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Three Marian Texts, Including a Prayer for a Lay-Brother, in London, British Library, MS Additional 37049

Marlene Villalobos Hennessy

British Library, Additional MS 37049 is a manuscript compilation produced by Carthusian monks in Northern England, probably at Axholme or Beauvale charterhouse, c. 1460–70. As one of the major sources for Middle English religious lyrics, this multifarious manuscript has been a trove for scholars, who have mined it for its rich devotional materials and unusual illustrations. Many of the items in the manuscript are grouped by subject-matter, and Douglas Gray has recently suggested that this would have facilitated reading certain selections together for meditative purposes. Although Marian materials are interspersed throughout the volume, fols 21r–v contain an artfully arranged series of three unedited vernacular prose texts on the Virgin that are of particular interest (see Appendix).

The series begins with an illustrated text on the subject of Mary’s physical beauty. The scribe has carefully ensured that the full text fit on one leaf, with a handsome quarter-page illustration of the Virgin and child (fol. 21r, Plate 1) as part of the original design. The text appears to be a Middle English translation of a Latin commentary on Canticles 4:1, which may be derived from Alexander of Hales’ *Summa Theologica* or a similar scholastic text. The passage extols Mary’s physical and spiritual perfection in a systematic manner, using a threefold division that describes her natural, spiritual and essential ‘fayrenes’. The topic of Mary’s beauty was traditional, and had frequently been the subject of learned commentary on the Song of Songs in the twelfth and thirteenth century by writers such as Albertus Magnus, who typically connected the Virgin’s beauty to that of her Son. The text in Additional 37049 reiterates this connection: ‘And be certayn argument we may prefe þat she was fayrest of body. For it is written of hyr son Ihesu þat he was fayrest before þe sonnes of men. And certayne so þe moder was fayrest before þe doghtyrs of men.’
The compiler(s) of Additional 37049 shows a particular interest in the theme, for a few folios later (on fol. 29r) a text appears on the physiognomic appearance of Christ, which commends the handsomeness of his face and person, or the ‘dyuers fayrmes in pat beyng’. The extraordinary beauty of Christ and Mary were visual details that were useful for mentally picturing the Passion and recreating scenes from Christ’s life and death as if one were an eyewitness, a central technique of late medieval meditation. In this instance, contemplating the dimensions of Mary’s beauty is also a prelude to a scripted prayer: ‘Forbi ilk deuowte servant to lyr says: “Quam pulcra es amica, & cetera.” pat is: how fayr art pu my frecne, how fayr & how semely.’

The idea of Mary’s relationship to Christ is further developed in the next text in the series, a scripted prayer that focuses on her Holy Name (fol. 21v, PLATE 2). This rare, possibly unique item in particular merits further attention than it has hitherto received. The prayer is initially ascribed to or voiced by a certain Freburtus, an individual who cannot be securely identified, for neither is he a known medieval author, nor is he, to the best of my knowledge, obviously connected with the Carthusian order. It is of interest, however, that at the end of the first few lines the text shifts to the perspective of a Carthusian converse or lay-brother.

This unusual work is of historical and even literary interest for several reasons. Although we may never know the precise circumstances of this text’s production, it is tempting to speculate that the writer was an English lay-brother of the Carthusian order; at the very least, the text states that it was designed for use by one. Consequently, this prayer is most significant as an example of the kind of writings deemed suitable for lay-brothers during the period. Because extant English manuscripts with texts specifically written for the lay-brethren are rare at best, we have very little independent evidence for their reading habits or devotional lives. This short text, therefore, might enlarge our understanding of this important manuscript and the textual community of readers who made and used it. In addition, this prayer can be used as a source for briefly considering some of the broader literary activities of the Carthusian order, including its role in the circulation of religious texts and popular devotions.

In a manuscript setting rich with texts and illustrations focused on the Holy Name of Jesus, this prayer is notable for its imagery and subtle allusiveness. The author displays a certain degree of originality and lyricism. Like many of the items in the manuscript, the prayer shows traces of the influence of Richard Rolle, for whom the Holy Name was of supreme importance. The prayer uses alliteration, repetition, antithesis
PLATE 2. The Lay-brother's Prayer, opening lines, followed by a prose Miracle of the Virgin. London, BL MS Additional 37049, fol. 21v.
and balance to achieve a mellifluous tone—all distinctive features of Rolle’s style.\textsuperscript{15} The verbal expression of tender love-longing for Mary and Jesus and the elaborate Holy Name meditational imagery in this prayer are also hallmarks of Rolle’s writings.\textsuperscript{16}

The lay-brother’s prayer expands the metaphor of the Holy Name in inventive ways. The prayer builds up from an opening invocation that celebrates the efficacy of Mary’s name to a long and intricate series of interrelated images of Mary and Jesus. Through a generative, associative process, Mary is given a range of identities: she is sister, mother, daughter, nurse, handmaiden and lover of Jesus. The conflation of familial imagery allows the names Mary and Jesus to be repeated within a balanced pattern of cadenced prose. Just as the prayer states that they are joined by an ‘inseparable luf’, the author asks for the name of Mary to be closed within the name of Jesus, and vice versa, one Holy Name locked inside the other.\textsuperscript{17} This unusual image of inscription, fastening, and enclosure not only thematically echoes the making of manuscript books but also resembles a printed seal on the mind.\textsuperscript{18} We can construe that this prayer depicts writing in the mind and in the memory, for the phrase ‘to haft in my mynde’ suggests a mnemonic purpose.\textsuperscript{19}

Once the two interlocking Holy Names are joined together, they provide access to the full spectrum of divine power, reflecting the plenitude of the Incarnation and the comprehensiveness of humankind’s salvation. Through a binary of association, Marian devotion encompasses devotion to Christ, God the Father, the Holy Spirit and the Holy Trinity itself, ‘induyuysibill, incomprehensybyll’, in the text’s words. Through the figure of Mary, first the humanity of Jesus is made manifest, then his majesty, followed by his relationship to the Holy Spirit, with the Trinity itself as the final focus. In this way the prayer manages to distill a great deal of potentially complex doctrine.\textsuperscript{20}

Like the previous text on Mary’s beauty, the lay-brother’s prayer is deceptively simple and actually exemplifies a fairly sophisticated spirituality—a testament to the rich and complex devotional lives of the English lay-brethren, who would have appreciated and perhaps even composed texts of high quality or nuance. A text such as this is a salient reminder that lay-brothers were not exclusively or necessarily illiterate and that some may also have composed or transmitted texts orally. Moreover, this prayer offers evidence of devotional literacy of a very specific kind.\textsuperscript{21} Like some of the other vernacular texts transmitted by the Carthusians, this one reveals how the devotion to the Holy Name circulated within the walls of the charterhouse, in effect revealing the social dimensions of the devotion and how it was being made accessible and relevant for greater numbers of people.\textsuperscript{22}
It would be a mistake, however, to see this text as support for the suggestion that the entire manuscript was written or compiled for the edification of the lay-brethren, an idea that has been put forward on a number of occasions.23 It is the only item in the manuscript that specifically mentions use by a lay-brother. Vincent Gillespie has shown that the Carthusian order in England possessed surprisingly large numbers of vernacular pastoral and catechetical materials.24 There is no reason, therefore, to automatically associate this manuscript with the lay-brotherhood. Perhaps this prayer can best be appreciated in a manuscript context that mingles, on either side of the two Marian items that surround it, a vernacular version of the Ten Commandments with Latin rubrics and a drawing of God with Moses (fol. 20v, PLATE 3) and a Middle English poem on the foundation of the Carthusian order (IMEV 435, fols 22r–v, PLATE 4)—items that also would have been appropriate for the entire monastic community: lay-brothers, novices and mature contemplatives. Like the manuscript itself, the prayer has a breadth of appeal.25

We do know that prayers to be memorized were taught to the lay-brothers at their weekly chapters for religious instruction under the guidance of the procurator, a choir monk who was responsible for most of their material and spiritual welfare.26 E. Margaret Thompson reports that ‘After matins, they went to their private devotion, some formula in their mother-tongue being taught to them for this.’27 This is not to say that such was the only use of this prayer, but it was probably a principal one. A procurator would also have found the materials in the manuscript especially useful. The compilation would have been well suited to his needs: it contains texts of personal contemplation and private devotion, as well as those appropriate for instruction and edification of the lay-brethren.

Lay-brothers were men of genuine religious piety and vocation, who often shared and participated in what are sometimes considered elite forms of spirituality. Although they lived physically separate from the choir-munks as ‘second-class monastic citizens’,28 they were part of the same monastic family and members of the same community. The lay-brother’s prayer would have been appealing and appropriate for all members of the charterhouse, lay-brother and choir-monk alike; it demonstrates, moreover, how these audiences were not necessarily mutually exclusive—yet another aspect of the ‘literary character of the spirituality of the Carthusian Order’.29

This literary character with a similar breadth of appeal can be seen in the last text in the series, an exemplum that further underlines the miraculous power of Mary’s name. One of nine miracles of the Virgin
PLATE 3. God and Moses (horned), with the Ten Commandments in Middle English with Latin rubrics. London, BL MS Additional 37046, fol. 20r.
PLATE 4. Four Scenes from the Foundation of Carthusian Order, with Middle English verse. London, BL MS Additional 37049, fol. 22r.
in this manuscript, the tale concerns a slothful servant of St Anselm, who is freed from a demon’s grasp when he calls upon the name of Mary. The tale has a clear message: if one is tempted to stay in bed on a cold morning and avoid mass or the performance of the liturgy, expect severe punishment—perhaps even a hell-bound ride through the air on a demon’s back. Although Christ and the saints are deaf to the sinner’s entreaties, the wonder-working properties of Mary’s name are potent enough to release him from his captor, suggesting Mary’s tolerance, forgiveness and supreme grace.

Although there is no known source for this miracle, it draws together motifs common to the genre. The monk who stays in bed is a common topos, the name of Mary frequently drives away the devil, and the related phrase ‘Holy Mary, help me’ is found in several other tales. In yet another tale, a lay-brother is carried off by a demon and, after Mary’s intercession, set down far from home. This colourful miracle with its stress on spiritual sloth and disobedience seems ‘specifically related to monastic ideals and observances’. Marienlegenden were a monastic genre, and monastic libraries generally had such items available to them; they were especially useful for reading in the chapel and refectory on the feast days of the Virgin. This is certainly one of the ways this text could have been used in the charterhouse.

Read together, what this series of Marian texts reflects is a compiler’s mind at work; it shows how the activity of compilation and the individual tastes of the compiler could join quite diverse materials (learned, mystical and popular) united by a common subject. The first two items emphasize doctrine and exegesis and would have been well suited to private reading, while the third item appeals less to the intellect and more to a need for the miraculous, and could have been employed in a more public function. In this sense, the group of texts reflects the interesting range of texts and devotions circulating within Carthusian charterhouses, as well as the tastes of this specific compiler.

For all three texts, the question of sources remains problematic, as no identifiable source has been found for any of the items. Nevertheless, these texts clearly indicate that the manuscript was assembled from an array of sources, many of them originally Latin, some perhaps even translated by one of the scribes. The first and last texts in particular appear to be translations from a Latin source.

All three texts have in common not only their devotion to the Virgin, who is especially venerated by the Carthusian order, but also are designed to satisfy a variety of approaches to her person. The users of the manuscript are encouraged to meditate upon her different qualities and the full range of her powers: as bride of Christ, as reflection of
Christ’s humanity, as queen of heaven, and as mediatrix. In this way, we can see the diverse roles fashioned for Mary through manuscript books in the everyday life of a late-medieval English charterhouse.

APPENDIX

An edition of three Marian texts in London, British Library, Additional MS 37049, fols 211r-v

Editor’s note: Original spelling has been retained, abbreviations have been silently expanded, and modern capitalization and punctuation have been introduced. Damage to the text or lacunae have been indicated by the use of [ ].

[I.] Of pe faynnes of Saynt Mary gods moder our lady. Of pe fayrhed of saynt Mary. Alexander says pat thre faynesses is. One is natural, ane ojer is spryntual, pe thyrth is essencyal. Fayrhe dyal natural worschippt hyr body, fayrhe spyriritual anowntyd hir mynde, pe endless faynnes pat is essencial inhabyt bodelyn pe chawmer of pe vrynge wome. Mary had swylk natural faynnes pat I hope neuer woman in hir lyfe had swylk faynnes. Forpe it is sayd of Saynt Ignacius pat of theynes wrote pystyls to pe blysseyd vrynge & schen to hym agayne, pat when he sawe pe blysseyd vrynge, he felle to pe ethe for pe faynnes he sawe in hyr face & in hyr body. And when he rose at hyr hyldynge, it is sayd pat he sayd, if he had not bene certyfied by hyr & by Saynt Ion pe euangelist & verely bene informed in pe fayrhe, he had trowed pat no ope god had bene bot schen for pe wonderyful schynynge of hyr face & excellent faynnes. And he certayn argument we may prefe pat schen was fayrest of body. For it is written of hyr son Ihesu pat he was fayrest before pe sonnes of men. And certayne so pe moder was fayrest before pe doghtrys of men. Forpe ilk deouwe servante to hyr says: ‘Quam pulcro es amica & cetera.’ pat is: how fayr art ju my frende, how fayr & how semely. It is sayd pat fro pat tym pe schen had conceyfed pe son of rightweynes pat a brightnes of pe son schene in hyr face, pat Ioseph myght not [se] in hyr face before schen was deluyerd. If pe face of Moses so [se]chane for pe compeny of pe wordes of God pat pe sonnes of Israel myght [n]ot luke in hyr face how nykyl more pe blysseyd vrynge pat was [un]byschadowed of pe virtewe of pe aller hyghest & pat pe holy goste [del]ightyd in.

[II.] Freburtus says: A Mary, a ju gret, a ju mykde, a ju onely lufablyl. Mary, ju may neuer be mynynge bot ju kyndels, nor jeght bot ju confortys & fedes pe effections of ju lyfer. Also a consers sayd: A ju glories lady Saynt Mary blusseyd vrynge, moder of God, doghtyr of Ihesu, hande mayden of Ihesu, moder of Ihesu, nures of Ihesu, systyr of Ihesu, frende & lyfer of Ihesu, luf of Ihesu, sweetnes of Ihesu. A Mary of Ihesu, for ju
dwels in Ihesu & Iheau in þe. Forþi he þat lufes Ihesu, he lufes þe. And he þat lufes þe lufes Ihesu. For by inseperably luþe ar ioynd togedyryr. Forþi by grace I couet to haue in my mynde þe name of Mary closed within þe name of Ihesu. And þe name of Ihesu closed within þe name of Mary. And so by þe name of Ihesu and þe name of Mary, I sal haue þe moder & þe son, þe fadyr & þe holy goste. For none may say lord Ihesu bot in þe holy gost. And wher the holy gost is þer is þe holy trynyte, indyvisi-bill, incomprehensybyll. O God almyghty.

[III.] þer was a servaund of Saynt Anselme þat when his felos had hym ryse of his bed upon a Sunday & go to þe kyrrk with þaim, he lay stylly & wold not ryse for þaim & bard þe chawner dere after þaim þat þai sulde not let hym to hafe his ese. And þan come þer a fende to a hole & cald opon hym & sayd þat he had brouht hym a gyft, & þan he rase naked & come to þe hole þer as a child myght not pas forthe at & þer he sawe when he put forth his hande ane ugly roghie deuyll with byrmand eene sprenkylland mouthe & neshethprocessors bow & lyke to a bere þat toke hym by þe armes. And he wold fede crost hym bot he myght not for he was slayd oute of wytte & þan þe fende pulde hym oute at þat lytel wyndow withouten any horte & keste hym upo his bake & alow forth with hym sum tymne in þe aye & by þe erthe & porowe woddes. And when he felde it was a fende þat bare hym: he gret & made gret sorow blaming his sleuthweit telling his synnes & beheste to amende hym if he myght scape þat pelerr & þan he askyd help of saynts to pray for hym before þe maestie of god be whome he consuere þe fende to telle hym whyder he wold here hym, & þe fende sayd to hell, þan þe fende bare hym porow clewe & cragges depe & straye & þan he cryde & sayd: lord Ihesu Criste, by þe virtue of þi passion & þe prayer of þi blissed moder mercy on me wrecche. And glorios Virgyn Mary, haue mercy on me in þis gret neede lyke to peresche, & sone þe emny stode stil & sayd: þu synges to me a lyttel sang þat rehersys þe name of Mary. And þan with a gret vgly crye he kast hym downe upon a hepe of stones & vanyched away, þan wytte he not wher he was & made gret sorow & prayed. And so comyn in a mans lyknes ane angel & askyel whyne he was & why he was nakyd & þan he told hym al how he was delyuered by þe help of Saynt Mary & þan syed þe angel: & þow had not cald þe name of Our Lady þu had entryred into helle. Fro now forthe he deuowte to þi delyuerer & forgot not þat þu suffred, þu [art] so fer fro home þat be mans helpe þu cummes neuer agayn. And þan he was made slepyng with þe angel help brought to þe same in war he was layd in a hows upon a hyghe bolke & when he felt hymself þer he [calde] of þe name of Saynt Mary besily. And when his felows soght [hym], þai hard hym crynyng of þe name of Saynt Mary, & with mykil lab[our] gat
hym downe, & warmed hym at a fyre for he was nerhand for, [ ] tan pe remelande of his lyfe he led in pe drede [ ]

NOTES


3 He remarks: ‘It was probably intended to be read in “bits”, individual items or sections, and sometimes a grouping might suggest some encouragement to read a series of items together’, Douglas Gray, ‘London, British Library, Additional MS. 37049: A Spiritual Encyclopaedia’, in Text and Controversy from Wycof to Bœc: Essays in Honour of Anne Hudson, ed. by Helen Barr and Ann M. Hutchison, Medieval Church Studies (Turnhout, 2005), pp. 99–116; at 103; and see pp. 109–10 for a discussion of several other Marian items in the manuscript.

5 Several miracle tales focus on Mary’s extraordinary beauty, which is sometimes literally blinding. See Albert Poncelet, ‘Index miraculum B.V. Marieae quae saecl. VI—XV latinae conscripta sunt’, Analecta Bollandiana, 21 (1902), 247–566, esp. those miracles collected and retold in the fifteenth century by the Dominican friar Johannes Herold: no. 753, on the clerk of Paris devoted to the Virgin, who is blinded, and no. 714, which also concerns Mary’s beauty. Also translated in Johannes Herold, Miracles of the Blessed Virgin Mary, ed. by C.C. Swinton Bland (New York, 1928), pp. 105–9.


7 The relation between Mary’s beauty and Christ’s was eloquently captured by Dante: ‘Look now upon the face that is most like/ the face of Christ, for only through its brightness/ can you prepare your vision to see Him.’ Paradiso XXIII.136–37, as quoted in Jaroslav Pelikan, Mary Through the Centuries: Her Place in the History of Culture (New Haven and London, 1996), p. 139.

8 For an edition of this text and a brief commentary, see R.H. Bowers, ‘Middle-English Verses on the Appearance of Christ’, Anglia, 70 (1951), 436–37, in which he notes that the description of Christ is similar to that found in the Cassov Mendi. Dywan Elliott has discussed the widespread interest in Christ’s physical appearance seen in both the Veronica cloth and the Lentulus letter, which was reportedly sent by the governor, Publius Lentulus of Judaea, to Oecussus Caesar: ‘It contains a purported description of Christ, which concludes by portraying him as “a man, for singular beauty, far exceeding all the sons of men”.’ Dywan Elliott, ‘True Presence/False Christ: The Antinomies of Embodiment in Medieval Spirituality’, Medieval Studies, 64 (2002), 241–65; at 247 n.20.


10 The only notice of the text appears in James Hogg, ‘Unpublished Texts in the Carthusian Northern Middle English Religious Miscellany British Library MS. Add. 37649’, in Essays in Honour of Erwan Stercl on his Sixtieth Birthday, ed. by James Hogg (Salzburg, 1990), p. 256; Hogg briefly mentions the text as an unpublished item and remarks (without reference) that the name ‘probably refers to Fredericbert, an eighth-century Bishop of Angouleme’. Ulysse Chevalier, Répertoire des Sources Historiques du Moyen Âge: Die-Bibliographie, vol. 1 (New York, 1960), col. 1787 lists one Fredericbert, an eighth-century bishop of England. In the twelfth-century Vita of Christina of Markyate, she is brought before Fredericbert, prior of Huntington, who tries unsuccessfully to persuade her to accept her marriage vows. See The Life of Christina of Markyate, ed. and transl. by C.H. Talbot (Oxford, 1959), pp. 14, 58–67. Yet none of these possibilities is remotely persuasive, especially in light of the well-documented popularity of the devotion to the Holy Name in late medieval England. The text could be a translation or adaptation of a Latin text, or it may have been originally authored by a continental Carthusian, but no source has been identified.

11 There is no matching reference in any of the Carthusian reference works I have consulted, including P.-A. Leclercq, Saint Bruno et l’Ordre des Chartreux, 2 vols (Paris, 1885); L. Le Vasseur, Éphemerides Ordinis Cartusianus (Monte-Crul-sur-Mer, 1880), 4 vols; C. Le Coutre, Annales Ordinis Cartusianus Ab Anno 1084 Ad Annum 1429 (Monte-Crul-sur-Mer, 1888–90), 8 vols; Carol B. Rowntree, ‘Biographical Dictionary of the

12 Two interesting exceptions are the English manuscripts BL. Additional MS 13903, a sixteenth-century vellum copy of the statutes for lay-brothers from Sheen charthouse, with prayers and meditations, and BL. Cotton MS, Nero A.III, a manuscript that contains vernal forms of confession and other catechetical materials of use to the lay-brothers. On the use of illustrated books as teaching texts for lay-brothers, see Willene B. Clark, 'The Illustrated Medieval Aviary and the Lay-Brotherhood,' Gesta, 21:1 (1982), 63–73. For details of daily life in the lower house, see Thompson, The Carthusian Order in England, pp. 41–8.

13 The IHC or IHS monogram appears five times as a meditative or decorative emblem, and in many are discursive references to the Holy Name in the manuscript on, for example, fol. 23v, 24r, 26v, 30v, 35v, 37r, 46r, 52v, 67r, 81r. See Denis Renevey, 'The Name Poured Out: Margins, Illuminations, and Miniatures as Evidence for the Practice of Devotions to the Name of Jesus in Late Medieval England,' in The Mystical Tradition and the Carthusians, vol. 9, ed. by James Hogg (Anatolica Cartusiana 130) (Salzburg, 1995), pp. 127–48, and John Block Friedman, Northern English Books, Owners, and Makers in the Middle Ages (Syracuse, 1995), pp. 186–202. The Carthusian order may have played a special role in promoting Holy Name devotion; see Joseph A. Gribbin, Aspects of Carthusian Liturgical Practice in Later Medieval England (Analecta Cartusiana 99, no. 33) (Salzburg, 1995), pp. 38–50. For the liturgical contexts of the devotion, see Richard W. Pfaff, New Liturgical Feasts in Later Medieval England (Oxford, 1979), pp. 62, 78, 77–9.

14 On Rolle’s devotion to the Holy Name, see Denis Renevey, 'Name Above Names: The Devotion to the Name of Jesus from Richard Rolle to Walter Hilton’s Scale of Perfection,' in The Medieval Mystical Tradition: England, Ireland, Wales, Exeter Symposium VI, ed. by Marion Glasscoe (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 105–21, who notes (at 116): ‘Although one has to make allowances for Rolle’s idiosyncratic characteristics, it is important to recognize that the devotion to the Name triggers the mystical phenomena he calls name, color, and dolor.’ The subject is also treated in Nicholas Watson, Richard Rolle and the Invention of Authority (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 18–19, 55, 159–60 and passim.

15 These features conform with Hope Emily Allen’s description of Rolle’s style in Writings Ascribed to Richard Rolle Hermit of Hampole and Materials for his Biography (New York and London, 1927), p. 78.

16 According to Hope Emily Allen, Rolle ‘passed through a period of special devotion to the Virgin, which served as initiation into the devotion to the “Highest” [the Holy name of Jesus]: Allen, Writings Ascribed to Richard Rolle, p. 92.

17 Joining together the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary may have been a common devotional practice, especially on the continent. See Peter B. Biasiato, History of the Development of Devotion to the Holy Name, with a Supplement (St Bonaventura, NY, 1943), P. 99.

18 The broader tradition of medieval mnemotechnique has been richly detailed in Mary J. Carruthers, The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture.
(Cambridge, 1996), and The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images, 300–1200 (Cambridge, 1998). There is also the possibility that the lay-brother’s prayer bears a relation to an actual emblem of the Holy Name found on fol. 29r. The drawing appears in another group of Marian materials in the manuscript, just after the well-known lyric, ‘In a ternaked of a toure’, (IMEV 1466, fol. 25v). In the right-hand column, just above a prose text on the power of Mary’s name, a tree appears that bears a coloured calligraphic image of Mary’s name with the unusual spelling ‘Meria’. Two smaller flowers issue from the tree labeled ‘ifa’ and ‘Maria’, while below the text is a drawing of the Image Pietatis or ‘Man of Sorrows’. I would suggest that the appearance and spelling of the inscription ‘Meria’ reflects an attempt on the part of the scribe-artist to enclose the word ‘Jesus’ inside the word ‘Maria’. In other words, it seems at least possible that the drawing ‘Meria’ is based on the lay-brother’s prayer’s instruction to have ‘pe name of Mary closed within pe name of Ihesu. And pe name of Ihesu closed within pe name of Mary’. This drawing, therefore, might be a further facet of the production of the lay-brother’s prayer.

19 For a fascinating discussion of Middle English lyrics that highlight the transformation of written words into mental images intended for memorization, see Julia Boffey, ‘Loke on jis wrytyng, man, for jis devotion!’: Focal Texts in Some Later Middle English Religious Lyrics’, in Individuality and Achievement in Middle English Poetry, ed. by O.S. Pickering (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 129–45.

20 Some of the prayer’s compressed lines of relation may also be connected to the Eastern tradition of continuous prayer and devotion to the Holy Name, which was often linked with Canticles 5:2: ‘Ego dormio, et cor meum vigilat.’ Denis Renevey has shown that Rolle’s writings on the Holy Name may also have been influenced by this tradition. Because Rolle’s devotion to the Holy Name was so widely imitated throughout England and is especially ubiquitous in this manuscript as a whole, it is possible that the prayer was designed to satisfy higher levels of contemplation linked to this tradition. See Renevey, ‘Name Above Names’, p. 107 n.18 and Allen, Writings Attributed to Richard Rolle, pp. 72–7. On the role of the Carthusians in the circulation of Rolle’s writings and the promotion of his cult, see A.I. Doyle, ‘Carthusian Participation in the Movement of Works of Richard Rolle Between England and Other Parts of Europe in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries’, in Konkordanzzyklopädie und Mystik 2 (Salzburg: Analec Carthusiana 55, 1980), pp. 107–20.
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