der Stock & Dominique Vanwijnsberghe (eds.): \textit{Als ich can. Liber Amicorum in Memory of Professor Dr. Maurits Smeyers (Corpus of Illuminated Manuscripts, 11-12)}, Leuven 2002, p. 611-627, esp. p. 615-616; Wijsman 2003, p. 251-259.

\textsuperscript{50} Dubois 2002, p. 615-616.

\textsuperscript{51} Crépin-Leblond 1991, nr. 47.
Lokeren, who married Isabelle de Halewijn; and Antoine, lord of Hubsart, who remained unmarried. Philip also had at least five bastard children. After the death of Jeanne de Lannoy, Philip remarried his niece Marguerite de Hornes (d. 1518), daughter of Jacques de Hornes (d. 1488), a girl who had been betrothed at first to Philip’s own son Arnould. After Philip’s death, Marguerite remarried Jean II de Montmorency (d. 1510), lord of Nivelles.

The arms of Hornes-Gaasbeek were overpainted with Montmorency at some unknown point in time. Anne Dubois has reconstructed the transmission of Philippe de Hornes’s manuscripts during the first 70 years after the commissioner’s death. The manuscripts were first inherited by Arnould de Hornes (d. 1505/06), Philip’s eldest son. He was betrothed (probably at a very young age) to his cousin, Marguerite de Hornes. The marriage was intended to help resolve a dispute over possession of Gaasbeek between the two branches of the family. But, as we mentioned above, his own father Philip finally married Marguerite. Arnould then married Marguerite de Montmorency, a daughter of Jean de Montmorency and Marguerite de Hornes. Arnould had a long legal dispute with the heirs of his mother and her second husband, Jean de Montmorency (who was also father of Arnould’s own wife), over the dowry of his mother.

The manuscripts would then logically have passed to Arnould’s eldest son, Maximilien de Hornes (d. 1542/43), who was knight of the Golden Fleece and chamberlain of Charles V. In 1504 he married Berbele van Montfoort, a daughter of Jan van Montfoort, and they had seven children. The family quarrels continued, because Philip de Montmorency tried to take Gaasbeek from Maximilien de Hornes. He did not succeed in this, however.

As Maximilien’s eldest son Henri died in 1540, his second son Martin became his main heir. The succession was not greatly to his benefit, for while he may indeed have inherited the family library, he certainly inherited heavy debts to which he added new ones of his own because of his high expenditure in supporting the military expeditions of emperor Charles V. As he could no longer pay his creditors, on 13 May 1549 his possessions and incomes were put under the curatorship

---

52 They had two sons, Maximilien and Martin, and two daughters, Jeanne and Marguerite.
Ill. 2: Copenhagen, KB, Thott 568 2°, f. 7 (f. I). Miniature of the building of the Pantheon, painted collaboratively by the Master of the Harley Froissart and the Master of the Vienna Chroniques d’Angleterre. (Photo: Det Kongelige Bibliotek).
Ill. 3: Copenhagen, KB, Acc. 2008/74, f. IX (9). Example of a text folio. (Photo: The author).

Ill. 4: Copenhagen, KB, Thott 568 2°, f. 279 (f. CCLXXIII). Example of a text folio. (Photo: Det Kongelige Bibliotek).

Ill. 5: Copenhagen, KB, Acc. 2008/74, f. CCLViv (256v). Last page of the manuscript, where the original text breaks off and several words were added later. (Photo: The author).
Ill. 6: Copenhagen, KB, Thott 568 2°, f. 108v (f. CIIv). Miniature of a battle scene, painted by the Master of the chattering hands. (Photo: Det Kongelige Bibliotek).
Ill. 7: Copenhagen, KB, Thott 568 2°, f. 123v (f. CXVIIv): detail. Miniature of Roland killing Fernagu, painted by the Master of the Soane Josephus. (Photo: The author).
Ill. 8: Copenhagen, KB, Thott 568 2°, f. 213v (f. CCVIIv): detail. Miniature of Richard ‘Coeur de Lion’ and his army, painted by the Master of the Soane Josephus. (Photo: Det Kongelige Bibliotek).
Ill. 9: Copenhagen, KB, Thott 568 2°, f. 284 (f. CCLXXIX). Miniature of the Battle of Crécy, painted by the Master of the chattering hands. (Photo: Det Kongelige Bibliotek).

Ill. 12: Copenhagen, KB, Thott 568 2°, f. 109 (f. CIII): detail. Off-set on the parchment of the lower margin of the (mirrored) arms of Hornes-Gaasbeek that were formerly painted on the opposite page (but are now over-painted by those of Montmorency). (Photo: Det Kongelige Bibliotek).

Ill. 13: Reconstruction drawing of the arms of Hornes-Gaasbeek, which were over-painted in four instances in Copenhagen, KB, Acc. 2008/74 and Thott 568 2°. (Drawing: Laure Weill)
Ill. 23: Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus, ms. 15.6, f. 1. Miniature of Edmund of Langley before the King of Portugal, painted by the Bruges master of 1482. (Photo: Museum Plantin-Moretus).
of three lords, among whom there was Philip de Montmorency (1502-1566), lord of Hachicourt. Dubois concludes that this nobleman must have acquired the manuscript collection shortly after, and that in any event the arms must have been over-painted between 1549 and 1566. As Philip de Montmorency died without offspring, the manuscripts were dispersed after his death.55

This reconstruction of Dubois is entirely credible, but though it may well turn out to be accurate, some problems remain and alternative hypotheses cannot be excluded. Among the problems are especially the arms of Marie de Hornes (d. 1558), painted in one of the other manuscripts of Philippe de Hornes, the Froissart now in Antwerp (ill. 21), about which more below. Anne Dubois has supposed that ‘Philippe de Montmorency semble avoir souvent brisé ses armes avec celles de sa mère’.56 But the arms painted in this Froissart manuscript in lozenge-form are clearly the personal arms of a woman, Marie de Hornes. It is not clear why the manuscript would bear the arms of Philip’s mother if it had not been hers at some time. We could, indeed, suppose that Philip de Montmorency gave the manuscript to his mother, but this remains purely hypothetical and quite improbable. It is far more probable that the Antwerp manuscript bears the arms of a couple, i.e. of Philip de Montmorency’s parents. Supposing that the couple Philip de Montmorency (1465/66-1526) and Marie de Hornes (d. 1558) were in possession of the manuscript, an alternative transmission can be formulated as follows.

As we have seen, Philippe de Hornes’s heritage was the subject of a long dispute in the family. Even if Philip’s eldest son was his main heir, it could be that his library (or part of it) remained with his widow, Marguerite de Hornes (d. 1518), and her second husband, Jean II de Montmorency, lord of Nivelles (d. 1510). As they had no children, the books would then have passed to his brother and heir Philip de Montmorency, lord of Nivelles (1465/66-1526). The arms of Marie de Hornes, painted in Philippe de Hornes’s Froissart, lend support to this other provenance, at least in the case of the Antwerp Froissart manuscript.57 Logically the manuscripts would subsequently

57 Marie’s arms are not, as Dubois suggests, painted on an added piece of parchment. As there was no space next to her husband’s arms, they were put below. Later, when that manuscript was rebound and the folios trimmed, an owner took care to spare
have passed to their eldest son Joseph de Montmorency (d. 1530). As he died young, his widow Anna of Egmont (d. 1574) remarried to Jean de Hornes (d. 1540). Her second husband adopted the children of his wife’s first marriage, with the result that Joseph de Montmorency’s eldest son, Philip, acquired a substantial inheritance from the Hornes and Montmorency families. He was one of the most important nobles in the Netherlands, but became a well-known victim of the beginning of the quarrels that would lead to the Dutch Revolt. Since he was beheaded in 1568 at the Grand Place of Brussels, his possessions were sequestrated and in this way his library was probably dispersed.

Maybe archival data could inform us more precisely on the peregrination of the manuscripts within the Hornes and Montmorency families. What is clear for now is that Philippe de Hornes’s library, or at least a substantial part of it, passed to a member of the Montmorency family who had the arms over-painted, and that the library was subsequently dispersed.

We have no clues concerning the subsequent owners of the first volume, between the sixteenth-century Montmorencys and the nineteenth century. The first known modern owner is Jean Baptiste Joseph Barrois (ca. 1780-1855), the famous nineteenth-century scholar, collector and thief of manuscripts. He acquired his manuscripts from many sources. It could very well be that the fake-old letters on the last folio were added during this period. Together with the rest of the Barrois collection, the manuscript passed subsequently to Bertram, fourth Earl of Ashburnham (1797-1878). The manuscript appears as nr. CVII in the undated catalogue which was made of the Barrois collection as acquired by the Earl of Ashburnham. After Ashburnham’s death, the manuscript was sold in 1901 for 27 pounds to Quaritch.

De Poerck states that this manuscript belonged to the Phillipps collection as well. Could it be that this is a mistake, and that he simply meant the Ashburnham collection? See De Poerck 1936, p. 18.

Catalogue of the Manuscripts at Ashburnham Place. Part the Second Comprising a Collection formed by Mons. J. Barrois, London (Charles Francis Hodgson), 1861, nr. CVII.

The Ashburnham Library. Catalogue of the portion of the famous Collection of Manuscripts the property of the Rt. Hon. The Earl of Ashburnham, known as The Barrois Collection (sales catalogue Sotheby’s, London, 10-14 June 1901), London, 1901, p. 137, nr. 377. According to the list of prices and purchasers’ names in the catalogue, the manuscript was
is subsequently described in a 1902 Quaritch catalogue.\textsuperscript{61} The volume appeared on the market again five years later, in 1907, when it was sold at Sotheby’s to a certain ‘Poole’\textsuperscript{62}, and again in 1910, when it was sold to Count Chandon de Briailles.\textsuperscript{63} It then remained in the possession of this family for almost a century, until it was sold at the Hôtel Drouot in Paris in 2003\textsuperscript{64} to Jean-Michel Ennuyer, who took the initiative to have it permanently located under the same roof as Thott 568 2\textsuperscript{e} \textsuperscript{65}

The final volume has a less complicated provenance. The first trace of former owners we know of after the sixteenth-century Montmorencys is in the binding. As we stated above, the present early eighteenth-century binding indicates that the manuscript was probably part of the Harley library, built up by Robert Harley, first Earl of Oxford (d. 1724) and his son, Edward Harley (1689-1741). Upon the partial dispersion of this collection, the volume must have been acquired by the great Danish collector count Otto Thott (1703-1785), who acquired many books from the Harley library. At the end of his life, Thott bequeathed it with the rest of his manuscripts to the Royal Library of Denmark, where it has been located ever since.

As the two volumes contain the text of the first version of Jean Mansel’s \textit{Fleur des histoires}, it is probable that one or two other volumes must have existed.\textsuperscript{66} Unfortunately they seem to have been lost, but we can hope that one day they will reappear, as the last years have witnessed several unknown \textit{Fleur des histoires} manuscripts appear on the market.

\textsuperscript{61} Quaritch, catalogue 211 (1-1-1902), nr. 148 (according to the Schoenberg database it was sold there for 210 dollars). The catalogue dates the manuscript to ca. 1470, and supposes that it was written and illuminated for Jean de Montmorency, lord of Nivelles (d. 1477).

\textsuperscript{62} Sotheby’s, 31 Mai and 1 June 1907, lot 406, where it was sold for 17 pounds to ‘Poole’ according to the copy of the catalogue in the Groliers Club in New York. I am very grateful to Jim Marrow for having sent me a photocopy from the catalogue and this additional information (according to the Schoenberg database it was sold there for 85 dollars). The catalogue mentions again Jean de Montmorency as patron.

\textsuperscript{63} Sold at Sotheby’s, 16 June 1910, lot 495 (according to the Schoenberg database it was sold there for 215 dollars). The catalogue dates the manuscript to ca. 1480 and mentions Jean de Montmorency as patron.

\textsuperscript{64} Hôtel Drouot (Paris), sale Tajan, 17 December 2003, lot 9. The catalogue mentions Anne de Montmorency as owner of the arms on the first folio.

\textsuperscript{65} Copenhagen, KB, Acc. 2008/74.

\textsuperscript{66} We will briefly come back on this matter below.
A single second volume in Ghent does not seem to fit in, as it has no traces of either Hornes or Montmorency ownership, because it is unfinished (about 30 miniatures were never filled in), and because it contains sixteenth-century ownership marks of the d’Urfé family.\textsuperscript{67} Manuscript C of De Poercks ‘manuscrits perdus’, only known by a mention in the sales catalogue of the collection of the Duc de la Vallière, is another candidate. The description in the catalogue permits us to identify it as a second volume of the first version: 150 folios, ranging from the birth of Christ to the siege of Jerusalem by Titus. It is therefore possible that this manuscript is a missing volume of the Hornes-Montmorency copy. However, the hypothesis seems improbable, because no Montmorency arms were mentioned and no miniatures either, which would certainly have been the case in this sales catalogue had any existed, for miniatures would have augmented the value of the manuscript.\textsuperscript{68}

It is clear at this stage that our two volumes display considerable differences between them. The script is by a different hand (ill. 3 and 4), as are the miniatures and the border decoration of the two frontispieces (ill. 1 and 2). However, the heraldic ownership marks point clearly to a common fate in the first decade of their existence. Moreover, the work of the miniaturist who painted the frontispiece of the first volume and the decorator of the borders can be found on other folios of the final volume. In sections 6 and 7 of this article, I will make comparisons with several other manuscripts which were also made in Bruges in the 1480s, in order to show that collaboration between different scribes, miniaturists and decorators is not unique to our case, but in fact quite a common feature of manuscript production in that time and place.\textsuperscript{69} But before this, we have to examine the miniatures of our two volumes more closely.

\textsuperscript{67} Ghent, UB, 12 (which is De Poerck’s nr. 14).
\textsuperscript{68} Catalogue de la Vallière 1783, vol. III, p. 44 (nr. 4563) and vol. IV, p. 34 (nr. 4563). The manuscript was sold at the sale for 16 pounds and 4 shillings, which is, compared to the other prizes, a normal price for an unilluminated manuscript.
The miniatures and the decoration

So far I have only briefly mentioned the miniatures and not commented on their styles. In the first volume there is only one large miniature, painted on f. I (ill. 1). In its style and iconography, the miniature is very close to the frontispiece of another manuscript of the *Fleur des histoires* now in Paris, which was commissioned around 1480 by Jean Louis of Savoy (d. 1480), bishop of Geneva (ill. 14).\(^{70}\) Obviously the two miniatures are made by the same workshop. They share many characteristics. But on the other hand the painter did not simply copy the same model, rather he produced a variation on the same theme. No animal is exactly alike, neither are the poses of God, Adam or Eve. The Paris miniature has been attributed to the Master of the Soane Josephus.\(^{71}\) This is a master whose corpus is still to be more precisely established. He is easily confused with the better known Master of Edward IV. Bodo Brinkmann has subtracted part of the huge corpus of this last master and named it after the Flavius Josephus manuscript in the Sir John Soane Museum in London.\(^{72}\) Brinkmann called him a ‘doppelgänger’ as indeed their styles are very much alike, but nevertheless distinct. Scot McKendrick did important work in further defining the artist’s style and extending his corpus. The Master of the Soane Josephus seems to have been the senior of the two; the Master of Edward IV was the pupil who became more successful than his master. The corpuses of the two masters await further research.

The hand of the Master of the Soane Josephus is also to be found in most of the miniatures in the final volume of our *Fleur des histoires*, the Thott volume. All the small miniatures seem to be by his hand, as are three of the large miniatures (ill. 7, 8, and 10).\(^{73}\) Two of the other large miniatures are painted in a completely different style, which has often been described as that of a follower of Loyset Liédet (ill. 6 and 9).\(^{74}\) It is the Master of the chattering hands,

\(^{70}\) Paris, BnF, fr 296, f. I.

\(^{71}\) Kren & McKendrick 2003, p. 292.


\(^{73}\) Large miniatures: Copenhagen, KB, Thott 568 2o, f. 127v (f. CXXIV), f. 258 (f. CCLIII), and f. 290 (f. CC III 2xx V).

\(^{74}\) Copenhagen, KB, Thott 568 2o, f. 108v (f. CIIv) and f. 284 (f. CCLXXIX).
named after a specific feature in his miniatures. We can attribute a large corpus of miniatures to him. The two miniatures painted by him in our final volume are very much characteristic of his style. They are two standard battle scenes; the towns in their respective background are not precisely the same, but interchangeable. Armies are painted as a sea of helmets. Helmets on the foreground have a typical oval form and, when closed, a dark horizontal beaver. Bushes bear dark green dots below and white or yellow dots above. A typical feature of the master which is absent in this manuscript is the wavy architectural perspective. Walls, windows and townscapes are made up of two colours, grey and reddish brown, and have received lining in white painted lines. The faces of the persons depicted do not have much individuality and are quite expressionless, whereas this master does express emotions, such as greeting and addressing, by the posture of arms and hands. The difference in size between important figures and less important servants is sometimes striking. The latter often have shoeless clubfeet. The sometimes awkward poses with crossed legs are typical as well. The half closed eyes give everyone a sleepy look, even the horses (ill. 6, 9, and 19).

Master of the chattering hands (Maître aux mains volubiles; Meester met de sprakzame handen). A more usual sobriquet after a name of a patron was in this case difficult to find, as the master has worked for many different patrons. I started working on his style in the manuscript Paris, BnF, fr. 16380 (see Hanno Wijsman: William Lord Hastings, Les Faits de Jacques de Lalaing et le ‘Maître des inscriptions blanches. À propos du manuscrit français 16830 de la Bibliothèque nationale de France, Cardon et al. 2002, p. 1641-1664, esp. p. 1654, note 82) and continued since to augment the oeuvre. Pascal Schandel made important discoveries in the BnF in Paris and I thank him for the fruitful discussions we had. He is the one who proposed the name ‘Maître aux mains volubiles’. Many of our findings will be published in François Avril, Ilona Hans-Collas et Pascal Schandel (avec la collaboration de Hanno Wijsman): Manuscrits enluminés des anciens Pays-Bas méridionaux, vol. I. Louis de Bruges, Paris (Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des manuscrits; Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (K.U.L.), Illuminare), scheduled for 2009 (also the following volumes). See also Wijsman 2006, p. 74-87. I am presently preparing an article on the master, his corpus and his place in Bruges manuscript illumination of the late fifteenth century.

So far I have found his collaboration in around 50 manuscript volumes, all datable to the years 1470-1490. A few manuscripts had already been grouped in Otto Pächt, Ulrike Jenni & Dagmar Thoss: Flämische Schule II (Tafelband und Textband) (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Schrift- und Buchwesen des Mittelalters. Reihe 1, Die illuminierten Handschriften und Inkunabeln der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, 7), Wien 1990, p. 65-68.
The large frontispiece miniature of our final volume has been attributed to the Master of the Soane Josephus (ill. 2).\textsuperscript{77} I do not agree with the attribution, but to propose an alternative one is not easy if one looks for one single master. In fact, characteristics of two different masters appear in this miniature. The tower in the foreground is clearly painted in the style of the Master of the Harley Froissart, the painter with whom we can also associate all of the borders in the two volumes.\textsuperscript{78} But the rest of the scene, the figures in the foreground as well as the city in the background, are by another hand, the Master of the Vienna \textit{Chroniques d’Angleterre}.\textsuperscript{79} The impressive heavy walls, their matt light-brown and grey colours, the round towers, and the mirroring water are typical of him, as are also the physiognomies and the clothing of the figures.\textsuperscript{80} Collaboration between these two masters is not surprising, since it has been noted in other manuscripts.\textsuperscript{81}

The full border decoration on f. I of the first volume is in the same style as some of the borders in the final volume, in which at least two hands have collaborated.\textsuperscript{82} All the borders form one group though, painted by the Master of the Harley Froissart and his workshop.

Thus we have seen that a group of collaborating artists worked on a manuscript of Jean Mansel's \textit{Fleur des histoires}, of which two volumes are under discussion here: the Master of the Harley Froissart, the Master

\textsuperscript{77} Kren & McKendrick 2003, p. 292. As Scot McKendrick cites the 1999 exhibition catalogue (Petersen, \textit{Living Words}, 1999, p. 89-90 (n.126)) it could be that he has mistaken the illustration of f. 127v (f. CXXIv) for the frontispiece.

\textsuperscript{78} Compare the ecclesiastical architecture in some of his miniatures, e.g. London, BL, Harley 4379, f. 99.

\textsuperscript{79} On this master, see Pächt et al. 1990, p. 39-45; Avril et al. 2009.

\textsuperscript{80} The oeuvre of the Master of the Vienna \textit{Chroniques d’Angleterre} is vast and relatively unknown. Many typical features are to be found. People like the man in red on the far right or the man in the middle turning the wheel in the frontispiece of Copenhagen, KB Thott 568 2° are for example also encountered in the already mentioned privately owned manuscript with Mansel’s abbreviated version of the \textit{Chroniques de Hainaut} (f. 17, 95v, 104v). See Tenschert 2008, p. 158, 163, 164.


\textsuperscript{82} The border decoration in the first volume seems particularly close to that found in Copenhagen, KB, Thott 568 2o, f. 213v (f. CCVIIv), f. 223 (f. CCXVII), f. 225 (f. CCXIX), 290 (f. CC III\textsuperscript{V}V), 297 (f. CC III\textsuperscript{V}XII).
of the Soane Josephus, the Master of the chattering hands, and the Master of the Vienna Chroniques d’Angleterre. The most interesting feature of our two volumes is the collaborative work of the artists involved. Miniaturists, but also scribes, decorators and possibly others, seem to have combined their efforts in the making of this manuscript in an almost ‘industrial’ way.

A rich and illuminating article on the subject of the making of miniatures by different collaborating artists, which gives the reader a real sense of how miniaturists worked, has recently been published by the regretted Anne van Buren. She makes clear how collaboration was a widespread practice in later medieval manuscript production.

In the later fifteenth century this highly rationalised way of producing manuscripts reached its apogee. In the two decades between 1470 and 1490, many large illuminated manuscripts written in the vernacular were still produced. At the same time the market started to crumble under pressure of a court in crisis, political turmoil, and the arrival of printed books. Typical of this ‘small scale mass production’ is the collaboration of many hands in the same volume. This enabled manuscripts to be produced far more rapidly, but also gave them a more varied appearance. In the next two sections we will consider some other manuscripts displaying the same features.

Another – complete – manuscript of the Fleur des histoires

A manuscript now in Paris has already been mentioned because of the striking parallel between the two frontispieces. But the comparison goes further, and is in fact very illuminating. This manuscript contains...

84 See for a more detailed analysis of this period: Hanno Wijsman: Politique et bibliophilie pendant la révolte des villes flamandes des années 1482-1492. Relations entre les bibliothèques de Philippe de Clèves, Louis de Gruuthuse et la Librairie de Bourgogne. Jelle Haemers, Céline Van Hoorebeeck & Hanno Wijsman (eds.): Entre la ville, la noblesse et l’état. Philippe de Clèves (1456-1528), homme politique et bibliophile (Burgundica, xiii), Turnhout (Brepols), 2007, p. 245-278.
the same text as our volumes, i.e. the first version of Jean Mansel’s *Fleur des histoires*. But it is complete and divided into four volumes as follows: a first volume of 295 folios (ill. 14) with history from the Creation up to reign of Emperor Augustus; a second volume of 211 folios (ill. 15) which contains the lives of Christ and of the Virgin, miracles of the Virgin, the history of the Roman emperors from Augustus to Titus, an alphabetical list of descriptions of the ‘provinces of the world’, and a description of Rome; a third volume of 377 folios (ill. 16 and 18) with lives of saints in alphabetical order; and a last volume of 406 folios (ill. 17 and 19) containing the end of the saints’ lives, excerpts from the Dialogues by Saint Gregory, and the history of the Roman emperors since Domitian followed by the history of the kings of France up to Charles VI.

The handwriting in our first volume is very much like, and perhaps identical with, one of the hands in the Paris manuscript. As mentioned above, our first volume is incomplete. The text breaks off at the end of f. CCLVIv (256v). The last words written there are to be found in the Paris manuscript on f. CCLV (255). Thus, the text in both manuscripts is written on almost the same number of pages in the two versions (respectively 255 and 256 folios). The Paris volume contains another 39 folios (the explicit being written on f. CCXCIV (294)). It is therefore very well possible that in the first volume of our manuscript, some 39 folios have disappeared at some point in its history. But as we will see below, the division into volumes is not necessarily the same.

The first and the second Paris volumes are both only illustrated with two miniatures, a large one and a small one, whereas the third volume contains no fewer than two large and 42 small miniatures, and the fourth volume three large and 23 small ones. This unbalanced distribution of the miniatures in the Paris manuscript offers a parallel for the same phenomenon in the two volumes which concern us here. We now see that the fact that our first volume has only one miniature is not so surprising. Moreover, it suddenly seems quite probable that one of the cut-out folios C (100) and CI (101) did indeed contain a small miniature. The six large and 14 small miniatures in the Thott volume find a parallel in the three large and 23 small miniatures of the Paris counterpart. However, the precise distribution calls for further analysis, as in the final Paris volume only 14 small miniatures illustrate the part of the text which corresponds to the Thott volume (i.e. from the building of the Pantheon onwards).
In the Thott volume, the text begins with a rubric stating that it is the *quart volume de la fleur des histoires* and the original foliation begins on the page containing the frontispiece (f. I). Thus we are sure that the volume was originally conceived as such. However, this beginning of the text corresponds to folio VII⁺XXIII (163) of the fourth volume in the Paris manuscript. We must therefore conclude that the two manuscripts were not divided in exactly the same way; and because the middle part of our manuscript is missing, we cannot be sure that if it contained exactly the same texts as the Paris manuscript.

In conclusion, we do not know how many volumes were originally conceived between our first and final volume. These two volumes consist, respectively, of a minimum of 254 and exactly 322 folios. In the light of the comparison with the Paris manuscript which belonged to Jean Louis of Savoy, we might conclude that there were originally another one or two volumes between the two that we now have, but maybe even more. On the other hand, it is also perfectly possible that the set to which our volumes belong was relieved of some parts of the text found in other copies.

Another volume which belongs to the same group of manuscripts survives as a single second volume. 86 It is tempting to see it as a missing link in our manuscript, but this seems improbable, as it was made for king Edward IV of England and also because of its larger size. 87 Edward’s arms appear in the lower border of the frontispiece page and

86 London, BL, Royal 18 E vi.
87 It is very strange though that the London volume is all alone, and there are no traces of accompanying volumes, not even in the 1535 inventory of Richmond Palace (Henri Omont: Les manuscrits français des roys d’Angleterre au château de Richmond, *Etudes romanes dédiées à Gaston Paris*, Paris 1891, p. 1-13), where there is only one entry *La Fleur des histoires*, which could correspond either to the single volume London, BL, Royal 18 E vi, or to London, BL, Royal 16 F vi-vii or 16 G vii. We have to leave open the possibility that our ‘Bruges manuscript production centre’ made two manuscripts, of which one was more lavishly illustrated and went to the bishop of Geneva, and the other was not sold as a whole, either because the English king was not interested in the historical parts, or, inversely, because Philippe de Hornes was not interested in the hagiographical parts. More research in the speculative production of these manuscripts (i.e. manuscripts not made with a specific patron in mind) is needed. See also McKendrick 2003, p. 59-78, esp. p. 65. However, the problem in this case is the difference in size, because even if the writing frames of our first and final volume differ they remain close to one another (respectively 266 x 188 mm and 247 x 176 mm), whereas in the London volume it is significantly larger (290 x 201 mm). So I conclude that around 1480 three sets were produced in Bruges, of which several volumes were lost.
they do not show any sign of over-painting. The version of the text is the same as our manuscript and the aforementioned Paris copy. But the 462 folios of this large manuscript seem to combine the entire contents of the second and third volumes of the Paris manuscript.\footnote{Paris, BnF, fr. 297-298.}

The manuscript contains the lives of Christ and of the Virgin, miracles of the Virgin, the history of the Roman emperors from Augustus to Titus, an alphabetical list of descriptions of the ‘provinces of the world’, a description of Rome, and lives of saints in alphabetical order.

The large volume presently in London is only illustrated by two miniatures. The frontispiece miniature seems to be another miniature in which different masters collaborated. The architecture looks like that which we find in the work of the Master of the white inscriptions\footnote{Compare Paris, BnF, fr. 16830, where the borders are by the Master of the Harley Froissart, the frontispiece by the Master of the white inscriptions, and the 17 small miniatures by the Master of the chattering hands. See Wijsman 2002.}, whereas the figures show influences of the Master of the Soane Josephus. The only small miniature (of Saint Andrew) shows a style which is difficult to define precisely, maybe again due to collaboration within the same miniature. The borders in this manuscript are, once more, by the Master of the Harley Froissart’s workshop.

We return to the comparison of our two volumes with the Paris manuscript of the \textit{Fleur des histoires}. Exactly the same group of artists has worked on both manuscripts. The Master of the Soane Josephus did the frontispieces of the first two volumes and a few of the small miniatures (ill. 14, 15, and 18). The Master of the Harley Froissart did four other large miniatures and almost forty of the smaller ones (ill. 17). All the borders of the Paris volumes are very much like those in our volumes: homogenously in the style of the Master of the Harley Froissart.\footnote{In fact one border stands out because of its different colours: Paris, BnF, fr. 298, f. VII\textsuperscript{r}r 1 (141). But this kind of exception is not rare in the group of manuscripts of the collaborative Bruges production of the 1470s and 1480s.} The Master of the chattering hands was responsible for about 20 miniatures in the last three volumes (ill. 19). Of particular interest are several miniatures in which the master of the Harley Froissart seems to have been doing the drawing and sometimes part of the painting, and two other hands have finished the miniature. In numerous miniatures this other hand is the Master of the chattering...
hands. ¹⁹¹ In others, for example, in the frontispiece miniature of the third volume (Crucifixion of Saint-Andrew) (ill. 16), this secondary hand is the Bruges master of 1482. ¹⁹²

If we compare the placement of the miniatures illustrating the Thott volume and those illustrating the corresponding part of the text in the fourth Paris volume, it is striking that most of them are placed in very different spots. There is no link whatsoever in iconography, not even in the few cases where two miniatures illustrate the very same chapter.

Two other manuscripts artistically linked to the group survive, but they seem to contain the second and longer version of the text. ¹⁹³ They are, so to say, ‘cheaper versions’, because they have been written on paper. The miniatures have been executed with much less care as well. A manuscript of which two volumes (presently bound in three volumes) survive, now in Brussels, bears the arms and device of an unidentified owner. ¹⁹⁴ The volumes contain many miniatures showing the characteristics of the Master of the chattering hands, though they seem to have been painted rather swiftly and without much care. Several parchment leaves have been inserted, but many miniatures have been painted on paper as well. A manuscript now in Paris, consisting of the second, third and fourth volumes of the Fleur des histoires, is very much like the one in Brussels. The first owner is also unidentified. ¹⁹⁵ The only miniatures are the three frontispieces. They have all been painted by the Master of the chattering hands. ¹⁹⁶

¹⁹¹ The same phenomenon is to be seen in other manuscripts, like London, BL, Cotton Aug. A v, f. 22.
¹⁹² Paris, BnF, fr. 298, f. I: the crucifixion of Saint Andrew. The palette of matt colours, the fine-lined faces, and the armours of the soldiers (compare for example New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, ms. 230, f. 11v, 187, 230) point to the Bruges master of 1482, even if the figures are not at all his, because drawn by the Master of the Harley Froissart.
¹⁹³ As De Poerck rightly notes, the division of the manuscripts into two versions by Delisle is important, but it should not hide the many other variations that exist between the texts of the different surviving manuscripts. See De Poerck 1936, p. 18-19.
¹⁹⁴ Brussels, KBR IV 669 is volume 2. Brussels, KBR, 21252 and 21253 together form volume 4. The owner’s arms (De sable à une fasce d’or, entourée de quatre petites croix ancrées d’argent) and motto (Gar toy de ly) are still unidentified. See Cinq années 1975, p. 93-99 (nr. 46).
¹⁹⁵ Paris, BnF, fr. 302-304. The arms (D’azur à la fasce d’argent) have overpainted other arms, which are difficult to identify (maybe: Bandé d’azur et d’échiqueté d’or et gueules).
As we have seen, the *Fleur des histoires* now in Paris and originally owned by Jean Louis of Savoy is a key manuscript for the understanding of our *Fleur des histoires*. It is a complete version in four volumes of the same text, and it was written, decorated and illustrated by the same group of artists. In the following last section we will make some further artistic comparisons in order to define the group more precisely.

The place of our manuscript in Bruges book production in the 1480s

Our two volumes are part of an interesting larger group of manuscripts produced by several collaborating artists, of which we have seen a closely related four-volume *Fleur des histoires* now in Paris. It is beyond the scope of this article to investigate further this mode of production, but it is interesting to look briefly at some other cases which can serve as further examples of the scope of such collaboration, and help us to understand the whole group.97 One already mentioned manuscript, a three-volume manuscript containing the *Chroniques* by Jean Froissart, is also directly linked to our manuscript, since it was commissioned by Philippe de Hornes.98 He might have commissioned the Antwerp Froissart and our Mansel within a short period of time, because they are extremely similar in size, general outlook, and style.99

The Froissart manuscript contains three large frontispiece miniatures and one small miniature. The first frontispiece is by the Master of the Soane Josephus (ill. 21). The battle scene between the English and the Scottish armies bears close resemblance to the large miniatures

---


98 Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus, ms. 15.4, 15.5 and 15.6. The Montmorency arms (painted over the Hornes-Gaasbeek arms) are very similar to those painted in our *Fleur des histoires*. On the frontispiece pages of the first and second volumes (Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus, ms. 15.4, f. I and ms. 15.5, f. I) they are painted like f. I in the Thott volume; in the third volume (Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus, ms. 15.6, f. I) they bear the crest as in the first volume of our *Fleur des histoires*. Whereas for this last case the over-painting of the crest was not so clearly visible, in the last Froissart volume we can see clearly how the crest has been painted over an erased older crest.

99 The Antwerp volumes measure 385 x 295 mm and have been written on 38 lines.
that this master carried out in our Thott volume.\textsuperscript{100} The only small miniature, enclosed in the first volume, represents the coronation of king John II the Good of France in 1350 (ill. 20). It is painted by the same Master of the Soane Josephus in exactly the same semi-grisaille technique as the small miniatures in our Thott volume.\textsuperscript{101}

The second volume of the Antwerp Froissart opens with a frontispiece (the duke of Burgundy with his army entering in a town) painted by the Master of the Harley Froissart (ill. 22). The meagre figures with small heads, the fine horses and the movement of the parade are typical of this miniaturist. The composition with the huge grassy slope in the background that seems to push away the townscape is a bit awkward. The frontispiece of the third volume suffered even more from prolonged exposure to daylight than the other illuminated folios of this Froissart. We see Edmund of Langley, count of Cambridge (son of king Edward III) trying to convince Ferdinand, king of Portugal (1367-1383) to go to war against Castile (ill. 23). I attribute the miniature to the Bruges master of 1482.\textsuperscript{102} We have already encountered this master, who badly needs a thorough study,\textsuperscript{103} and there are more links between him and the group. In at least one other manuscript the Bruges master of 1482 collaborated closely with the Master of the chattering hands.\textsuperscript{104} The borders of the first two volumes are in the style of the Master of the Harley Froissart, whereas in the final volume they are different (ill. 20, 21, and 23).

\textsuperscript{100} Compare especially f. 127v (f. CXX Iv) of the Thott volume.
\textsuperscript{101} For a close comparison to the small miniature in the Froissart volume (Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus, ms. 15.4, f. IIC IX (209)) see especially Copenhagen, KB, Thott 568 2o, f. 264 (f. CCLIX).
\textsuperscript{102} Antwerp, Museum Plantin-Moretus, ms. 15.6, f. 1. For the style and composition, another frontispiece miniature by this master (Geneva, BP&U, fr. 170, f. 1) offers a close parallel.
\textsuperscript{103} Georges Dogaer: \textit{Flemish Miniature Painting in the 15th and 16th Centuries}, Amsterdam 1987, p. 127; Avril et al. 2009.
\textsuperscript{104} In a manuscript with Boccaccio’s \textit{Decameron} (The Hague, KB, 133 A 5) he painted the frontispiece and the miniatures on folios 256 and 278v, but the other miniatures (on ff. 47v, 121, 172v, 360) were painted by the Master of the chattering hands, though probably on drawings by the Bruges master of 1482 (five other miniatures have disappeared from this manuscript). The same two masters might also have collaborated in the production of Geneva, BP&U, fr. 169 and 170, but I have not had the occasion to study these yet.
Another key manuscript in the group is a richly illuminated copy for king Edward IV of England of the *Chroniques* of Jean Froissart.\(^\text{105}\) It has been doubted whether the two volumes now in London and the one now in Los Angeles really belong together, but the frequent collaboration of the different masters assessed in this article supplies additional circumstantial evidence of the volumes originally forming a single unit. In the third volume, now in Los Angeles, several miniaturists contributed, among them the Master of the Getty Froissart and the Master of the Soane Josephus. The volumes now in London were almost completely illustrated by the Master of the Harley Froissart and the Master of the chattering hands. But very few miniatures were done by only one or other of the two. Most of the miniatures were collaboratively painted, the under-drawing being done by the Master of the Harley Froissart, likewise the painting of the faces, while the rest of the painted surface was left for the Master of the chattering hands.\(^\text{106}\)

We may briefly mention three other linked manuscripts. A huge *Chroniques* of Froissart was made for Philippe de Commines. The fourth volume alone contains 80 miniatures, some of which were painted collaboratively by the Master of the Harley Froissart and the Master of the Vienna *Chroniques d’Angleterre*.\(^\text{107}\) Another example of these collaborative manuscripts is a two-volume *Decameron* by Boccaccio, in which

\(^\text{105}\) London, BL, Royal 18 E i (which is vol. 2), Los Angeles, J. Paul Getty Museum, Ludwig XIII 7 (which is vol. 3), and London, BL, Royal 18 E ii (which is vol. 4). See Kren & McKendrick 2003, p. 261-262, 286-288.

\(^\text{106}\) In the second volume of this Froissart manuscript the frontispiece miniature (London, BL, Royal 18 E i, f. 12) was entirely done by the Master of the Harley Froissart. The rest of the total of no fewer than 48 miniatures was painted by the Master of the chattering hands, but in most of these cases the under-drawing was clearly done by the Master of the Harley Froissart, and the latter also executed the faces of the persons depicted. This specific kind of collaboration, in which the master of the Harley Froissart clearly acted as the senior and the Master of the chattering hands the assistant, is for example very much apparent on the folios London, BL, Royal 18 E i, f. 69v, 73, 80, 87v, 97v, 103v, 121, 129, 139v, 147, 154, 165v, 175, 185v, 255, 269, and 345, but also in many of the smaller miniatures, like for example f. 40 and 94. In the fourth volume (London, BL, Royal 18 E ii) the frontispiece is by the Master of the Getty Froissart, whereas most of the other miniatures seem again products of the collaboration between the Master of the Harley Froissart and the Master of the chattering hands, although the latter has probably done some on his own as well.

the border decoration, and the lay-out of the ten miniatures are typical of the Master of the Harley Froissart, while the painting was done by the Master of the chattering hands.108 A last huge production to be mentioned is an interesting manuscript of the group, especially since the volumes are dated 1470 and 1479. It is a Bible historiale made for king Edward IV of England.109 The many miniatures have been attributed to the Master of Edward IV, the Master of the Soane Josephus (and an assistant), the Master of the Harley Froissart, the circle of the Master of the London Wavrin, the Master of the Vienna Chronique d’Angleterre, and other hands.110 The frontispiece of the first volume (ill. 24), a depiction of the Creation, is interesting when set alongside the two Creation miniatures we have seen (in our Fleur des histoires and in the linked Paris manuscript: ill. 1 and 4). In the London Bible historiale the scene is different (God is creating the animals, and Adam and Eve have not yet appeared) and the hand is clearly not the same. But the general outline of the grassy foreground, the rocky mountain to the left, the water with swimming birds in the background, the tree silhouettes against the sky and the ‘teddy bear-like’ animals are closely linked, especially in the light of the very similar general page lay-out including the border decoration by the Master of the Harley Froissart.

**Concluding remarks**

To conclude, we can confirm that the analysis of our two volumes of the Fleur des histoires and the closely linked four volumes of another manuscript of the same text in Paris, together with two Froissart manuscripts and several others, have revealed to us the existence of an interesting group of miniaturists. These manuscripts show that in Bruges, the main centre for the production of illuminated manuscript in the Southern Netherlands of the fifteenth century, a practice existed of making manuscripts in a rationalised, collaborative way. A group of miniaturists and decorators111 worked together. A leading figure

---

108 London, BL, Add. 35322 and 35323. The tapestry on f. 156v of the second volume is typical of the Master of the Harley Froissart as are the faces, but the rest of the miniature was painted by the Master of the chattering hands.
109 London, BL, Royal 15 D i, 18 D ix, and 18 D x.
111 And probably also a group of scribes, but close palaeographic research could tell us more in this respect.
among them seems to have been the Master of the Harley Froissart. He very frequently worked closely together with the Master of the chattering hands\textsuperscript{112} and also on several occasions with the Master of the Vienna \textit{Chroniques d'Angleterre} and the Bruges master of 1482. The Master of the Soane Josephus was another important member of the group, whereas his talented pupil, the Master of Edward IV, may have sometimes joined in as well. Other occasional contributors to collaborative products were the Master of the white inscriptions and the Master of the London Wavrin.

In this way large manuscripts of long texts like the \textit{Chroniques} of Froissart or the \textit{Fleur des histoires} by Jean Mansel could be produced far more rapidly than would have been the case if the work were done by one and the same hand, or even by the same workshop. Moreover, these manuscripts, which often contain quite repetitive and standardised illustrations, achieved a measure of variety through the differences in style between collaborators, and were thus more attractive to potential buyers. The process might very well have been a reaction on the part of manuscript makers to the growing competition of printed books. The manuscript makers did what they were good at (and much better at than printers): they produced lavishly illuminated deluxe volumes. But Colard Mansion was, in these same years, in the same town of Bruges, experimenting with deluxe printed books too. So the manuscript makers made an effort to work more efficiently. The slowness of their work might have been increasingly felt as a severe handicap, which could be overcome by bringing the collaborative way of working to perfection.

Little is known with certainty about the practical organisation of manuscript production and of miniaturist workshops. The existence of collaborative productions presented here could point to the existence of large workshops with several miniaturists, but I would rather suggest that it points to a kind of network of masters and workshops.

\textsuperscript{112} The Master of the chattering hands seems to have been francophone, that is at least what is suggested by the French indications he has received in several manuscripts (Paris, BnF, fr 16830 (see Wijsman 2002, p. 1644, 1655-1656) and Brussels, KBR, 21252, 21253 and IV 669). It seems probable that in the cosmopolitan town of Bruges a group of artists which wrote texts in French and worked for a francophone and even international elite were bi- or multilingual. Unfortunately all the artists of our group remain anonymous for the moment, but it is well known that several of the most important Bruges miniaturists were immigrants, like Loyset Liédet from Hesdin or Willem Vrelant from Utrecht.
Different miniaturists worked together – within the framework of the guild structure – in order to produce their work faster, more efficiently and at lower costs. The network consisted of a core group with other masters occasionally joining in. It would be interesting to see if archival evidence could corroborate these observations in any way.

The primary aim of this article was to present the surviving first and final volumes of the “Copenhagen Fleur des histories”, that is, to show that they were two petals of the same flower: a multi-volume manuscript produced for Philippe de Hornes, lord of Gaasbeek. For this, the comparison with other manuscripts, linked because illustrated by the same artists, has turned out to be particularly helpful. The detailed comparison of our Fleur des histoires with a Froissart manuscript, also made for Philippe de Hornes, and with another Fleur des histoires bearing the arms of Jean Louis of Savoy, reveals the contours of a network of collaborating miniaturists operating in Bruges around 1480.113

RESUMÉ


Begge bind indeholder Montmorency-familiens våbenskjold, men efter grundige studier har det vist sig, at i begge tilfælde er de malet oven på andre våbenskjold tilhørende Philippe de Hornes (1423-1488), herre til Gaasbeek. Fleur des histoires er da

113 In the future I hope to have the opportunity to say more about this group and its various collaborators.
også nævnt i boopgørelsen efter Philippes død i august 1488 sammen med adskillige andre manuskripter.


Med denne samarbejdende produktionsmåde blev det muligt for skriverne og illustratorerne at fremstille manuskripter af meget lange tekster som Fleur des histoires, Froissarts Chroniques, Bible historiale o.a., og at opnå en rationalisering. Man kunne fremstille dem meget hurtigere, end det ville være muligt, hvis arbejdet skulle udføres af den samme hånd – eller i det samme værksted. Desuden fik manuskripterne, som ofte indeholder gentagne og standardiserede illustrationer, et element af variation gennem de stilmæssige forskelle mellem de forskellige deltagere i samarbejdet, og manuskripterne blev på denne måde mere attraktive for potentielle købere. Tilblivelsen af denne produktionsmåde kan meget vel være skrivernes reaktion på den voksende konkurrence fra trykte bøger. Skriverne og illustratorerne gjorde det, de var gode til (og de gjorde det meget bedre end trykkerne): de fremstillede rigt illustrerede luksusudgaver. Manuskriptfremstillingens langsomme natur blev dog sandsynligvis i stigende grad oplevet som et alvorligt handicap, som kun kunne overvindes ved at forfine den samarbejdende arbejdsform til perfektion.

Denne metode til manuskriptfremstilling i Brügge i 1470’erne og 1480’erne giver en kontekst til og en forklaring på forskellene i layout, tekst og illustrationer mellem de to bind af Philippe de Hornes’ Fleur des histoires. Det eneste miniaturebillede i det første bind er blevet tilskrevet Mesteren af Soane Josephus (der var sandsynligvis endnu et miniaturebilledes, men det er gået tabt), mens de tyve miniaturebilleder i det sidste bind blev fremstillet af ham og af tre andre mestre i gruppen. De to bind er to kronblade fra samme Fleur, nu genforenet for første gang i mere end tre århundreder. Man kan blot håbe på, at de manglende bind imellem dem også dukker op en skønne dag.