

PHILIP GLEESON, *Dominican liturgical manuscripts from before 1254*, in «Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum» (ISSN 0391-7320), 42, (1972), pp. 81-135.

Url: <https://heyjoe.fbk.eu/index.php/afp>

Questo articolo è stato digitalizzato della Biblioteca Fondazione Bruno Kessler, in collaborazione con l'Institutum Historicum Ordinis Praedicatorum all'interno del portale [HeyJoe](#) - *History, Religion and Philosophy Journals Online Access*. HeyJoe è un progetto di digitalizzazione di riviste storiche, delle discipline filosofico-religiose e affini per le quali non esiste una versione elettronica.

This article was digitized by the Bruno Kessler Foundation Library in collaboration with the Institutum Historicum Ordinis Praedicatorum as part of the [HeyJoe](#) portal - *History, Religion, and Philosophy Journals Online Access*. HeyJoe is a project dedicated to digitizing historical journals in the fields of philosophy, religion, and related disciplines for which no electronic version exists.



Nota copyright

Tutto il materiale contenuto nel sito [HeyJoe](#), compreso il presente PDF, è rilasciato sotto licenza [Creative Commons](#) [Attribuzione-Non commerciale-Non opere derivate 4.0 Internazionale](#). Pertanto è possibile liberamente scaricare, stampare, fotocopiare e distribuire questo articolo e gli altri presenti nel sito, purché si attribuisca in maniera corretta la paternità dell'opera, non la si utilizzi per fini commerciali e non la si trasformi o modifichi.

Copyright notice

All materials on the [HeyJoe](#) website, including the present PDF file, are made available under a [Creative Commons](#) [Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License](#). You are free to download, print, copy, and share this file and any other on this website, as long as you give appropriate credit. You may not use this material for commercial purposes. If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you may not distribute the modified material.



DOMINICAN LITURGICAL MANUSCRIPTS FROM BEFORE 1254

BY
PHILIP GLEESON O.P.

The Dominican liturgy was fixed by the correction contained in the Prototype which was produced when Humbert of Romans was Master of the Order. 1254 was the year in which the legislation approving this correction was introduced. The Prototype, an exemplar of which is conserved in the General Archives of the Dominican Order in Rome (Codex XIV L₁), has been described several times, and its *Ordinarium* has been edited¹. From the period before 1254, only six known liturgical manuscripts witness to Dominican usages. Two of these have never been the object of a published study; the other four are better known, but a re-examination of their contents has proved worthwhile. The main purpose of this article² is to present these six manuscripts, to compare them with each other and with the *Ordinarium* of the Prototype, and to comment on their significance for the history of Dominican liturgical usages.

Before however dealing with the manuscripts themselves, it is necessary to sum up what can be known about the pre-1254 period from the early Constitutions and the acts of the General Chapters of the Order. Besides summing up what is already generally known, it is possible to draw attention to certain details which have never attracted much notice, but which in fact are of real help in solving some of the problems posed by the manuscripts.

¹ The most detailed description of the Prototype is by L. Rousseau, *De ecclesiastico officio fratrum praedicatorum secundum ordinationem venerabilis magistri Humberti de Romanis*, in AOP (= *Analecta sacri ordinis fratrum praedicatorum*) XVII (1925-6) 711-730, 744-766, 813-825; XVIII (1926-7) 104-120, 142-163, 193-203, 252-273. The *Ordinarium* of the Prototype has been edited by F. M. Guerrini, *Ordinarium juxta ritum sacri ordinis fratrum praedicatorum*, Rome 1921. In an appendix, Guerrini gives the calendar of the Prototype, taken from the *Collectarium*.

² This article summarizes a thesis presented to the Institut Supérieur de Liturgie in Paris. I thank Fr P.-M. Gy O.P. for his direction and encouragement.

THE EARLY CONSTITUTIONS

In dealing with the early Constitutions of the Order³, it is convenient to speak first of all about those constitutions which represent the customary adopted in 1216; then those which come from the General Chapter of 1220; and finally those which are from after 1220, or which cannot with certainty be dated as early as 1220.

Distinction I, Chapters 1 and 2, describe Matins, Lauds and *Pre-tiosa*, and also include prescriptions which apply to Mass and to the other hours of the Office. While very close to Prémontré, they contain elements which are not found in Prémontré but in other constitutions, and there are also sections for which no literary source has been found. These two chapters are, for the most part, from the customary adopted in 1216. They do not go into great detail, but we may note a few points. Matins of the Little Office of Our Lady was said while the brethren were rising, between the first and second bells for Divine Office. Matins and Lauds of the Divine Office are described as a unit, running from the *Venite* to the *Benedictus*. During the psalmody, each side of choir stands and sits alternately; that is, one side stands for the first psalm while the other side sits, and then sits for the second psalm while the other side stands, and so on.

The section about how the Little Office of Our Lady is to be said is one for which no exact literary source has been found. Humbert of Romans, in his commentary on the Constitutions, would go to some length to show that the custom of praying "while rising" was not a sign of irreverence⁴. As regards treating Matins and Lauds as one hour, Humbert uses the words, *Verum, secundum usum communem et moderum ambae matutinae insimul dicuntur, et computantur pro una hora...* He felt obliged to justify this custom, as it was not in accordance with the venerated Rule of St Benedict⁵. The text which explains how one side of choir sits while the other stands is another for which no definite

³ References are to the text as edited by A. H. Thomas, *De oudste constituties van de Dominicanen, voorgeschiedenis tekst, bronnen, ontstaan en ontwikkeling (1215-1237)*, met uitgave van de tekst, Louvain 1965.

Except where otherwise stated, I rely on Thomas's datation and identification of sources, as given in his critical apparatus and the accompanying study.

⁴ Humbert, *Opera* (= B. Humberti de Romanis, *Opera de vita regulari*, ed. J. J. Berthier, 2 vols., Rome 1888-9), Vol. II, 68-72.

⁵ Humbert, *Opera*, Vol. I, 156-7.

literary source has been found. The custom itself was observed in St Denys and in St Victor of Paris, but not in Prémontré.

We may also remark how *Pretiosa* was said in chapter, not in church. Originally, in the opinion of Fr Thomas, the lesson was not *de institutionibus vel de evangelio*, but *de regula vel de institutionibus*. The blessing, *Regularibus disciplinis*, occurs in the usages of St Rufus, but not in Prémontré.

Distinction I, Chapter 9, deals with Compline, and is in all probability from 1216. While the text contains many phrases for which no one literary source has been found, the actual Compline which is described is in no way unusual.

Distinction I, Chapter 21, contains a list of faults which might be mentioned at the conventual chapter. It is in the main from 1216, and is very close to Prémontré. Quite a number of faults have to do with liturgy. We may note in particular how a brother is at fault, *Si commune mandatum dimiserit et si aliquid cantare vel legere presumpserit quam quod communis sensus probat*.

Two prescriptions bearing on the Office have been identified as coming from the General Chapter of 1220. Distinction II, Chapter 29, speaks about students, and says that superiors are to see that the Office does not keep them from studying⁶. The phrase used, *taliter dispensetur*, is not in itself a clear reference to the actual dispensation of a student from the obligation to choir. However, the General Chapter of 1220 wrote into the Prologue of the Constitutions, as a general rule, that the superior has power to give dispensations in the interests of preaching and of study. The Acts of the General Chapter of 1240 show that in fact dispensations from choir were given for the sake of study⁷. Humbert's writings show that in his time such dispensations were quite common⁸. The other of the two prescriptions which come from 1220 is in Distinction II, Chapter 34, and says that preachers or other travellers, when on the road, should say the Office as best they can. They are also to content themselves with the Office of those churches at which they may happen to stay. It is hardly necessary to note that this does

⁶ See A. Duval, *L'étude dans la législation religieuse de saint Dominique*, in *Mélanges offerts à M.-D. Chenu*, Paris 1967, p. 232.

⁷ B. M. Reichert, editor, *Acta capitulorum generalium ordinis praedicatorum*, Vol. I (1220-1303), MOPH (= *Monumenta ordinis fratrum praedicatorum historica*) III, Rome 1898, 15.

⁸ Humbert, *Opera*, Vol. II, 30 & 38, for example.

not disprove the existence of a Dominican usage at the time⁹. It does show that it was not always possible for the brethren to say Office as it was said in their houses. This prescription about being content with the Office of their hosts is surely more than the regulation of a practical detail. It should probably be seen as another expression of the spirit which underlies the rule that the brethren should be content with the food which their hosts put before them; in other words, it strikes an evangelical note¹⁰. Humbert would dwell on the need for a preacher not to make himself too different from the rest of men¹¹. The part of this Chapter 34 which mentions those who live with bishops was struck from the Constitutions in 1240-42¹².

Distinction I, Chapter 4, states that all should be at Mass and Office together, unless someone is dispensed. The Office should be recited *breviter et succincte*. While Vicaire dated this chapter, which is proper to the Dominican constitutions, as part of the 1216 customary, Thomas prefers to date it 1220-31, and Duval, rightly it seems, is inclined to settle for 1220 itself¹³. The most notable thing in this chapter is the famous prescription to chant the Office briskly, in the interests not only of devotion but also of study. The work of the Order, which involved study, was seen to have claims even on the Divine Office.

Distinction II, Chapter 36, which should be dated 1220-31, sets the dates for two anniversaries: that of Fathers and Mothers on the 4th February, that of Benefactors and Familiars on the 10th September. The latter anniversary, whose date would be changed later on, is of particular interest in dating Dominican calendars.

In Distinction II, Chapter 34, the principle of conforming to the

⁹ It did not allow Dominican houses to adopt the Office of the locality. For a brief criticism of those who thought it did, see W. R. Bonniwell, *A history of the Dominican liturgy*, 2nd edition, New York 1945, 57.

¹⁰ For the evangelical idea behind accepting whatever food is offered, see W. A. Hinnebusch, *The history of the Dominican order*, Vol. I, New York 1966, 41.

¹¹ « Item, quaedam sunt regulae quae imponunt multa per quas sui professores multum differunt a communi vita hominum, sicut in habitu cucullato, vel in officio duodecim lectionum, et quibusdam aliis. Hujusmodi autem diversitates quandoque impediunt fructum animarum, et e contrario conformitates conferunt fructum. Propter quod Paulus fiebat omnia omnibus, eis se conformans, ut omnes lucrifaceret. I Cor. 9. Cum ergo regula beati Augustini non imponat aliquas hujusmodi extraneitates, magis praedicatori competit ». Humbert, *Opera*, Vol. I, 50.

¹² Reichert, *op. cit.*, MOPH III, 14, 19, 21.

¹³ M. H. Vicaire, *Histoire de saint Dominique*, 2 vols, Paris 1957, Vol. II, 371. A. Duval, *op. cit.*, 233.

customs of one's hosts is applied to the detail of inclinations. While this may have been done in 1220, it could be from a later date. During the period 1220-35 various details were added to the Constitutions, and may be seen in Distinction I, Chapters 1 and 4: there is to be a prostration during the Canon of the Mass, a genuflexion at the singing of certain texts, and the *Alleluia* at the end of Mass is prohibited.

In Distinction I, Chapter 4, there is a text which has aroused quite some interest. It reads, *Totum officium tam nocturnum quam diurnum confirmamus et volumus ab omnibus uniformiter observari, ita quod nulli liceat de cetero aliquid innovare*. This paragraph is out of place in the Rodez text of the Constitutions, which in all probability indicates that it is later than 1220. This argument is not absolutely conclusive, as the early Constitutions may simply have reproduced the anomaly of some prior text. In fact, as Fr Creytens points out, there is a rather similarly displaced prescription in Prémontré. Nevertheless, as Fr Creytens himself remarks, the use of the word *confirmamus* would seem to place the paragraph among the Acts of the General Chapters which took place from 1221 onwards¹⁴.

Is the paragraph the confirmation of a newly constituted usage or simply an attempt to stabilize a usage which had been in existence for some years? The paragraph itself does not make this clear, although the prohibition of "further innovations" seems to suggest that it meant to stabilize an already existing Office.

In virtue of this paragraph, the Office became "constitutional". The liturgical usages of the Order were explicitly taken into the constitutional sphere. Fr Creytens has traced how this was understood over the years, and how there was a passage from a rather general idea to a more precise one¹⁵. At first, General Chapters changed details of usage without the full constitutional procedure of inchoation, approval and confirmation, but eventually every detail of the liturgical books was regarded as something constitutional.

¹⁴ R. Creytens, L'Ordinaire des frères prêcheurs au moyen âge, in AFP (= Archivum fratrum Praedicatorum) 24 (1954) 124-6. Thomas agrees that this text is from 1221-35, and suggests 1228, the date of the Most General Chapter, as a probable date.

¹⁵ R. Creytens, op. cit., AFP XXIV, 126-8.

THE ACTS OF THE GENERAL CHAPTERS

The Acts of the General Chapters provide us with many useful points of reference, and help fill in the background to the liturgical activity of the early Dominicans. They contain texts which deal with the liturgical books and their revision, with the cult of St Dominic and other saints, and with the anniversaries of the dead. There are also texts which insist on the need for simplicity in worship, and which regulate certain ceremonial details.

The liturgical books

The Chapter of 1233 is the first we know of which speaks about liturgical books. It says that novices who have enough money should buy breviaries¹⁶. We may note in passing how there seems to be no hesitation on this point. The Order was decidedly clerical, and saw the Office-book as a necessity¹⁷. The breviary is again mentioned in 1240-42. When a brother is sent from one province to another he should take his breviary with him¹⁸. The book in both these mentions must be a personal Office-book, and note how it is taken for granted that the same breviary could be used in different provinces.

The Chapter of 1244¹⁹ shows that the Office was causing some difficulty. The books were apparently no longer in agreement with each other. The diffinitors are told to bring the rubrics and notation of the liturgical books for the night and day Office, and of the gradual and missal, to the next Chapter, in order to have them brought into harmony with each other. The following Chapter, that of 1245²⁰, set up a commission of four friars from the provinces of France, England, Lombardy and Germany. They are to correct the text, the chant, and the rubrics of the Office, and to supply defects. The house in Angers is to be their place of work, and they are to bring the night and day Offices of their respective provinces along with them. It is also prescribed that they

¹⁶ Reichert, *op. cit.*, MOPH III, 4.

¹⁷ We may contrast this with the soul-searching of the early Franciscans. See S. J. P. Van Dijk & J. H. Walker, *The origins of the modern Roman liturgy. The liturgy of the Papal court and the Franciscan Order in the thirteenth century*, London 1960, 184 f.

¹⁸ Reichert, *op. cit.*, MOPH III, 22.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, 29.

²⁰ *Ibidem*, 33.

are to work *minimo cum dispendio* — presumably the spending of money is meant, but perhaps also the spending of time. While the Chapter of 1244 spoke about the books of the Office and the Mass, this Chapter of 1245 seems to concern itself only with the Office. Perhaps the Mass-books were thought to be sufficiently uniform.

The Chapter of 1246²¹ begins the procedure to make the as yet uncompleted revision of the Four Friars constitutional; it adds that if they disagree among themselves the Master of the Order's decision is to be accepted. The Chapter of 1247²² continues the procedure, and it shows too that the work of revision was still not finished. It repeats the provision that the Master's decision is to be accepted in case of disagreement. The Chapter of 1248²³ completes the procedure — the correction of the Four Friars is to be accepted by all. The work would seem to be finished at this stage, and there is no mention about having recourse to the Master's decision. It is interesting to note that the Provincial Chapter of Provence decided, in 1249, to send two of the brethren to the Province of France to obtain "the new correction of the breviary"²⁴.

These same three years, 1246-48²⁵, deal also with the lectionary, both for the temporal and the sanctoral. The Provincial of France, that is, Humbert of Romans, is commissioned to put the lectionary in order, and all are to accept his lectionary. The 1248 confirmation of this lectionary is not attested by all the manuscripts, but it seems most likely that Humbert had at any rate produced a lectionary. We may recall that while he was Provincial of the Roman Province it was decided to produce a lectionary there²⁶.

The Chapter of 1250 registers the fact that many complaints had been received about the Angers correction of the Office. The phrase which is used, *super discordia multiplici divini officii per quatuor fratres ordinati*, may refer to an internal lack of coherence in their work. Ho-

²¹ Ibidem, 35.

²² Ibidem, 39.

²³ Ibidem, 41.

²⁴ C. Douais, *Acta capitulorum provincialium ordinis fratrum praedicatorum*, Première province de Provence, Province romaine, Province d'Espagne (1239-1302), Toulouse 1894, 34.

²⁵ Reichert, op. cit., MOPH III, 36, 39, 41.

²⁶ T. Kaeppli & A. Dondaine, *Acta capitulorum provincialium provinciae Romanae* (1243-1344) in MOPH XX, Rome 1941, 4. We are not saying that the Humbert mentioned in the Chapter was Humbert of Romans, but simply that Humbert of Romans was provincial at that time, 1244.

wever, one may also suspect that provincial susceptibilities had been hurt, and that the brethren were unwilling to abandon the practices with which they had become familiar. Whatever about this, the Four Friars are commissioned to be in Metz on the 1st November, and to correct the Office once again. They are told to produce the correction in one volume²⁷. This makes one wonder if the material presentation of the Angers correction left something to be desired. Perhaps the Four Friars had taken the *minimo cum dispendio* too much to heart, and merely corrected the existing books by putting in marginal notes and extra folios. However, we cannot be sure of this, and it is possible that a good material presentation in several volumes had been produced, but for some reason, economy or convenience perhaps, it was decided to produce a one-volume Office-book. Meanwhile, copying and correcting according to the Angers revision are to be suspended. The Chapter of 1251²⁸, in a simple admonition, says that this most recent correction (that of Metz) is to be accepted by all. An exemplar is to be left in Paris and another in Bologna. The Order's Office-books are to be copied or corrected in accordance with these exemplars.

An inchoation of the Chapter of 1252²⁹ begins the procedure which would have changed the text of the Constitutions so as to make explicit mention of the Metz correction. But then the Master of the Order, John of Wildeshausen, died, and there was no Chapter in 1253. The procedure for putting the Metz correction into the Constitutions was never to be completed.

In 1254, the new Master of the Order, Humbert of Romans himself, is commissioned to put the Office in order, and to correct the "ecclesiastical books". At the same Chapter of 1254, the procedure for changing the text of the Constitutions to make explicit mention of Humbert's correction is begun. The change is approved in 1255 and confirmed in 1256³⁰.

In 1254 also³¹, the brethren are invited to write to the Master of the Order and tell him what they think needs to be corrected in the Office. Finally, in 1256³², the General Chapter taxes the provinces to pay the

²⁷ Reichert, *op. cit.*, MOPH III, 53.

²⁸ *Ibidem*, 60.

²⁹ *Ibidem*, 63.

³⁰ *Ibidem*, 68, 73, 78.

³¹ *Ibidem*, 71.

³² *Ibidem*, 81.

cost of making exemplars of Humbert's correction. Subsequent Chapters would insist that all the Order's liturgical books be accurately corrected in accordance with these exemplars³³.

The cult of the saints

In the Acts of the General Chapters there are several mentions of the cult of the saints, especially that of St Dominic.

The Acts of the General Chapter of 1233³⁴ give an account of the translation of the body of St Dominic. This date of the Translation, and the date of St Dominic's canonization in 1234³⁵, are naturally important points of reference in any study of early Dominican liturgical manuscripts.

An admonition of 1239³⁶ treats of the cult of St Dominic. When possible, one conventual Mass a week should be in honour of him. Besides this, five antiphons are given to be used as a memory of St Dominic at Lauds and Vespers. One of these is the antiphon *O decus Hispaniae*. Only these words of an *incipit* are given in the Acts of the Chapter, but the diurnal of Engelberg, which we shall describe below, shows us that it is in fact the antiphon *O lumen Ecclesiae*, except for the first three words³⁷. The next year, 1240, the antiphons for the memory of St Dominic are somewhat changed, and *O lumen* itself appears for the first time known to us³⁸. In 1242, the legend of St Dominic is purged of a section which must have been regarded as disedifying³⁹. In 1244, the text of the collect for St Dominic is changed to read *meritis et doctrinis*⁴⁰. It originally read *meritis et exemplis*, as is seen from the manuscripts. In 1245 the brethren are asked to report any miracles of St

³³ Humbert himself, in an encyclical letter of 1256, wrote, « Adhuc noveritis quod diversitas Officii Ecclesiastici, circa quod unificandum multa jam capitula sollicitudinem non modicam adhibuerunt, per Dei gratiam, ad unitatem incertis exultantibus [?] est reducta. Rogo autem ut detis operam ad correctionem illius secundum illa, ut uniformitas Officii diu desiderata in Ordine inveniatur ubique. » Humbert, *Opera*, Vol. II, 503.

³⁴ Reichert, *op. cit.*, MOPH III, 3.

³⁵ See the Bull of Gregory IX, 3rd July 1234, « Fons sapientiae », in BOP (= Bullarium ordinis fratrum praedicatorum, I-VIII, ed. Ripoll-Bremont, Rome 1729-40) I, 67.

³⁶ Reichert, *op. cit.*, MOPH III, 11.

³⁷ f 30^{va}.

³⁸ Reichert, *op. cit.*, MOPH III, 15.

³⁹ *Ibidem*, 24.

⁴⁰ *Ibidem*, 29, variant reading. In 1254 Stephen of Salanhac petitioned to have « temporalibus » changed to « spiritualibus » in the prayer of St Dominic; he wished

Dominic which are not written in his "Life"⁴¹. The Chapters of 1249-51 change the rules about inclinations, by adding that a head inclination should be made when St Dominic's name is mentioned in a prayer⁴².

Various admonitions urge the brethren to see that due attention is given to the cult of St Dominic. The Chapter of 1250 tells them to try and have their own churches, and other churches also, dedicated in honour of St Dominic⁴³. The Chapters of 1254 and 1256 admonish them to make sure that St Dominic's name is put into calendars and litanies, and also urge that his feast be celebrated and that pictures of him be put in the churches⁴⁴. These same years see his name added to the formula for profession; the Chapter of 1254 permits a procession on his feast, and that of 1255 again asks for reports of miracles.

Besides St Dominic, other saints are mentioned in the Acts of the Chapters. An admonition of 1239⁴⁵ makes the feast of St Vincent of Saragossa, 22nd January, a *semiduplex*. In 1243 an admonition makes the feast of the Eleven Thousand Virgins, 21st October, a nine lesson feast; likewise the feast of St Elizabeth of Thuringia, 19th November⁴⁶.

An inchoation (not just an admonition) of 1251⁴⁷ directs that the feast of St Catherine of Alexandria, 25th November, be made a *semiduplex* and have a proper *historia*; that a memory of St Martha be made on the feast of St Mary Magdalen, 22nd July; and that the feast of the Eleven Thousand Virgins be made a nine lesson feast. This inchoation is

the prayer to read, « Deus qui ecclesiam tuam beati Dominici confessoris tui illuminare dignatus es meritis et doctrinis, concede ut eius intercessione spiritualibus proficiat incrementis et gaudiis perfruatur eternis. Per dominum ». His petition was not granted, but it witnesses to the fact that the reading « meritis et doctrinis » had been adopted before Humbert's correction. See A. Callebaut, *Influence de l'oraison de l'office de s. François sur celle de s. Dominique*, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, 20 (1927) 213-215.

⁴¹ Reichert, *op. cit.*, MOPH III, 33.

⁴² *Ibidem*, 43, 48, 55.

⁴³ *Ibidem*, 53. Note that Innocent IV himself dedicated the Dominican church in Bologna in honour of St Dominic in 1251. See the Bull « Dei Filius », 17th October 1251, which refers to this dedication, BOP I, 200. Alexander IV dedicated the church in Naples in honour of St Dominic; see the Bull « Consecrationes altarium », 11th February 1255, BOP I, 271.

⁴⁴ Reichert, *op. cit.*, MOPH III, 70 & 81.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, 11.

⁴⁶ *Ibidem*, 27. St Elizabeth was canonized in 1235; see H. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum romanorum*, Berlin 1874-5, no. 9929.

⁴⁷ Reichert, *op. cit.*, MOPH III, 56.

neither approved nor confirmed by the following Chapters, but it is interesting to see the full constitutional procedure appearing for such changes in the rank of a feast ⁴⁸. Note too how this inchoation of 1251 makes the feast of the Eleven Thousand Virgins a nine lesson feast, although an admonition of 1243 had done the same thing. So the admonition of 1243 was either ignored or resisted by the provinces, or perhaps the Four Friars decided not to have this nine lesson feast on their revised calendar. At any rate, this inchoation of 1251 makes us wary about assuming that previous admonitions about the rank of a feast were necessarily heeded by the Four Friars. We cannot assume that the calendar of the Four Friars had nine lesson feasts of the Eleven Thousand Virgins and of St Elizabeth of Thuringia, as prescribed by the Chapter of 1243. In other words, the absence of these nine lesson feasts should not lead us to conclude that a calendar or sanctoral is pre-1243. This detail has shown itself to be of some importance in dating the manuscripts. We may add that Humbert's revision adopted the proposal for a *semi-duplex* feast of St Catherine, but did not make the feasts of the Eleven Thousand Virgins and of St Elizabeth nine lesson feasts.

St Peter Martyr, who died in 1252, was canonized in 1253, and his cult was vigorously encouraged by a number of Papal documents ⁴⁹. An admonition of the Chapter of 1254 says that his name should be put into all calendars and litanies, that pictures of him should be put in churches, and that his feast should be celebrated, while another admonition of the same year makes the feast a *totum duplex* ⁵⁰. The Chapter of 1255 asks the brethren to let the prior of Milan know about any miracles ⁵¹, and the Chapter of 1256 again admonishes that Peter Martyr's feast be celebrated, that his picture be painted in the churches, and his name inserted in calendars and martyrologies ⁵².

The Chapter of 1255 ⁵³ contains an admonition that priors should not make people work in the houses of the Order on the feasts of the saints of the Order. At that time there were three such feasts, two of St Dominic and one of Peter Martyr.

⁴⁸ See R. Creytens, op. cit., AFP XXIV, 126-7.

⁴⁹ For Peter Martyr's canonization see the Bull « Magna et crebris », 25th March 1253, BOP I, 228. See also, e. g., « Magna magnalia », 8th August 1254, BOP I, 252, which insists that his Office be celebrated with due solemnity.

⁵⁰ Reichert, op. cit., MOPH III, 70 & 71.

⁵¹ Ibidem, 76.

⁵² Ibidem, 81.

⁵³ Ibidem, 76.

The anniversaries of the dead

The anniversaries of the dead are the subject of a constitutional change made by the Chapters of 1246-48⁵⁴. The anniversary of Benefactors is changed from the 10th September to the 5th September. The anniversary of the Brethren is fixed on the 10th October. There is a slight discrepancy between the text of the inchoation and the text of the approval and confirmation. The inchoation puts the anniversary of Benefactors on the 6th September (*tertia die post octavam s. Augustini*); the text of the approval and confirmation specifies the 5th September (*sequenti die post octavam s. Augustini*). Perhaps this discrepancy is due to a scribal error, but it could be that the Chapter of 1247 decided to change from the 6th to the 5th.

In 1245 the Nativity of Our Lady, 8th September, was given an octave in the Roman calendar⁵⁵. The Cistercians too introduced this octave the same year⁵⁶. It is very probable that the Dominicans also introduced the octave, although the Acts of the Chapters do not mention it. This introduction of an octave would seem to be the reason why the anniversary of Benefactors was moved from the 10th September, that is, it was moved out of the week following the Nativity of Our Lady. This change of the anniversary of Benefactors from the 10th to the 5th September is a useful reference which has been somewhat neglected.

Besides those texts which deal with the liturgical books, with the cult of the saints, and with the anniversaries of the dead, there are many other matters of liturgical interest in the Acts of the General Chapters. For example, Chapter after Chapter told the brethren to avoid all pretentiousness in their liturgical ceremonies. In particular, the Chapters tried to restrict the use of rich materials, especially gold and silver, silk and precious stones. The texts show us that abuses did exist, and that the Chapters remained determined to correct these abuses; they also show that it was difficult to make practical regulations about these questions of detail, and difficult to enforce such regulations. Many details of rubrics are also dealt with in the Acts of the General Chapters, and it is noticeable that several inchoations in this field were not followed by

⁵⁴ *Ibidem*, 34, 38, 41.

⁵⁵ See J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, Venice 1759, XXIII, col. 675. See also Van Dijk, *op. cit.*, 373.

⁵⁶ B. Backaert, *L'évolution du calendrier cistercien*, *Collectanea ord. cist. ref.* 13 (1951) 115.

approval and confirmation, again showing how hard it was for the Order to reach agreement on such matters of detail. It is however beyond the scope of the present article to comment on these texts, even though an acquaintance with them is of great help in understanding the background to the task of revision and correction which was undertaken by the Order.

THE LITURGICAL MANUSCRIPTS

In the following pages, I first of all present the manuscripts⁵⁷, and then summarize the results of a detailed comparative study. As the St Dominic breviary is in some ways eccentric, I deal with it separately, after all the others. These are the six manuscripts:

- C = *The Copenhagen choir-book*. Copenhagen, Royal Library, Ny kgl. Saml., 632, 8^o.
- M = *The missal of Paris*. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Latin 8884, (formerly Suppl. lat. 842).
- E = *The diurnal of Engelberg*. Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek, Codex 104, (formerly 5/34).
- B = *The breviary of the Four Friars*. Rome, Archivum Generale Ordinis Praedicatorum, XIV Lz.
- R = *The Rau missal*. Early Dominican missal from Lyons, in private collection.
- D = *The St Dominic breviary*. Rome, Monasterio del S. Rosario, Monte Mario, *Breviarium quo utebatur S. P. Dominicus confessor*.

*The Copenhagen choir-book*⁵⁸

Copenhagen, Royal Library, Ny kgl. Saml. 632, 8^o. Vellum. 135 × 98 mm. 139 folios. The recent pagination is complete and consecutive. There is also an early pagination; the versos of folios 6-138 are marked II-CXXXIII. Most of the gatherings are signed, and some bear catchwords. The gatherings are arranged as follows: Folios 1-5: a gathering from which the first folio has been lost; folio 5 is glued to folio 6. Folios 6-17: a regular gathering of 12 folios; the signature 'II' appears on 17^v.

⁵⁷ I must thank the members of the Leonine Commission who helped me both by answering my queries about paleographical details and by letting me have whatever microfilms I needed.

⁵⁸ This manuscript is briefly described in E. Jørgensen, *Catalogus codicum latinorum medii aevi bibliothecae regiae Hafniensis*, Copenhagen 1926, 208. I wish to thank Dr Tue Gad for checking the material collation.

Folios 18-77: six regular gatherings of 10 folios each; the signatures 'III' - 'VIII' appear on 27^v, 37^v, 47^v, 57^v, 67^v, and 77^v. Folios 78-89: a regular gathering of 12 folios; no signature appears on it. Folios 90-99: a regular gathering of 10 folios; the signature 'X' appears on 99^v. Folios 100-139: five regular gatherings of 8 folios each; the signatures 'XI' - 'XIII' appear on 107^v, 115^v, 123^v, and 131^v; half of folio 139 is lost (it is torn from the upper outside corner to the lower inside corner) and what remains of this folio is badly soiled.

The whole book seems to come from the one 13th century hand; even the majority of marginal annotations are in a hand which is not clearly distinguishable from the first hand, but which may be called the "second hand" for the sake of convenience. Various other hands are responsible for additions to the calendar, the re-arrangement of the responsories for Matins of the Dead (56^r-59^r), and the addition of some *incipits* for the common of saints in paschaltide (123^v).

The book contains the following sections:

- 1^r-5^v: Calendar. One month to a page. The months of January and February are missing.
- 6^r-139^v: Choir-book giving Dominican usage; with 7, 8 or 9 full lines of music to a page. It supplies material relating to both Mass and Office.
- 6^r-41^v: Kyriale, Sequences, Masses of Our Lady. In the margin of 41^v, at the end of the Masses of Our Lady, there is the note, *Usque huc est secundum usum fratrum predicatorum*, followed by the *va* of a *vacat* whose ending has been lost.
- 41^v-48^v: Office of St Nicholas, complete except for Matins, for which only the invitatory verse is given; sequence of St Nicholas; two sequences of Our Lady. The Marian sequences are followed by the note, *Hic incipit secundum usum fratrum predicatorum usque in finem libri*.
- 48^v-49^v: Tract, of Our Lady.
- 49^r-61^r: Mass and Office of the Dead.
- 61^r-112^r: Offices of the Trinity, of St Nicholas, and of Our Lady (Assumption, Nativity of Our Lady, Annunciation and Purification).
- 112^r-114^r: Lenten Compline.
- 114^r-115^v: Sacred Triduum, not complete. With rubrics.
- 116^r-123^v: Processions. Antiphons without rubrics.
- 124^r-139^v: Hymnal. This has been corrected. Certain hymns are left without music (although with staves). Others have been re-divided, some re-headed. There are marginal additions.

This manuscript, the *Liber choralis*, the *Codex Rosenthal*, caused some discussion at the beginning of the century. As may be seen from

the above description, it contains a collection of material for use at Mass and Office. The most obvious reason for thinking this book has some interest for the Dominican liturgy is that a hand, uniform with the first hand, writes three notes in the margins. The first note is at the beginning of the first Office of St Nicholas (41^v), and it reads, *Usque huc est secundum usum fratrum predicatorum*, and is followed by the beginning of a *vacat*; the second is at the beginning of the tract for Our Lady in Septuagesima (48^v), and says, *Hic incipit secundum usum fratrum predicatorum usque in finem libri*; the third is at the beginning of the second Office of St Nicholas (71^v), and reads, *Secundum usum fratrum predicatorum*. According to these notes, therefore, up to the first Office of St Nicholas is the Dominican usage. Then follows a section which seems to be cancelled; only the beginning of the *vacat* can be seen, but the cancellation surely applies to the section between the first and second marginal notes, that is, the section containing the first Office of St Nicholas and the three sequences which follow this Office. From the end of these three sequences (the beginning of the tract for Our Lady in Septuagesima) to the end of the book is according to the Dominican usage; a third note reminds us of this when we come to the second Office of St Nicholas. The script is uniform throughout the book, so we may take it that even the processional and hymnal, which are contained in the last three gatherings, are meant to be covered by the note which says the usage is Dominican *usque in finem libri*.

A comparison with other manuscripts shows there is no reason to doubt the accuracy of these notes. The hymnal, it is true, presents certain problems. Some hymns have not had the musical notation filled in, and there are hymns written into the margins by a hand uniform with the first. These facts may be interpreted as indicating that a correction was made before the hymnal was completely finished, that is, before the music was written onto the staves. The presumption must be that this correction, like the marginal notes, aimed at eliminating non-Dominican elements and supplying Dominican. This is borne out by comparative study.

Neither the original calendar nor the body of the choir-book contains any mention of St Dominic. The latest feast in the calendar is St Francis'; he was canonized in 1228. St Elizabeth of Thuringia is absent from the calendar, and the Eleven Thousand Virgins are only a memory. As the month of January has been lost, we cannot say what rank was given to the feast of St Vincent of Saragossa. The anniversaries of the Dead are not mentioned, and the Nativity of Our Lady is not given an

octave. In other words, nothing in the calendar suggests a date much later than 1228.

The calendar contains four mentions which are not found in any of the other early Dominican manuscripts known to us. These are: Perpetua and Felicity, 7th March; Christina, 10th May, after the usual mention of Gordianus and Epimachus; Victor, 14th May; Gall, 16th October. None of these mentions has helped in localizing the manuscript. The cult of the saints in question was not at all confined to any particular area. St Gall is the most unusual of the four; while he frequently occurs in Germanic manuscripts, he occurs less often in others; however, his presence does not even indicate if the manuscript is from North or South of the Alps. No rank is given to the mention of St Gall, so it may be the remnant of a previous calendar rather than the witness to a special devotion to the saint.

The dates of two feasts differ from the dates given in other known early Dominican manuscripts. St Margaret is mentioned on the 13th July, a date on which her feast was observed in many different places. St Leodegarius is mentioned on the 3rd October, which is an uncommon date. We find it only once in Leroquais, in a 15th century breviary of St Bernard of Romans; we also find it only once in Ebner, in an 11th century calendar of Salzburg⁵⁹. It is impossible to deduce anything from such coincidences.

The only saint in the body of the book, apart from those in the hymnal (John the Baptist, Peter and Paul, Michael) is St Nicholas. In the apparently "non-Dominican" section between the marginal notes on folios 41^v and 48^v, he is given an Office, complete except for Matins, and a sequence, *Congaudentes exultemus vocali concordia* (45^r). These, judging by the beginning of the *vacat* mentioned above, have probably been cancelled. They are at any rate marked off in a way which indicates they are not Dominican. Further on in the book, St Nicholas is given a complete Office, marked as Dominican (71^v-80^r). This Office comes after the Office of the Trinity, and before the Offices of Our Lady. I prefer not to speak of a "double Office" of St Nicholas⁶⁰; as the book

⁵⁹ V. Leroquais, *Les bréviaires manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, 6 vols. Paris 1934, Vol. III, no. 635. A. Ebner, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte und Kunstgeschichte des Missale Romanum in Mittelalter. Iter Italicum.*, Freiburg im B. 1896 (photo. reprod. Graz 1957), 353.

⁶⁰ Dom Cagin spoke of « la dualité d'office dont bénéficie saint Nicolas »: P. Cagin, *Dominicains et Teutoniques, conflit d'attribution du 'Liber Choralis'*, no.

stands, there is one Office which seems to have been cancelled, and another which is marked as Dominican. The hymnal, as has been noted, was almost certainly revised before completion; we may suggest that the treatment of St Nicholas was due to the same revision, and that, before the book was completed, the first Office was cancelled and replaced by the second. The arrangement of the gatherings offers no difficulty to such a hypothesis.

However, even if there is not a "double Office" of St Nicholas, it is right to assume that he was the object of special devotion in the place or community to which the book belonged. If we take it that the manuscript was actually used by Dominicans, then we must say that it is from before the canonization of St Dominic in 1234, as he is not mentioned in the original calendar. One naturally thinks of the church of St Nicholas of the Vineyards in Bologna, which was in Dominican hands since 1219⁶¹. It is the only church of that early pre-1234 period which was both Dominican and dedicated in honour of St Nicholas. In fact, the identification in the catalogue of Ludwig Rosenthal was quite plausible⁶².

Very few additions were made to the calendar after it was written. The mention of St Margaret, 13th July, has been crossed out, another hand adds Margaret on the 20th July, but this addition has been partially erased, or perhaps accidentally smudged. Three feasts have been added to the calendar. They are that of Peter Martyr, 29th April, *semiduplex, ix lectiones*; the Translation of St Dominic, 24th May, *ix lectiones, semiduplex*; and St Anthony of Padua, 13th June, three lessons. The last of these additions, that of St Anthony, offers no difficulty; St Anthony was added to the Dominican calendar, as a three lesson feast, in 1260-62⁶³. The mentions of Peter Martyr and the Translation of St Dominic present a problem. On the one hand, their presence reinforces the connection with the Dominican Order. On the other hand, the rank of *semiduplex* is a lower rank than that assigned to either of these feasts in any of the other Dominican calendars known to us. The Translation, in pre-

182 du Catalogue 120 de M. Ludwig Rosenthal (extract from *Revue des Bibliothèques*, juillet-septembre 1908), Paris 1908, 18.

⁶¹ For the history of how the Dominicans acquired this church, see Vicaire, *op. cit.*, II, 153-155.

⁶² He described it as « *Liber choralis, ad usum fratrum praedicatorum. Manuscript sur vélin en rouge et noir, composé avant 1232 à Saint-Nicholas de Bologne...* ». See Cagin, *op. cit.*, 5.

⁶³ Reichert, *op. cit.*, MOPH III, 104, 107, 113.

Humbert calendars, is *duplex*, and in Humbert's calendar it is *totum duplex*. The feast of Peter Martyr was introduced in 1254 as a *totum duplex*. So a slight doubt is created; perhaps the calendar and choir-book, although *secundum usum fratrum predicatorum*, were not actually used by Dominicans. There were other Orders which adopted the Dominican use. The Teutonic Knights, at least from 1244, did this ⁶⁴. We do not know if they or anyone else had adopted the use before 1244 ⁶⁵. However, even if the book belonged to non-Dominicans, it is still the Dominican use. Its marginal notes and a comparative study reassure us about this.

The feast of St Dominic has not been added to the calendar. This need have no great significance. The calendar may no longer have been in regular use, or perhaps it was the object of that carelessness which seems implied by the Chapters of 1254 and 1256 when they urge the brethren, some twenty years after the canonization of St Dominic, to make sure that his name is written into all calendars and martyrologies. In fact, the relatively low rank of Peter Martyr and the Translation is more difficult to explain than the simple failure to add the feast of St Dominic. We may remark however that *semiduplex* was one of the higher ranks, which only later became quite common, so the "down-grading" involved in the rank *semiduplex* should not be exaggerated. Still, the slight doubt cannot be completely removed. Perhaps the book was compiled for non-Dominicans, or perhaps it passed into non-Dominican hands at an early stage. However, we are not forced to adopt such an explanation, and the simplest solution is to presume that the book was in Dominican hands at least until 1262, when St Anthony of Padua was added to the Dominican calendar.

Two obituary notices have been added to the calendar, those of Sister Bartholomea and Sister Richeldina, on the 21st May and the 22nd June. Because of these, Dom Cagin suggested that the manuscript always belonged to nuns, perhaps even to the monastery of the Dominican nuns of St Agnes in Bologna, which would explain the obituary notices and also the importance given to St Nicholas ⁶⁶.

In the body of the book there are two additions which are certainly not Dominican ⁶⁷. Maybe the obituary notices should be linked to these,

⁶⁴ See Potthast, *op. cit.*, no. 11257. See also Cagin, *op. cit.*, 11.

⁶⁵ See Bonniwell, *op. cit.*, 197-209.

⁶⁶ Cagin, *op. cit.*, 7.

⁶⁷ The two non-Dominican additions are the notes which change the order of

that is, maybe the obituary notices and these two additions are from the one non-Dominican source. Once again, however, no one explanation forces itself upon us.

What is certain is that the book contains the Dominican usage. It is from after 1228, and most probably from before 1234. It is the earliest known Dominican manuscript to contain plain-chant. As such it is being studied by Sister Schwerdtfeger, who agrees that it is the Dominican usage⁶⁸.

*The missal of Paris*⁶⁹

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Latin 8884 (formerly Suppl. lat. 842). Vellum. 357 × 253 mm. 335 folios. There are two ancient fly-leaves in front, the second of which is marked 'A' by a recent hand. The recent pagination, 1-336, is complete and consecutive. 336 is an ancient fly-leaf. There are no signatures, and the binding-thread is difficult to see. But judging by catchwords and traces of catchwords, the gatherings are arranged as follows: Folio 1 is a single leaf, a later addition. Folios 2-7: a regular gathering. Folios 8-115: nine regular gatherings of 12 folios each. Folios 116-125: a gathering of 10 folios. (Perhaps two folios are missing from between 120 and 121, the centre of the gathering. However, the original text breaks off before the end of 120, after the Solemn Prayers for Good Friday, and 121 begins with the heading of the first reading for Holy Saturday. So it is impossible to say if any of the original text has been lost, or if part of the text was omitted by the copyist). Folios 126-269: twelve regular gatherings of 12 folios each. Folios 270-282: a gathering of 12 folios, plus a later insert, the smaller folio 277. Folios 283-296: probably a gathering of 14 folios. Folios 297-332: three regular gatherings of 12 folios each. Folios 333-335: a pair of folios followed by a single folio.

The manuscript contains the following sections:

[Folio 1: a later insert, with Gloria and Credo on recto]

2^r-7^v: Dominican calendar, one month to a page, written in red and black, with some blue. Except for two 14th century obituary notices, all additions

the responsories in the Office of the Dead (folios 56^r-59^r), and the material for the common of saints in paschaltide (folio 123^v).

⁶⁸ My knowledge of Sister Schwerdtfeger's work comes from an exchange of letters.

⁶⁹ This manuscript is described in V. Leroquais, *Les sacramentaires et les missels manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, 4 vols. Paris 1924, Vol. II, 104-6.

to the calendar are by a single 14th century hand. This hand, the "second hand", has added over one hundred mentions, and changed the rank of many feasts, thus adapting the calendar to the use of Paris. In dealing with the missal as an early Dominican document, it is possible to ignore this hand.

- 8^{ra}-296^{vb}: Dominican missal. Full missal, without musical notation. Two columns to a page, 25 lines to a column. Rubrics in red or with red underlining, initials in red and blue. A single hand is responsible for nearly all the additions. It adapts the body of the missal to the use of Paris, is uniform with the second hand of the calendar, and may be ignored. A few other hands have also made additions, but most of these are without Dominican interest. However, the additions of St. Martha, 29th July, St Wenceslaus, 28th September, and St Edward, 13th October, are by one distinct hand, and are perhaps an indication that the missal was still in Dominican hands at the end of the 13th century. Still, the book is remarkably free from Dominican additions or corrections. This missal is made up of a temporal on 8^{ra}-191^{ra}, which runs from the first Sunday of Advent to the 25th Sunday after Trinity (the ordinary of the Mass and proper prefaces on 126^{vb}-133^{rb}, before Easter Sunday); a proper of the saints on 191^{ra}-247^{va}; a common of the saints on 247^{va}-272^{ra}; Masses for various occasions on 272^{ra}-291^{ra}; a blessing for Holy Water on 291^{ra}-292^{ra}; general rubrics on 292^{rb}-293^{vb}; and sequences on 293^{vb}-296^{va}.
- [297^{ra}-332^{vb}: Non-Dominican supplement. The parchment is whiter and stiffer than in the Dominican part. The hand is uniform with the second hand of the preceding section. Initials are in red and blue. This supplement contains mainly scripture-readings and sequences, representing the use of Paris].
- 333^{ra}-335^{ra}: Dominican supplement. Red and black (no blue). The hand is distinct from the first hand. It gives the feast of Peter Martyr, both feasts of St Dominic, and the feast of the Crown of Thorns, all agreeing with the Prototype of Humbert.
- 335^{rb} and 335^v were originally blank. They have been written on by various hands, and now show, besides some *probationes penne*, notes which say that the missal belongs to the Chapel of St Louis of Marseilles, and that this Chapel was founded in the church of Paris in 1302 by Galleran le Breton, Cup-bearer to the King.

The original parts of the book are clearly Dominican. In the calendar, the Translation of St Dominic, 24th May, is ranked *duplex*, and his feast, 5th August, *totum duplex*. Both these feasts are in the body of the missal. The Translation gives the formularies for the Mass, the feast refers back to the Translation. The presence of these feasts fixes the date of the manuscript after 1234.

The feast of St Peter Martyr is absent from the calendar and the sanctoral, but it is added in the supplement at the end of the missal. So the missal is from before 1254, it is pre-Humbert. This is confirmed by the existence of fairly numerous differences between the missal and the Prototype.

There are indications which suggest a date close to 1234. The feast of St Vincent of Saragossa, 22nd January, has the rank of nine lessons in the calendar, whereas in 1239 an admonition of the General Chapter raised this feast to the rank of *semiduplex*. The collect for St Dominic reads *meritis et exemplis*, not *meritis et doctrinis*, so it has not been affected by the admonition of 1244. The calendar has no mention of the anniversary of Benefactors, which prevents us from using the change of date as a test. But neither the calendar nor the sanctoral mentions the octave of the Nativity of Our Lady, and this is probably an indication that the manuscript was written before the introduction of the octave to the Roman calendar in 1245, as explained above. It is true that the rubrics on 292^{va} mention an octave of the Nativity of Our Lady. But if we assume that the calendar is more likely to be up to date than such rubrics, then we may say that the octave in the rubrics is the remnant of a practice which had been abandoned, that is, a non-Roman octave of the feast — such an octave did of course exist outside the Roman usage before being put on the Roman calendar. The paragraph of the rubrics in question does have a somewhat eccentric appearance, as it begins by referring to the Epiphany as *Apparitio*.

The feast of St Francis, who was canonized in 1228, appears in the calendar as a nine lesson feast. It is on the 2nd October, not the more usual 4th October, nor the Parisian 3rd October. This mention, although of nine lesson rank, is written by the first hand after the memory of St Leodegarius. The body of the missal does not mention St Francis, although four lines have been left blank, at the point where his feast should be inserted. All these facts indicate a date when the feast of St Francis was new to the Dominicans. Without being able to cite anything in the legislation of the Order, we may presume that we have here a strong indication that the date of the manuscript is much closer to 1234 than to 1254.

The feast of St Elizabeth of Thuringia is not mentioned in calendar or sanctoral. The Eleven Thousand Virgins are given only a memory. In other words, the admonition of 1243, which raised these feasts to nine lesson rank, has not had any effect on the missal. Not much stress however should be put in this, as it is by no means a positive proof of an early date.

The localization of a manuscript like this is of relatively little importance. In a sense, its identification as Dominican takes the place of localization. However, it was eventually used in the Chapel of St Louis of Marseilles in Paris. This explains the additions made by the second hand in the 14th century, which adapt the missal to the use of Paris. There is no reason to believe it was ever outside Paris. Apart from the unusual date for St Francis, the missal has only two mentions on its calendar which are peculiar to itself, that is, which are not found in the other early Dominican calendars which are known to us. These peculiar mentions are the Translation of St Thomas à Becket, 7th July, and the entry *Dedicatio huius ecclesiae*, 10th October. The feast of the Translation of St Thomas à Becket is not confined to any one place, but offers no difficulty to a Paris localization. The dedication mentioned, however promising it may look, has not helped further identification.

So even a preliminary study of the missal shows it to be Dominican, pre-Humbert, and after 1234. It is very probably from soon after 1234, even from before 1239⁷⁰.

*The diurnal of Engelberg*⁷¹

Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek, Codex 104 (formerly 5/34). Vellum. 210 × 148 mm. 60 folios. The pagination, which is recent, is complete and consecutive. There are no catchwords or signatures. The gatherings are arranged as follows: Folios 1 and 2 are a pair of folios. Folios 3-12, 13-24, 25-34, and 35-44 are regularly composed gatherings of 10 or 12 folios each. Folios 45 and 46 are two single leaves. Folios 47-50 are two sheets in folio. Folios 51-60 form an irregularly composed gathering, 53-54 being an insert of smaller dimensions.

The manuscript contains the following sections:

[1^r-2^v: Fragment of Bible, in 11th century hand, the lines are full, there are 25 lines to a page].

3^{ra}-60^v: Dominican Office-book and calendar, in various 13th century hands, with some 14th century additions. The rubrics are in red, the initials in red and blue.

⁷⁰ All who have examined this manuscript agree on an early date. See Leroquais, « Sacramentaires... », II, 106; Bonniwell, op. cit., 34-35; L. M. Gignac, *Le sanctoral dominicain et les origines de la liturgie dominicaine* (typescript, Paris 1959), 5-6.

⁷¹ This manuscript is catalogued in B. Gottwald, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum qui asservantur in bibliotheca monasterii O.S.B. Engelbergensis in Helvetia*, 1891, 120-121. I wish to thank Fr Frederick Hinnebusch for checking the material collation.

- 3^{ra}-42^{va} line 36: Dominican Office-book in 13th century hand ("first hand"), without any musical notation. There are two columns to a page, 42 lines to a column. The rubrics are in German; these rubrics are just headings, none of them describes the ceremony to be performed. The book gives the texts needed for Vespers, Compline, and Little Hours. It also gives the hymns for Matins and Lauds. Sometimes a Benedictus antiphon intrudes, and sometimes the fourth antiphon of Lauds intrudes between the antiphons for Sext and None. The Benedictus antiphon is regularly given in series of antiphons for use during octaves. This intrusion of Lauds-elements suggests that the book was copied from a manuscript which gave Lauds in full.
- 42^{va} line 37-43^{va} line 26: Short supplement, in a 13th century hand ("second hand") very similar to the first hand. This second hand also makes certain marginal notes in the preceding section of the book.
- 43^{va} line 27-46^{vb}: Long supplement, in another 13th century hand ("third hand"). This gives, after certain other things, the Lauds-elements which are not in the body of the book. It also gives invitatory verses. It ends abruptly, on the Friday after Pentecost.
- 47^{ra}-52^{va}: Psalms for Vespers and Little Hours, in another 13th century hand.
- [52^{va}-54^v: Blessings, rules for blood-letting, rules for Golden Number etc., in various 14th century hands].
- 55^r-60^v: Dominican calendar, in another 13th century hand.

The fact that the rubrics are in German indicates that this Office-book was used by nuns. While it may be referred to as a diurnal, it did not originally contain Lauds. It has already been observed, in speaking of the early Constitutions of the Order, that the Dominican usage treated Matins and Lauds as a unit; in fact the *officium nocturnum* was Matins and Lauds. If we may judge by the constitutions of the nuns which Humbert published in 1259⁷², the Office of the nuns followed the same general pattern. We may also add that the primitive rule of San Sisto says that on ferial days the nuns could say Little Hours in their work-room⁷³.

⁷² See the description of Office in the nuns' Constitutions of Humbert in AOP III, 339 col. 1 - 340 col. 1. The constitutions of the Dominican nuns of Montargis of the year 1250 contain the same description; see R. Creytens, *Les constitutions primitives des Sœurs dominicaines de Montargis (1250)*, AFP 17 (1947) 68-69.

⁷³ See B. Balme; B. Lelaidier; J. Collomb, *Cartulaire ou histoire diplomatique de saint Dominique*, 3 vols. Paris 1893-1901, Vol. II, 451, where we read, « Primam vero, tertiam, sextam, nonam profestis diebus in operatorio dicere poterunt, cum visum fuerit expedire ».

This nuns' diurnal is a Dominican book. The feast of St Dominic, 5th August, is in the sanctoral, and is given a proper Office. The Magnificat antiphon for second Vespers is *O decus Hispaniae* (30^{va}). This antiphon has so far been known only from the *incipit* mentioned by the Acts of the General Chapter of 1239; the Chapter of 1240 changed to *O lumen ecclesiae*, which is the same antiphon except for the first three words, as has been noted above. So it seems that the variant *O decus Hispaniae* fell out of favour around this time. Here therefore we have an indication that the diurnal is from an early date, not later than 1240. The prayer for St Dominic's feast reads *meritis et exemplis*, that is, the admonition of 1244 has not affected it. The Office of St Dominic contains other interesting features, some of which will be discussed below in a comparison with the breviary of the Four Friars and the *Ordinarium* of Humbert.

Peter Martyr is not mentioned in the original diurnal, which is clearly from before Humbert's correction.

The feast of St Elizabeth of Thuringia, 19th November, is present, and has a proper Office. So the diurnal is from after 1235, the year of St Elizabeth's canonization. As the diurnal has a Germanic origin, the presence of this feast is not an argument for a date after 1243, the year of the admonition to insert the feast of St Elizabeth as a nine lesson feast. The devotion to the saint in Germanic lands is sufficient explanation for her presence. The feast of the Eleven Thousand Virgins, 21st October, is also present, but under the heading of St Ursula. It too has a proper Office. The fact that it is more than a memory does not prove that the diurnal is later than the admonition of 1243, which raised the rank of this feast to nine lessons. Once again, the Germanic origin of the diurnal is enough to explain the presence of the higher rank at an earlier date. It should also be noted that the feast is given as that of St Ursula, whereas, if it were the result of the 1243 admonition, it would much more probably be headed *Undecim milium virginum*, as in the admonition.

The original diurnal, then, is from after 1235. Judging by the antiphon *O decus* in the feast of St Dominic, we may say it is not later than 1240. It certainly contains nothing which forces us to date it later than this.

Apart from the feast of St Elizabeth, the sanctoral of the diurnal has only one peculiar mention. This is the mention of Felix and Regula, which, to judge by its position in the sanctoral, is the feast of Felix and Regula, martyrs, which occurs on the 11th September. This is a rather

uncommon mention. It appears in only three of Leroquais's manuscripts — an 11th century sacramentary from Reichenau; another 11th century sacramentary whose calendar is related to Reichenau and St Gall, and which is tentatively identified as coming from St George in the Black Forest; and a 15th century breviary from Altdorf in Alsace⁷⁴. The Bollandists put the centre of the cult in Zurich⁷⁵.

While we know that there were thirty-two monasteries of Dominican nuns in the German Province by 1250, we do not know all their names, nor do we know how many of them were in existence before 1240⁷⁶. Of those we do know to have existed, none really imposes itself as the place of origin of the diurnal. However, the monastery of Oetenbach in Zurich was there since 1234⁷⁷, and if it was the place of origin this would explain the presence of Felix and Regula in the sanctoral. It is possible, of course, that there were other monasteries which would answer just as well.

The German dialect of the rubrics would suit this Swiss location, but cannot add any greater precision, especially as the forms which are used are much more ancient than the diurnal itself⁷⁸.

The two supplements add greatly to the interest of the diurnal. The short supplement, by the second hand, consists of a short series of texts which in fact are corrections, as is shown by the marginal notes which the same second hand makes throughout the body of the diurnal. Both temporal and sanctoral are affected by these corrections. It is the second hand which adds the Translation of St Dominic, 24th May, to the sanctoral, and which gives the antiphon *O lumen* as a memory of St Dominic during his octave. These two additions are in the margin of the diurnal, while the supplement itself gives a responsory for first Vespers of St Dominic. These corrections confirm that the book is Dominican. The long supplement also gives certain corrections, both for temporal and sanctoral. It too mentions St Dominic. It is in perfect agreement with the *Ordinarium* of Humbert of Romans. Besides corrections, it supplies what is necessary to make the diurnal capable of serving for Lauds, and it adds invitatory verses also.

⁷⁴ Leroquais, *Sacramentaires* I, no. 46 & 72; *Bréviaires* I, no. 209.

⁷⁵ *Acta Sanctorum*, Venice 1734 et seq., Septembris III, 767-769.

⁷⁶ See W. A. Hinnebusch, *op. cit.*, 377.

⁷⁷ A. Halter, *Geschichte des Dominikanerinnen-Klosters Oetenbach in Zürich 1234-1525*, Winterthur 1956, 3-11.

⁷⁸ I wish to thank Dr Laufner of the Municipal Library in Trier for the information he gave me about the 'hochalemannisch' dialect used in the manuscript.

The diurnal therefore has been subjected to two 13th century corrections. The later correction is in agreement with Humbert's revision. The diurnal itself is from after 1235. So there is a strong presumption that the earlier correction, made between the year 1235 and the correction of Humbert, represents the revision of the Four Friars. Comparison with the other manuscripts bears this out.

The psalter for Vespers and Little Hours given on folios 47^{ra}-52^{va} has the *cursus* used by the Dominicans⁷⁹. The fact that no psalms are given for Lauds helps to show that this section is part of the original book.

The calendar, which is on folios 55^r-60^v, has both feasts of St Dominic. The Translation, 24th May, is a *duplex*, the feast of St Dominic, 5th August, is *totum duplex*. Peter Martyr, 29th April, is an addition, and is given the rank *totum duplex*. So the calendar is both Dominican and pre-Humbert.

The anniversary of Familiars and Benefactors is on the 5th September, the anniversary of the Brethren on the 10th October. So the legislation of 1246-48 has been put into effect. The Nativity of Our Lady is assigned an octave-day of nine lesson rank.

The feast of the Eleven Thousand Virgins, 21st October, here given under the heading *Undecim milium virginum*, is *semiduplex*. Likewise the feast of St Elizabeth, 19th November, is a *semiduplex*. In this respect there is a certain harmony between the original diurnal and the calendar. The diurnal gives each of these feasts a proper Office; the calendar gives them the high rank of *semiduplex*, thus placing them among the principal feasts of the year⁸⁰. In giving these two feasts the high rank of *semiduplex*, the calendar goes further than the admonition of 1243, which said they were to be nine lesson feasts. Local devotion, not the general legislation of the Order, seems to be influencing the calendar at this point.

The feast of St Margaret is on the 15th July, and in this the calendar differs from all other early Dominican calendars known to us. The feast of St Margaret was in fact celebrated on several different days, the 15th was fairly common, and is of no help in localizing the calendar.

Several additions have been made to the calendar in the 13th, 14th

⁷⁹ See Bonniwell, op. cit., 135-7.

⁸⁰ *Semiduplex* was a high rank. In the Montargis Constitutions we read, « *Precipuum autem festum dicimus semiduplex vel duplex* », R. Creytens, op. cit., AFP XVII, 70. The same phrase is found in the nuns' Constitutions of Humbert, AOP III, 340 col. 1.

and 15th centuries. They would be of capital importance in tracing the subsequent history of the manuscript. They show a continuing Dominican influence, and also a strong Germanic influence. There are also signs of Benedictine connections. It is clear too that the book continued to be used by nuns (two obituary notices are given, on the 8th June and 14th July, which mention sisters Mathilda and Bertha).

Felix and Regula, 11th September, have been entered into the calendar by another hand, and given the rank *semiduplex*. So the presence of this feast in the sanctoral of the original diurnal is not a mere accident of transcription, but reflects a special devotion to these saints. Two dedications are added, 2nd September and 11th October, but they have not helped in giving us an insight into the history of the manuscript.

Whatever about the significance of the later additions, it is certain that the original diurnal is Dominican and after 1235, and it is probably from before 1240. It has received two Dominican corrections, a short one which is presumably according to the revision of the Four Friars, and a longer one according to Humbert's revision. The calendar at the end of the book is Dominican, and is from the Four Friar period, from between 1246 and 1254. Comparison with other manuscripts bears out the Dominican nature and early date of the diurnal.

*The breviary of the Four Friars*⁸¹.

Rome, Archivum generale ordinis praedicatorum, XIV L2. Vellum. 125 × 85 mm. 583 folios, including 287A, a blank half-leaf. In front there is a recent fly-leaf marked 'A'; at the end there is a recent unmarked fly-leaf. The recent pagination, 1-287, 287A, 288-582, is complete and consecutive. The cover is no longer that which was described by Rousseau and Bonniwell, but is in plain brown leather, with nothing written on the outside. The mark, XIV L2, is pencilled on folio 1^r. The binding-thread is difficult to see. There are no signatures, except in sections which are later additions. It is impossible, without undoing the binding, to give the arrangement of all the gatherings. Many folios have been too closely trimmed.

The manuscript contains the following sections:

[1^r-6^v: Dominican calendar, from after Humbert's correction, on a separate gathering which is regularly composed. The mention of St Louis of

⁸¹ This manuscript is described in L. Rousseau, *op. cit.*, AOP XVII, 744-766. I wish to thank the members of the Dominican Historical Institute in Santa Sabina who assisted me when I was studying it.

- France, 25th August, on folio 4^v, is by the original calendar hand. St Louis was canonized in 1297. The original calendar hand does not occur in the manuscript anywhere outside the calendar. Several of the additions to the calendar would seem to be by the "second hand" mentioned below].
- 7^r-582^r^b: Dominican Office-book, in various hands. The original 13th century hand, the "first hand", has initials in red and blue. In the psalter it writes two columns to a page, 41 lines to a column. In the body of the breviary it writes two columns to a page, 36 lines to a column, or 13 lines of text and musical notation to a column. A 15th century hand, the "second hand", is responsible for additions on inserted folios, and for most of the additions in the lower margins of the original breviary. It has initials in red, and some letters are decorated with a vertical or diagonal stroke of red. This second hand gives no musical notation. Another 15th century hand, the "third hand", is responsible for the section composed of folios 533-582, and also for folios 45 and 48. It has initials in red and blue, and many letters are decorated with a characteristic spot of ochre. This hand gives no musical notation. Many other hands, which I do not number, have made additions in margins and on blank or inserted folios. Some of these hands give musical notation.
- Folio 7: an original folio which has been left blank.
- 8^{ra}-44^v^b: First hand. Psalter. The psalms are in the order of the Vulgate. Canticles, the Athanasian Creed, and the litany of the saints are given. Folios have been lost from between folios 39 and 40, the centre of a gathering. The original hand and type of vellum break off with the end of 44^v^b, in the middle of the litany. There was originally no musical notation in this section.
- [45^{ra}-45^r^b: Third hand continues but does not complete the litany, on inserted folios.
- 45^v-47^v: Inserted folios which have been left blank.
- 48^{ra}-48^v^b: Third hand gives general rubrics, on inserted folios].
- 49^{ra}-53^{1v}^b: A Dominican breviary with musical notation for the antiphony-elements. Parts of the original have been lost.
- 49^{ra}-280^v^b: First hand. Temporal.
- 280^v^b-286^r^b: First hand. Office for the feast of the Consecration of a church.
- [286^r^b line 15-287^v^a: Originally left blank. Another hand adds the Genealogy according to Luke, with musical notation. There are no coloured initials. 287A is an original blank half-leaf, at the end of a gathering]
- 288^{ra}-302^r^b: First hand. Hymnal, for temporal and sanctoral.
- [302^r^b-303^v^a: Additions to hymnal in various hands, on folios originally left blank. Some musical notation is given. All of these hands have initials in red only. The hymns for Peter Martyr, which are the first addition, are by one distinct hand.
- 303^{va}-306^v^b: Second hand. Additions to hymnal, on folios originally left

- blank and on inserted folios. 307 is an inserted folio which has been left blank.
- 308^{ra}-311^{vb}: Another hand gives general rubrics, on inserted folios. Initials and underlining are in red].
- 312^{ra}-461^{va}: Proper of the saints. In several places the original folios are missing, and in these places the second hand, on inserted folios, takes up from where the first hand leaves off and continues to where the first hand begins again.
- 312^{ra}-380^{vb}: First hand. Vigil of St Andrew to feast of John the Baptist, 24th June, the latter being incomplete. [381^{ra}-386^{vb}: Second hand].
- 387^{ra}-387^{vb}: First hand. Part of the Commemoration of St Paul, 30th June, and heading for the octave-day of John the Baptist. [388^{ra}-389^{vb}: Second hand].
- 390^{ra}-390^{vb}: First hand. Part of the octave-day of Peter and Paul, to the feast of St Mary Magdalen, 22nd July. [391^{ra}-391^{vb}: Second hand continues the Office of Mary Magdalen].
- 392^{ra}-461^{va}: First hand. The further continuation of the Office of Mary Magdalen, to the memory of St Saturnine, 29th November.
- 461^{va}-516^{vb}: First hand. Common of saints, including memories of Our Lady, procession after Compline, general rubrics, blessings for lessons, Office of Our Lady.
- 516^{vb}-517^{vb}: First hand. Lessons for Little Office of Our Lady and for Office of the Dead, incomplete. [518^{ra}-520^{vb}: Second hand continues lessons for Office of the Dead, and gives various texts and rubrics for the Offices of the Dead and of Our Lady. It ends abruptly in the middle of the blessing before Compline].
- 521^{ra}-530^{va}: First hand. Thirteen tones for *Venite*. [530^{vb}-531^{vb}: Another hand writes the Genealogy according to Matthew, with musical notation, on folios originally left blank. Initials are in red].
- 532^r-532^v: Original folio, blank.
- [533^{ra}-582^{ra}: Third hand: Lessons and some Offices for proper of saints and for Corpus Christi, on inserted folios. 582^{rb}-582^v are blank].

This is the "breviary-antiphony" which has already received quite some attention from historians of the Dominican liturgy. It is a book of small dimensions, carefully written. It is a breviary, but one which gives musical notation for the antiphony-elements, as well as fairly developed rubrics. It does not give a full lectionary; for ferial days it simply refers to the relevant chapters of the Bible. The original folios have been lost from many places, as noted above in the material description. The book contains a psalter, a temporal, a hymnal for temporal and sanctoral, then the proper of saints and the common of saints.

The calendar which precedes the breviary is too late to be of interest to us.

The original breviary has both feasts of St Dominic. His Translation, 24th May, is *duplex*, while the rank of his feast, 5th August, is not put in. The prayer for his feasts reads *meritis et doctrinis*, in accordance with the admonition of 1244. The antiphons for the memory of St Dominic throughout the year agree neither with the admonitions of 1239 or 1240, nor with the Prototype. They do however include the antiphon *O lumen*.

There is no mention of St Elizabeth of Thuringia (the marginal addition is 15th century). Only a collect is given for the Eleven Thousand Virgins. So the admonition of 1243 did not affect the original breviary. But, as has already been pointed out, this does not mean that the manuscript is from before 1243. The feast of St Vincent of Saragossa, 22nd January, in the general rubrics at the end of the book (512^{ra}), is not ranked among the feasts ranked *semiduplex*, although an admonition of 1239 had said this rank should be given to his feast.

The anniversaries of the Dead are not mentioned — we are dealing with a breviary, not a calendar. But the Nativity of Our Lady is given an octave, which is an indication of a date after 1245, as explained above.

The feast of Peter Martyr is not in the original breviary or hymnal, so the book is from the pre-Humbert period, it is from before 1254. In fact, as it is from after 1245, we may say it is from the Four Friar period.

It is true that Laporte, Rousseau and Gignac date this breviary earlier than the Four Friars⁸². Rousseau and Gignac put forward the argument that St Elizabeth is absent and the Eleven Thousand Virgins are only a memory. This argument, as we have seen, is not at all as conclusive as it might appear. Furthermore, in examining the Rau missal below, we shall see a calendar, clearly after 1246, which has no mention of St Elizabeth and gives the Eleven Thousand Virgins the rank of commemoration. Bonniwell recognized the book as the work of the Four Friars; the perfection of the production seems to be what decided him⁸³.

When exactly between 1245 and 1254 was the breviary written? The presumption must be that it is the result of the Four Friars' work, as it

⁸² V. Laporte, *Précis historique et descriptif du rite dominicain*, in AOP XIII (1917-18) 336; Rousseau, *op. cit.*, AOP XVII, 766; Gignac, *op. cit.*, 10-11.

⁸³ Bonniwell, *op. cit.*, p. 192. An anonymous article of 1905 also attributed the breviary to the Four Friars. See « *Calendarium vetus ordinis praedicatorum* », in AOP VII (1905-6) 90, note 1. Laporte would later say that he was responsible for this attribution — see Laporte, *op. cit.*, AOP XIII, 336.

is unlikely that after 1245 such an elaborate book would have been produced independently of them. Presuming then that it is the Four Friars' work, we think immediately of the admonition of 1250, which called for a correction *in unum volumen redigenda*. Apparently the earlier Angers correction was not written in one volume. This breviary in a striking way gathers the whole Office, rubrics, text and musical notation, into one volume. So the most likely date for the manuscript is 1251, the date of the later Metz correction, or soon after.

The sanctoral of the breviary contains no peculiar mentions. For the feast of St Margaret in July, it states that the feast is to be observed on the local day, but it gives no date of its own. The general rubrics (512^{va}) permit local feasts and the use of proper Offices for these feasts, but the breviary itself has no such feast, no such Office peculiar to itself. It contains only feasts which occur in other pre-Humbert manuscripts. We may just note that it gives a memory of St Eusebius on the 1st August, a mention shared only by the calendar of the missal of Paris.

As pointed out in the material description of the breviary, most of the additions were made in the 15th century. Quite a few hands had however been at work before that. They all add mentions which either agree with Humbert's revision or are obviously later than it. The hymn for Lauds of Peter Martyr (302^{rb}) is an exception, as its opening words, *Adest triumphus nobilis festum caelestis curiae*, differ slightly from the Prototype (folios 123^{ra} and 320^{rb}), which has *Adest triumphus nobilis festumque caeli curiae*. So the hymns for Peter Martyr may well have been added during the years when Humbert's revision was getting under way.

In the original parts of this manuscript, then, we have a witness to the Four Friars revision, presumably their final revision, that of Metz, 1251. Below, in the comparative study, it will be seen how this is borne out by the relationship between this breviary, the Prototype of Humbert, and the diurnal of Engelberg.

*The Rau missal*⁸⁴

Private collection. Vellum. 248 × 176 mm. 255 folios. There are no signatures or catchwords. There is no complete pagination. Folios 9-103

⁸⁴ This manuscript is briefly described in the sales catalogue: *Précieux manuscrits à peintures du XIII^e au XVII^e siècle*, Paris 1960, no. 1. I am very grateful to Mr Arthur Rau, who acquired the missal in 1960, and who willingly answered my questions about it. The missal has recently changed hands again, and has disappeared from view.

are numbered I-LXXXXV; folios 104-112 are not numbered; folios 113-156 are numbered LXXXXVI-CXXXIX; folios 157-231 are numbered I-LXXV; folios 232-255 are not numbered. The binding makes it impossible to say how the gatherings are arranged.

The original hand is 13th century, and is uniform throughout the manuscript, including the calendar. Various other hands have made additions and corrections in margins, and on folios originally left blank. There are two large miniatures, Christ crucified (106^v) and Christ in Majesty (107^r). There are nine illuminated initials (9^{ra}, 104^{ra}, 105^{ra}, 105^{rb}, 107^{va}, 110^{rb}, 111^{rb}, 112^{va}, 157^{ra}).

The book contains the following sections:

Folios 1 and 2 are blank.

3^r-8^v: Dominican calendar. One month to a page.

9^{ra}-254^{vb}: Dominican Mass-book. Full missal, combined with gradual, and followed by kyriale and proser.

9^{ra}-156^{ra}: Temporal, including proper prefaces and canon. Two columns to a page, 37 lines to a column. Musical notation is given for the gradual-elements, and also for prefaces and Pater.

157^{ra}-219^{vb}: Sanctoral, proper and common. Musical notation is given for the gradual-elements.

219^{vb}-228^{ra}: Various Masses (for the consecration of a church, for various necessities, for the Dead).

228^{ra}-230^{rb}: Blessing of Holy Water, Asperges, Vidi Aquam. General rubrics.

[230^v-231^v: Originally blank. Another hand has made additions].

232^r-237^r: Kyriale. The lines are full, there are 12 lines of text and music to a page.

237^r-252^v: Sequences. The lines are full, there are 12 lines of text and music to a page.

252^v-253^v: Genealogy according to Matthew, with musical notation.

[253^v-254^v: Additions in various hands. A folio seems to be lost from after 253].

Folio 255 is blank.

This is a full missal, which gives musical notation not only for the celebrant's solos but also for the gradual-elements. It is preceded by a calendar and followed by a kyriale and a book of sequences. All these sections, to judge by the script, seem to form a unity.

The calendar contains both feasts of St Dominic. The Translation, 24th May, is *duplex*. The feast, 5th August, is *totum duplex*. The anniversary of Familiars and Benefactors is on the 5th September, the anni-

versary of deceased Brethren on the 10th October, so the legislation of 1246-48 has been put into effect. The Nativity of Our Lady has an octave. Peter Martyr was not on the original calendar, but has been added by another hand. So the calendar is from between 1246 and 1254.

The feast of the Eleven Thousand Virgins is only a memory; the feast of St Elizabeth of Thuringia was absent from the original calendar, but has been added by another hand and given the rank of memory. (Humbert's calendar ranks St Elizabeth as a memory). So, while the calendar is certainly from after 1246, it is not affected by the admonition of 1243 which said these two feasts should be of nine lesson rank.

An entry on the 4th March permits us to localize the calendar. It is *Dedicatio ecclesiae lugdunensis, totum duplex*. This must refer to the Dominican church in Lyons, it is not the dedication of the cathedral. We do not know if the first Dominican church in Lyons was dedicated, but, during the Lent of 1251, Pope Innocent IV consecrated a newly-built Dominican church there, and dedicated it in honour of St Dominic⁸⁵. It seems quite likely that this is the dedication referred to in the calendar, which would mean that the calendar is from 1251 or soon after.

The only other peculiar mention in the calendar is that of Margaret, on the 19th July. This feast, as we have seen, was observed on different days in different places. The 19th July, while not such a common day, does not seem to have been associated with any particular region. The mention of St Ireneus is not peculiar to this missal, but its rank, *simplex*, is the highest I have found in a pre-Humbert Dominican calendar. This reinforces the link with Lyons.

The calendar, then, is from the Dominican church in Lyons, from between 1246 and 1254, most likely from 1251-1254.

⁸⁵ It is in the *Chronica* of the Order that we learn that Innocent IV dedicated the church during the Lent before he left Lyons for Genoa, i.e., the Lent of 1251. See B. Reichert, « Cronica ordinis, redactio prior », in MOPH I, 333-4. In the *Excerpta* of the General Archives there is mention of a Bull in which Innocent IV spoke of having dedicated the church in Lyons; see « Excepta ex tabulario Conventus Lugdunensis ordinis praedicatorum monumenta, quae annalibus conscribendis inservire possunt », Rome, Archivum generale ordinis praedicatorum, XIV Liber M, where, on p. 488, we read, « [Bulla] 27^a. Qua conceditur unius anni et quadraginta dierum indulgentia assistentibus Ecclesiam Praedicatorum Lugdunensium in Festo dedicationis ejus. Edicit vero Pontifex eo in diplomate sese dum Lugduni commoraretur hanc Ecclesiam in honorem Sancti Dominici dedicasse. Incipit: *Si juxta divinae*. Data Januae VII Cald. Julii Pont. anno octavo [25th June 1251] ». Mention is also made of this Bull on pp. 434-5 of the *Excerpta*, where however the date is given as 7th calends of June (26th May). Since these excerpts were made in preparation for Mamachi's work on the *Annals*, all other trace of the Bull has been lost.

In the body of the missal, the Translation of St Dominic is a first-hand marginal entry. His feast is in the body of the text, but there is some confusion at this point. The Mass for St Sixtus is begun but not finished, then the Mass for St Dominic is given, and is followed by a collect for St Sixtus. The scribe had apparently some difficulty in inserting the feast of St Dominic, 5th August, in its proper place, that is, before the feast of St Sixtus, 6th August. Whether it was his own mistake, or whether he repeated the mistake of a previous copyist, it is impossible to decide. At any rate, the presence of St Dominic in the body of the text shows that it is certainly from after his canonization in 1234. The prayer for the feast of St Dominic reads *meritis et exemplis*, so the admonition of 1244 has not affected this detail. The sequences include *In caelesti hierarchia* (243^v) for St Dominic. As in the calendar, the Eleven Thousand Virgins are mentioned as a memory, and the feast of St Elizabeth is absent. The Nativity of Our Lady has an octave in the sanctoral and in the general rubrics (229^v), as well as in the calendar. This indicates a date after 1245. Peter Martyr was absent from the original missal, but has been added.

There are no peculiar mentions in the body of the missal. Note however that a proper Mass is given for St Francis, including the proper Alleluia verse, *Hic Franciscus pauper* (192^{va}). This verse occurs in the ordinals of Haymo of Faversham, but not in the Regula missals of the Franciscans⁸⁶. This indicates a date after the ordinals of Haymo, that is, after 1243-44.

The whole manuscript, to judge from an examination of the script, seems to be a unity. The calendar is certainly from 1246-54, probably 1251-54. The body of the missal is certainly from 1234-54, and contains some features which might suggest an early date, others which indicate that it is from the same period as the calendar. Suggesting an early date, there are the *meritis et exemplis* in the prayer for St Dominic's feast, and the confusion in inserting his feast. However, the features which suggest a later date seem of more weight, especially the octave of the Nativity of Our Lady and the proper Mass of St Francis. In view of the apparent uniformity of the script, it seems best to say that the whole book was transcribed in 1246-54, but that the body of the missal is not up to date on every point. It is perhaps relevant to note that the revision of the Four Friars, which was being carried out at this time, seems to have been concerned mainly with the Office.

⁸⁶ Van Dijk, op. cit., 379.

The miniatures in the missal are 13th century. They present a certain problem. If they were painted in Lyons, it would seem that they cannot be earlier than the sixties. However, if they were painted in Paris, they could easily be from the earlier date demanded by the liturgical content of the book⁸⁷. We may add that the illuminated initials are integrally part of the manuscript, they do not give the appearance of having been added later on. As regards the two large miniatures on folios 106^v and 107^r which depict Christ crucified and Christ in Majesty, it is possible to wonder if they were part of the original missal, but the binding of the book makes it impossible to decide if in fact they could be dated separately from the rest of the manuscript. So, if we take it that the miniatures are from the same date as the rest of the book, then we need to say they were painted in Paris, not in Lyons, even though the missal was intended for use in Lyons. It is not outside the bounds of possibility that the missal was brought from Paris to Lyons on the occasion of the consecration of the church in Lyons by Pope Innocent IV.

In matters of detail, this missal shows signs of hurry or hesitation. Some headings were omitted by the original hand and only added later, while other headings have never been put in. There is confusion, as we noted, about the insertion of the feast of St Dominic. There is also confusion where full text and musical notation seem to have been rather awkwardly inserted into rubrics which originally gave only the *incipit* of a piece (e. g., folio 75^{ra}, Palm Sunday procession). There are also some internal disagreements, to which attention will be given below.

The structure of the book is worth noticing. It is, as it were, a sister-volume to the breviary-antiphony, and might be called a "missal-gradual". It puts everything needed for Mass — rubrics, text and musical notation — into one volume.

The Rau missal, then, is certainly Dominican and pre-Humbert. Its calendar is from 1246-54, quite possibly from 1251-54. In all probability the whole book was transcribed at the same time as the calendar.

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE MANUSCRIPTS AND THE PROTOTYPE

Here I wish to summarize the results of a comparison between the five manuscripts described above and the Prototype. I have compared each manuscript in detail with the *Ordinarium* of the Prototype and with

⁸⁷ For these remarks about the paintings, I am relying on comments made by Jean Porcher and Fr P.-M. Gy.

the calendar of the Prototype. I have noted every occasion on which the choice of text in the manuscript differs from what is indicated in the *Ordinarium*, and every difference between the calendars of the manuscripts and the calendar of the Prototype. This detailed comparison, to put it very briefly, confirms the datations and identifications suggested above, and provides additional points of interest.

The calendars

In studying the calendars included in the liturgical books described above, I have made much use of Fr Gignac's work on the Dominican calendar⁸⁸. We may recall that manuscripts C, M, E and R include calendars. The calendar attached to B is too late to interest us.

The first thing which needs to be emphasized is that comparison shows a striking harmony between the calendar of Humbert's Prototype and the calendars of C, M, E and R. The differences, though not as striking as the fundamental harmony, are however of real importance. In dealing with each of the manuscripts, I have already said a few words about those mentions which are peculiar to one or other of the manuscripts. It remains to draw attention to certain other aspects of the comparative study.

The feast of St Dominic is present in all the calendars except that of C. It is never less than a *totum duplex*. The octave also is present whenever the feast is given; M and R rank it *semiduplex*, E ranks it nine lessons, and Humbert ranks it *simplex*. The Translation of St Dominic is also present in all except C. Humbert's calendar separates itself from the others in giving it the rank of *totum duplex*; the others rank it *duplex*. We have already commented on the addition to C which ranks it *semiduplex*.

In passing, we may note that St Francis is mentioned in all the calendars. He is given the rank of nine lessons or *simplex*. M, as has been noted, puts his feast on the 2nd, not the 4th October.

Vincent of Saragossa, 22nd January, is mentioned in all except C, whose manuscript is deficient. His rank is nine lesson in M, *semiduplex* in all the others. This is an indication that the admonition of 1239 was

⁸⁸ L. M. Gignac, *Le sanctoral dominicain et les origines de la liturgie dominicaine*, (typescript, Paris 1959). It must be realized that, besides the calendars attached to the liturgical manuscripts which we are studying, there exist a number of other pre-Humbert calendars which are not attached to liturgical books, and which Fr Gignac deals with in his study.

in fact effective, and strengthens the argument that M is pre-1239 because of the nine lesson rank of his feast.

The anniversaries of the Dead are mentioned only in E and R, and in Humbert. All three give the dates laid down by the legislation of 1246-48. The other manuscripts simply do not mention the anniversaries. The Nativity of Our Lady, 8th September, in E and R and in Humbert, is *totum duplex* and has an octave. In the other two, C and M, it has no octave. This strengthens the idea that the change in the anniversary of Benefactors, its removal from the 10th to the 5th September, is connected with the introduction of an octave of Our Lady.

The feast of the Eleven Thousand Virgins is present as a memory in C, M, R and Humbert. This shows that the admonition of 1243 should not be trusted as a criterion for datation. The Germanic E ranks this feast *semiduplex*, higher than the nine lessons suggested by the admonition of 1243 and the inchoation of 1251. The feast of Elizabeth of Thuringia is mentioned only in E and Humbert. It is absent from the others. Again we note that the admonition of 1243 is not a reliable means of datation. In none of our manuscripts do we find the nine lesson rank mentioned in that admonition. In E the feast is *semiduplex*, in Humbert it is a memory.

Peter Martyr is of course absent from the original calendars of C, M, E and R.

Besides these saints, who are mentioned in the Acts of the Chapters, we may draw attention to two others. The St Julian mentioned towards the end of January is put on the 28th of the month in M, E and R, while Humbert puts him on the 27th. (The sanctoral of B, it may be added, agrees with Humbert). R has been corrected to agree with Humbert. It is unusual to find a Julian mentioned on the 28th. The feast of Julian of Le Mans was usually on the 27th. However, the Cistercian calendar put the commemoration of St Julian of Le Mans on the 28th; it later changed this date to the 29th⁸⁹. In the light of Fr Gignac's thesis that the Dominican calendar is of indirect Cistercian inspiration, it is most likely that the Julian on the Dominican calendar is Julian of Le Mans. There is however a slender possibility that it is Julian of Cuenca, a saint who entered the Roman martyrology in the sixteenth century, and is said to have died on the 28th January in 1207 or 1208⁹⁰. Perhaps the

⁸⁹ Backaert, op. cit., Collectanea ord. cist. ref. XII, 87.

⁹⁰ See: Martyrologium romanum ad formam editionis typicae scholis historicis instructum. Propylaeum ad Acta Sanctorum Decembris, Brussels 1940, 39.

Dominican calendar reflects a local devotion to this outstanding reformer of clerical life ⁹¹.

St Margaret, whose feast occurs in July, is mentioned on different days in different places. There is a rubric in the breviary of the Four Friars, as we have remarked, which accepts this state of affairs, and says that the feast of St Margaret is to be observed on the local date. Our manuscripts in fact give us four different dates. Humbert however decides on the 20th July, which is the date given by M.

A comparison of the ranks assigned to feasts in the different calendars also supports the datations given above. There is difficulty in comparing the Copenhagen choir-book with the others, because it never uses the terms *simplex*, *semiduplex*, *duplex* or *totum duplex* in its calendar, although all these terms occur in its kyriale. However, to indicate the kind of pattern which emerges from a comparative study of the ranks, we may select an example. If we look at those feasts which are *totum duplex* in Humbert, we see several cases in which M disagrees with Humbert, while E and R agree with Humbert. The following are the feasts which are *totum duplex* in E, R and Humbert, but not in M: The Epiphany, *duplex* in M; St Augustine, nine lesson in M, and without the octave specified in E, R and Humbert; the Nativity of Our Lady, nine lesson in M and without an octave; All Saints, nine lesson in M. We may add that C agrees with M in not giving an octave to Augustine or to the Nativity of Our Lady. In other words, the pattern which emerges fits in with the idea that the calendars of E and R are comparatively late, that is, from the Four Friar period, while the calendars of M and C are comparatively early, from before the revision of the Four Friars. Incidentally, as regards Humbert's *totum duplex* feasts, we may recall that Humbert is the only one to give this rank to the Translation of St Dominic.

The "real calendars" of M, E, B and R, that is, the mentions which actually figure in the sanctorals of these books and not just in the calendars, manifest above all a fundamental agreement.

The hymnals

The hymns contained in C, E, B and Humbert are basically the same. There are of course some differences, and it is C which manifests the most peculiarities.

⁹¹ See Vicaire, op. cit., I, 76, for some words about Julian of Cuenca's place in the reform of clerical life.

For the Epiphany, after the hymn for Vespers, C gives the hymn *Nuntium vobis fero*, which is absent from the other hymnals. But this hymn is left without a heading, and the musical notation has not been filled in. For Lent too, C gives some peculiar hymns. It gives special hymns for Terce, Sext and None during Lent, but leaves them without music. For Vespers and Matins of Lent, C gives three hymns, which are the same as the three hymns which E and Humbert give for Matins, Lauds and Vespers, but in a different order. One wonders if there is some confusion in C's headings, which indicate two hymns for Vespers, and none for Lauds.

The hymns for Lent provide one valuable point of comparison. B, for Lauds, gives *Iesu quadragenarie*, not *Iam Christe*. This hymn, *Iesu quadragenarie*, occurs also in the earlier correction of E, but not in Humbert. This agreement between B and the earlier correction of E confirms that B and the short supplement of E are from before Humbert, and it also indicates that the original part of E is from before the Four Friars.

In the paschaltide hymns, C is again peculiar. There is some evidence of an attempt to correct it. C gives *Aurora lucis* for Lauds, while E, B and Humbert give *Aurora lucis* for Matins, and *Sermone Blando* for Lauds. In C however, *Aurora lucis* has been divided at the verse *Sermone blando*, thus giving us the two hymns of the Dominican use. In isolation, the simple dividing mark would not seem very significant, but in the light of the marginal notes and the more obvious corrections in other parts of C, it seems right to interpret this division as part of a correction aimed at making this book agree with the Dominican usage. The hymns for Ascension also show signs of being subjected to such a correction.

The feast of the Trinity was inclined to be unsettled at this period, and Humbert separates himself from the earlier manuscripts in giving *O Trinitas* for Lauds.

In the sanctoral, only Humbert gives special hymns for the Holy Innocents. For the Purification, there is quite a lot of variation; the feasts of Our Lady are among the most unsettled in our manuscripts. The feast of John the Baptist is another instance of C being corrected to agree with the Dominican use; one hymn has been re-divided, another is inserted.

So the hymnals show an impressive uniformity. Even C, in its corrected form, is in almost perfect harmony with E and B, in some cases against Humbert. This confirms the hypothesis that C has been brought

into line with the Dominican use, and, as has been said, this correction seems to have been carried out before the manuscript was completed, before the musical notation was put in. C's agreement with E and B against Humbert confirms the early, pre-Humbert date assigned to it.

The sequences

The four sets of sequences also bear out the relation between the manuscripts established above. C, M and R are seen to be pre-Humbert, and R is seen to be later than C and M.

We note for example that C, M and R are united against Humbert in having *Rex Omnipotens* for the Ascension, not *Omnes gentes*⁹². For the Purification, C, M and R have *Hac clara die*, Humbert has *Laetabundus*. For the Assumption, C, M and R have *Aurea virga*, Humbert has *Salve Mater*. For the Nativity of Our Lady, C, M and R have *Hodierna lux*, Humbert has *Nativitas*.

Only Humbert has a sequence for Peter Martyr; only Humbert and R have the sequence for St Dominic, a sign that R is later than C and M. R separates itself from Humbert and also from C and M in giving proper sequences for Mary Magdalen and the Holy Cross.

As regards *ad libitum* Marian sequences, we note that there are many of these in R and Humbert, but few of them are common to both. M is very restrained, giving only one Marian sequence apart from those which are assigned to special feasts of Our Lady. The sequence, *Virgini Mariae laudes*, is an interesting case. In C, it begins *Virgini Mariae laudes immolant christiani*; judging by the marginal notes, the corrector decided that this sequence was not according to the Dominican use; it is in fact the last thing in the section which seems to be marked off as non-Dominican. Significantly enough, the sequence does not occur in M, supporting the idea that at an early date this sequence was not according to the Dominican use. The sequence does occur in R, but the verb in the *incipit* is *intonant*, not *immolant*; it also occurs in Humbert, where the verb is *concinnant*.

The antiphony-elements

In speaking about the antiphony-elements, that is, about the antiphons, responsories and versicles, the first remark must once again be

⁹² The sequence, « Omnes gentes », is ascribed to William of Cologne, but nothing is known about him. See J. Quéatif; J. Echard, *Scriptores ordinis praedicatorum*, Paris 1719, Vol. I, 136A.

that there is basic agreement between the manuscripts and Humbert. However, E and B are fairly frequently in agreement against Humbert. Even more interesting, we find that C and E agree against B and P in several significant places, thus confirming the early date given to C. Besides this, the short supplement of E agrees with B against Humbert, thus confirming that this short supplement is pre-Humbert.

It is enough to mention the clearest examples. The feast of the Trinity is a case where C, E, B and Humbert can be compared. C, E and B agree against Humbert. The Annunciation enables us to compare C, E, the short supplement of E, B and Humbert. As responsory for first Vespers, C and E give *Suscipe*, B and the short supplement to E give *Christi Virgo*, and Humbert gives *Quomodo*; this is a good illustration of the relation which exists between these witnesses.

The antiphons for the octave of the Assumption show that E and B are richer than Humbert. This is something which accounts for many of the differences between these manuscripts and Humbert. For use during this octave, E and C give *Salve Regina*; B and Humbert do not use this antiphon for this octave, but for the procession after Compline. E gives no information about this procession.

For the feast of St Catherine, E gives a full proper Office, while B does not. Humbert gives a full proper Office, but it is quite different to E. In giving proper antiphons for Compline, E is alone.

The common of the saints links E to B against Humbert, and in places it sees disagreement between E and B. We may just note that E and B give five antiphons *ad psalmos* for second Vespers of an apostle. Humbert gives only one antiphon, and thus makes the common of an apostle conform to the other commons of saints. This standardizing tendency of Humbert is noticeable in several places.

Additional points of comparison which bear out the identification of the Copenhagen choir-book

If we compare the "non-Dominican" Office of St Nicholas contained in the Copenhagen choir-book with the Office in the other books, we note the following. It contains three pieces which disagree with Humbert. For first Vespers, the *ad psalmos* antiphon is *Similabo*, whereas in E, B and Humbert it is *Amicus*. It gives the prose *Sospitati* for Vespers; in this it disagrees with B and Humbert, but agrees with E. The versicle for Vespers is *Ora pro nobis*, not *Amavit* as in E, B and Humbert. The rest of this Office of St Nicolas agrees with E, B and Humbert.

So we find that the "non-Dominican" section of C contains the following elements: an incomplete Office of St Nicholas, little different from Humbert and the pre-Humbert manuscripts, but beginning with a different antiphon; a sequence for St Nicholas not found in the other sequence-books; two sequences for Our Lady, both found in other sequence-books — the second of these, however, *Virgini Mariae laudes immolant christiani*, has a peculiar variant (*immolant*) in the *incipit*, and does not occur in M. In other words, this section contains little that is really "non-Dominican", but it begins with an antiphon which is "non-Dominican", includes a special sequence for St Nicholas, and ends with a sequence which may perhaps have been "non-Dominican" when the choir-book was corrected. We may add that Sister Schwerdtfeger's study of the chant reveals no reason for looking on this section as being particularly non-Dominican.

In the Office of St Nicholas which is marked *secundum usum fratrum praedicatorum*, we note the following points. It is a complete Office, and this is its most obvious difference from the other Office of St Nicholas. It has a few peculiarities of its own. After the eighth responsory of Matins, it has an alternative responsory, *Summe dei praesul*, which is not in B or in Humbert. After the ninth responsory, it gives the prose *Sospitati*, which, in this position, it not found in the other witnesses. In fact neither B nor Humbert ever give a prose at this point in Matins. Humbert however, in the rubrics for the feast of the Purification, specifies that no prose is to be said in Matins, thus indirectly testifying that the use of a prose at this point was not such an unusual thing in those days⁹³.

In working through the details of C, we find that in many places it agrees with B against Humbert, and in other places it disagrees with both B and Humbert. Only a handful of C's texts are not found either in Humbert or in one of the other pre-Humbert manuscripts. Most of these are in Matins, where the only points of comparison are B and Humbert, both of them later revisions which might be expected to differ from an earlier book.

Rubrics and other details.

C, M, B and R give some long passages of rubrics. They are closer to each other than to Humbert. The main difference between the rubrics in these manuscripts and the rubrics in Humbert, is that Humbert

⁹³ Guerrini, op. cit., no. 334.

is fuller and clearer, and more precisely expressed. Rarely is there a real difference in the actual ceremonial which is described. There are however some details which amount to more than a difference of expression.

For the Palm Sunday procession, M and R say that three brethren are to sing *Unus autem*, whereas Humbert specifies two singers; M and R say the brethren should go down on hands and knees at the antiphon *Ave rex noster*, while Humbert is content to make them kneel. As regards the verses of the *preces* after Lauds of the Sacred Triduum, C and B say that on Thursday they should be sung by two priests, on Friday by two deacons, on Saturday by two subdeacons, if this can be done conveniently; Humbert makes no such suggestion.

In the rubrics for Palm Sunday, M and R have retained a phrase which must be the remnant of some customary. R reads, *Ad hanc passionem nec " Dominus vobiscum " nec " Gloria tibi " dicatur, nec signant se fratres. Hac die vadunt pausatam fratres in dormitorio. Passio domini nostri...* (folio 76^{va}), while M reads, *Ad hanc passionem et ad alias lumen non fertur nec " Dominus vobiscum " nec " Gloria tibi " dicitur nec signant se fratres. Hac die vadunt pausata [sic] post prandium fratres in dormitorio. Passio domini nostri...* (folio 94^{vb}). It would be interesting to know where this phrase comes from. Apart from the way it intrudes in these rubrics, it seems unusual to find mention of a siesta on Palm Sunday, as Easter was the normal beginning of the summer programme, with its midday rest.

On Good Friday, M gives a rubric not found in R or Humbert. For the reading of the Passion, two stoles are to be placed over altar-cloths, and pulled apart when the division of Christ's garments is mentioned.

M, like R and Humbert, says there is no Gloria in Mass during Advent and Septuagesima, but it permits it if such is the *consuetudo patriae* (folio 8^{ra}). This admission of the local custom does not appear in R and Humbert.

B explicitly allows local saints to be celebrated. So does Humbert, but he is careful to say their Offices should be written in separate booklets, or at the end of the liturgical books; in other words, they should not be allowed to confuse the basic content of the Dominican use. This reminds us of how great an effort was needed in those days to produce books which agreed with each other in every detail ⁹⁴.

⁹⁴ Humbert, *Opera*, Vol. I, 138, « Porro circa libros ecclesiasticos bene correctos et bene legibiles habendos est magna diligentia habenda ».

M, R and Humbert have the preface for the Holy Cross. M uses it only on feasts of the Cross, and uses the Lenten preface up to Holy Thursday. R is rather confused. The heading of the Lenten preface indicates that it should be used until Holy Thursday, while the preface of the Cross is left without a heading. But in its general rubrics, R says that the Lenten preface is to be used up to Passion Sunday, and that the preface of the Cross is to be used for Passiontide and for feasts of the Cross; this is the usage which appears in Humbert.

This leads us to raise the problem of R's unity once again. Its calendar, we recall, is from 1246-54, but the body of the missal, if transcribed at the same time, is not fully up to date. We may add that the *incipits* of sequences in the body of the missal are not in full agreement with the sequences in the sequence-book which follows the missal; however, the sequence-book has been left without headings. Now, in the matter of the Lenten preface and the preface of the Cross, the body of the missal is not in accord with the general rubrics at the end of the book. However, the preface of the Cross is left without a heading in the body of the missal, an omission which creates the impression that it was realized there was something wrong. It is a small point, but one which suggests that we are right in not separating the datation of the body of the missal from the datation of the other parts, including the calendar; the whole book should be dated as a unit, which at any rate is what we would be inclined to do because of the uniformity of the script. It is perhaps not out of place to remark that with liturgical manuscripts the date of transcription assumes an importance all its own, because we are interested not just in a particular compilation of texts, but in the fact that this compilation was intended for use at a particular time and in a particular place or community.

M contains rubrics for the Masses on the final Sundays after Pentecost. R contains no such rubrics, but B does. Perhaps this should be seen as supporting the idea that the Rau missal and the breviary of the Four Friars are "sister-volumes", not just in the sense that they have a similar structure, but in the sense that between them they give all that is needed for Mass and Office. The rubrics in M and B are rather complicated, and are not in agreement with each other. The solution given by Humbert to this problem of what Mass should be said on the final Sundays after Pentecost is much simpler than the solution given in M or B.

It is interesting to note that Martène has published Dominican rubrics for Ash Wednesday, and his text agrees with M and R rather than

with Humbert⁹⁵. Unfortunately, he seems to have retained nothing else from the manuscript of St Quentin which he was using.

There are many other matters of detail to which attention could be drawn. For example, the litany of the saints is given in M, R, and B, and none of them agree on where to insert St Dominic. M mentions him very early in the litany, before St Augustine; R puts him lower down, after St Jerome and before St Benedict; B puts him before Jerome and Benedict. St Francis is not mentioned in M's litany; in R he is put immediately after St Dominic; in B he is separated from St Dominic and put after St Benedict.

However, it is impossible to do justice to all the various points of comparison without actually editing the texts and giving detailed comparative tables. The ordinary of the Mass alone, as contained in M, R and Humbert, would provide material for an interesting study. But, for the time being, suffice it to say that the rubrics contained in C, M, B and R show that these manuscripts are witnesses to the Dominican use before Humbert. They support the datations proposed in the description of each manuscript, and in particular they help to show that R is definitely later than M.

THE ST DOMINIC BREVIARY⁹⁶

Rome, Monasterio del S. Rosario, Monte Mario, *Breviarium quo utebatur S. P. Dominicus confessor*. Vellum. 120 × 85 mm. 93 folios. The recent pagination is complete and consecutive. Many of the original folios have been lost. The gatherings are arranged as follows:

- (i) Folios 1-5: folio 5 is a single leaf. (ii) Folios 6-11: two leaves are missing from before f 6. (iii) Folios 12-17: leaves are missing from before f 12 and f. 14. (iv) Folios 18-27: a regular gathering of 10 folios. (v) Folios 28-36: a leaf is lost from before f 32. (vi) Folios 37-38: a pair of folios. (vii) Folios 39-40: a pair of folios. (viii) Folios 41-46: leaves are missing from between f 44 and f 45, and from after 46. (ix) Folios 47-48: two single leaves. (x) Folios 49-55: at least one leaf is missing from before f 49, and leaves are missing from between f 51 and f 52. (xi) Folios

⁹⁵ E. Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus*, Lib. IV, cap. 17, ordo 15. M. Martimort kindly drew our attention to this text.

⁹⁶ The St Dominic breviary is normally kept sealed in a reliquary. I am very grateful to the nuns of Monte Mario and to Fr Benedict Joseph O.P. for making it possible for me to examine the manuscript itself. I must also thank Fr A. Dirks O.P. for allowing me to study the notes he has made on the subject of this manuscript. There is a description of the manuscript in Gignac, *op. cit.*, 16-26.

56-73: a regular gathering of 18 folios. (xii) Folios 74-79: leaves have been lost from between f 76 and f 77. (xiii) Folios 80-86: leaves have been lost from between f 83 and f 84, and at least one from after f 86. (xiv) Folios 87-91: a leaf is missing from before f 91. (xv) Folios 92 and 93: two loose folios; the order should be 93, 92. Gatherings i, ii, iii, iv, x, xi, xii are signed III, V, VII, VIII, I, II, III,

Gatherings i, ii and iii have red initials, but no blue except on folios 8^v-10^r; folios 1 and 17 are blank. Gatherings iv-ix have red and blue initials. Gatherings x, xi, and xii have no coloured initials; marginal rubrics are in red, and there is red underlining in the text. Gathering xiii: folios 81-83 have red initials and red underlining in the text; folios 84-86 have no coloured initials, but some ornamental initials in black, with marginal rubrics in red and red underlining in the text. Gathering xiv has red initials, marginal rubrics in red, and red underlining in the text. Gathering xv consists of two loose folios ruled for musical notation and bearing faint traces of musical notation and text.

At least eight different hands can be distinguished. The first is responsible for the calendar on 2^v-5^r. The second occurs on 5^v; it is not calligraphed, uses light ink, and is slightly backhand; it occurs again, being responsible for corrections on folios 49^r-83^r. The third hand writes folios 6^r-11^r and the first three lines of 11^v; the fourth hand writes the last two lines of 11^r and from the fourth line of 11^v to the end of 15^r. The fifth hand writes folios 15^v-16^r. The sixth writes folios 18^r-48^v. The seventh writes folios 49^r-83^v and 87^r-90^v. The eighth writes folios 84^r-86^v. All eight hands appear to be from the first half of the thirteenth century, but further precision is difficult.

The book contains the following sections:

2^r-5^r: Calendar. Two columns to a page, one month to a column. 5^v was blank originally, but has been written on by the second hand.

6^r-7^v: Hymnal (incomplete).

7^v-15^r: Collectarium (collects and capitula - incomplete).

15^v-16^r: Little Office of Our Lady.

16^v-17^v: Blank.

18^r-46^v: Lectionary (incomplete) for temporal and sanctoral.

47^r-48^r: Office of the Dead (incomplete).

48^v: Blank.

49^r-90^v: Ordinal (incomplete) for temporal and sanctoral, in which the antiphons and responsories are given in full, while the other texts are indicated by their *incipits*.

None of the above sections contains musical notation.

91^r-91^v: Blank.

92^r-93^v: The order should be 93, 92. Traces of text and musical notation, pertaining to Mass.

Interest in this manuscript stems, not only from the tradition which links it with the name of St Dominic ⁹⁷, but also from the fact that Fr Gignac has shown that its calendar, in its corrected form, is certainly early Dominican ⁹⁸.

The book forms a rather loose unity. As the material description shows, it is the product of several different hands. There are discrepancies between the calendar and the body of the book, and also, within the body of the book, between the ordinal and the other parts of the breviary.

As the calendar stands, it lacks five mentions which occur in the body of the breviary. These mentions are the Transfiguration (*De transmigratione* [sic], f 14^r of the collectarium); the Translation of St Benedict (f 42^v in the lectionary); Remy and Hilary (f 82^v in the ordinal); Speosippus, Eleosippus, and Meleosippus (f 82^v also); Martial (f 85^v in the ordinal). However, there are erasures in the calendar which correspond to the three mentions in the ordinal, that is, mentions have been erased from the 13th and 17th January, and from the 30th June. There is also an erasure on the 27th July, which may correspond to the Transfiguration in the collectarium. There is no erasure to correspond to the Translation of St Benedict, 11th July. Of course the calendar contains many mentions which are not in the body of the breviary, even where the manuscript is not deficient, but it is usual for calendars to be fuller than the books to which they are attached.

The lectionary combines temporal and sanctoral, but the ordinal separates them. The Gospels for Advent are different in lectionary and ordinal. Some of the collects for Lent are different in the collectarium and the ordinal.

In spite of such discrepancies, the book can be taken as representing one kind of liturgical usage — it is not a collection of totally heterogeneous parts.

The book has been corrected. The calendar has had many mentions erased ⁹⁹; in the breviary there are erasures, marginal additions, and the order of certain pieces has been re-arranged.

There is nothing in the manuscript which makes it immediately identifiable as Dominican. It is only a comparative study which establishes the importance of this breviary for the study of the Dominican usage.

⁹⁷ For the quite solid tradition which links this breviary with St Dominic, see Rousseau, *op. cit.*, AOP XVII, 719-720.

⁹⁸ Gignac, *op. cit.*, 22.

⁹⁹ The erasures remain illegible even under the ultra-violet lamp.

As regards the calendar, Fr Gignac, in a very thorough study, has shown that in its corrected form it is early Dominican. We may make just a few remarks about this calendar. The most recently canonized saint on the calendar, as it now stands, is St Bernard, 20th August; he was canonized in 1174. St Bernard is not mentioned in the collectarium or the ordinal, although at this point their text is continuous; as regards the lectionary, the manuscript is deficient. St Thomas à Becket, 29th December, who was canonized in 1173, is present in the calendar, the lectionary and the ordinal, while the collectarium is deficient at this point.

The criteria we established in examining the Acts of the General Chapters are of no positive help. There may have been an octave of the Nativity of Our Lady, as there is an erasure at this point in the calendar. The anniversaries of the Dead are not mentioned. There is no mention of St Francis, St Dominic, the Eleven Thousand Virgins, or St Elizabeth of Thuringia. They have not even been added at a later date.

However, comparison shows clearly that this calendar is Dominican, in its corrected form. In fact it contains only two mentions peculiar to itself, "Praelecti" on the 25th January, and Vitalis and Felicula on the 14th February, after the usual mention of St Valentine. Vitalis and Felicula, from the Gelasian calendar, are of no interest in localizing the calendar of the St Dominic breviary, as the feast is of very common occurrence. "Praelectus" (Praejectus or Projectus) is of less frequent occurrence, but the most it may suggest is that the manuscript is from France.

Only three additions have been made to the calendar. They are in a very small hand, and are all in the month of August. They are Peregrinus on the 11th, Rochus on the 16th, and Alexander on the 26th. The mention of Rochus shows that these additions are much later than the original calendar¹⁰⁰. Peregrinus, a name of very frequent occurrence, does not appear on the 11th August in any other document I know of.

The corrected calendar lacks some mentions which occur in all the other calendars with which we have dealt. These are Hilary and Remy, 13th January; Blaise, 3rd February; Eusebius, 14th August; Marcellus, 4th September; Leodegarius, 2nd October; the Eleven Thousand Virgins, 21st October; and Damasus, 11th December.

Even in themselves, these peculiarities of D's corrected calendar are

¹⁰⁰ While the saint's history is obscure, he seems to have been born around the end of the 13th century. See: *Martyrologium romanum*, 343.

not very striking. Fr Gignac, by comparing the Dominican calendar with a number of non-Dominican calendars, has shown that the basic agreement between D and the Dominican calendar by far outweighs its slight disagreements¹⁰¹. So in this corrected calendar of D we have a Dominican calendar, which must be of a very early date, as it mentions neither St Francis nor St Dominic.

My own examination of the ordinal of this manuscript confirms the Dominican interest of this book. In the ordinal, texts have been erased, and the second hand makes additions and also indicates that the order in which certain texts are used should be changed. Except in a very few instances, these second-hand corrections agree with the Dominican usage as contained in Humbert. In some of the few cases where the corrections of D disagree with Humbert, they agree with B against Humbert; and, in the other places, they disagree with both Humbert and B. There is no doubt about the Dominican nature of the second-hand corrections in D; the fact that these corrections differ from Humbert in a few cases supports the idea that the correction is pre-Humbert.

There is another detail which supports the idea that the correction is pre-Humbert. The second hand, which makes the corrections, has also written a hymn, *Christe redemptor omnium*, on folio 5^v, that is, on the final page of the gathering which contains the calendar. So we are permitted to suspect that the correction of the calendar and the correction of the ordinal took place at the same time, although of course they may have been made at different times. It is at any rate certain that the calendar and the ordinal were together in one book when the ordinal was corrected; and so, if the correction of the ordinal had been made at a late date, the second hand would probably have made at least a few additions to the calendar. The second hand in fact makes no additions to the calendar, it does not even add St Dominic or St Francis, and this is an indication that the correction of the ordinal is from a very early date.

The St Dominic breviary therefore gives us a calendar dating from before 1228, the date of the canonization of St Francis, and also an ordinal which in its corrected parts contains a pre-Humbert Dominican use, is probably from the same early date as the calendar, and is therefore the earliest known manuscript to give the Dominican use. It is from this point of view especially that the manuscript is of interest to the history of the Dominican liturgy.

While asserting the importance of the St Dominic breviary as a wit-

¹⁰¹ Gignac, *op. cit.*, 89-92.

ness to the Dominican use, we must remain very reticent about another question, namely, the original usage contained in the breviary and the importance of that usage for the history of the Dominican usage. It is not right to assume that enough is known about the liturgies of the 12th and 13th centuries to enable us to identify the usage contained in D with any degree of certitude; in fact, once we descend to matters of detail, it is very difficult to see any clear pattern in the variations of liturgy from one place to another. Nor is it right to assume that the original usage of D is the "source" of the Dominican use; there is no reason to make such an assumption, as the mere fact that a breviary was corrected in accordance with the Dominican usage in no way suggests that the Dominican usage is derived from the original usage of that breviary.

However, it is possible to argue, in agreement with Fr Gignac, that the original calendar of D was a canonical calendar of Cistercian inspiration¹⁰². It is also true, as Fr Gignac has pointed out, that certain things in the breviary may point to the diocese of Toulouse, without however excluding a Spanish origin¹⁰³. Besides this, the liturgy contained in the breviary is the type of usage which must be at the origin of the Dominican usage, but it is hardly the specific source of the Dominican breviary¹⁰⁴.

As regards the general structure of the Office, we may note just a few points. There are three nocturns in Matins, with three lessons to each nocturn, but for all of Paschaltide there is only one nocturn with three lessons, as in the Dominican use. However, the St Dominic breviary gives fixed collects for Sext and None, whereas the Dominican use employs the prayer of the day. As regards the details of the text, there are too many differences to number. The places which have been corrected by the second hand show this to some extent, and the uncorrected parts also contain many differences to the usage found in the other manuscripts we have examined. Two points of difference may be noted by way of example. The *preces* for the Sacred Triduum, on which C, B and Humbert agree, are quite different in D. The Office of the Trinity in D agrees neither with C, E and B, nor with Humbert.

It is common to look at the responsories of Matins for the Sacred Triduum when trying to identify the usage contained in a breviary. Dom Lemarié¹⁰⁵ supplies certain points of reference. For the Sacred Tri-

¹⁰² Ibidem, 22-23.

¹⁰³ Ibidem, 110-112.

¹⁰⁴ Ibidem, 116-117.

¹⁰⁵ Lemarié, *Le bréviaire de Ripoll*, Paris B. N. lat. 742. Étude sur sa composition et ses textes inédits, Abbey of Montserrat 1965, 69-71, and note 23; also 91, note 58.

dium, as regards the responsories of Matins, the usages of Provence, Narbonne and Catalonia are quite close to each other; but, on Holy Saturday, Narbonne separates itself from Provence. D follows Narbonne in this, except that in D the ninth responsory is *Sicut ovis*, not *Dominus post Passionem*. Dom Lemarié also mentions a manuscript of Budapest¹⁰⁶ which gives the usage of the canons regular of Carcassonne, and this offers other points of comparison. We find that the *preces* for the Sacred Triduum are the same in D and in the Budapest manuscript¹⁰⁷. The Matins-responsories for the Sacred Triduum are the same in both manuscripts, except that in Budapest the ninth responsory for Holy Saturday is *Dominus post Passionem*. On the Commemoration of St Paul, D indicates three "median" lessons for St Martial, that is, the 4th, 5th and 6th lessons of the feast are given over to St Martial. The Budapest manuscript also does this, but while D simply refers to the common, Budapest gives propter lessons¹⁰⁸. The feast of the Trinity¹⁰⁹ in the Budapest manuscript differs in many ways from D. Still, the antiphons for Lauds are the same as in D (we may note that D differs from C, E and B, and also from Humbert, in these antiphons).

These exploratory soundings may be seen as supporting what has been already suggested by Fr Gignac, namely, that the breviary gives a usage which seems closely related to the usages of Toulouse and Carcassonne; but it would not be wise to conclude with any kind of finality that the St Dominic breviary is in fact from the ecclesiastical province of Narbonne.

It is not easy to find material which would help to make the comparison sufficiently detailed and extensive to secure a definite conclusion. Leroquais however, besides his published works, left behind some note-books¹¹⁰ in which he gives the responsories for Matins of Holy Week and of the Sundays of Advent. An examination of these note-books shows that the variation from place to place does not seem to follow any very definite pattern. There are very similar Offices in places far apart, and very different Offices in places near each other. This means that the identification of a manuscript which does not mention a particular church or some very localized devotion is very difficult.

¹⁰⁶ Ibidem 76, note 28. The manuscript is Budapest, Bibl. Nat., Cod. lat. 340.

¹⁰⁷ D 63^r-66^v; Budapest 79^{vb}-86^{ra}.

¹⁰⁸ D 86^r; Budapest 282^{va}-282^{vb}.

¹⁰⁹ D 73^v et seq.; Budapest 115^{ra} et seq.

¹¹⁰ For access to « Les carnets de Leroquais » I am indebted to M. Vezin of the Bibl. Nat. in Paris.

We have noted that if we compare D with Provence, Narbonne and Catalonia we can say that its responsories for the Sacred Triduum are close to those of Narbonne. But if, using Leroquais's note-books, we compare D with the manuscripts which he has examined, we find that as regards the "characteristic" Holy Saturday responsories D is the same as some hundred other manuscripts, from places anywhere from the Rhineland to the Atlantic, from the English Channel to the Mediterranean. But it may be significant that if we extend the comparison to the responsories of Holy Thursday and Good Friday, then we are left with only a few which agree with D. These few are from Clermont-Ferrand, la Chaise-Dieu, Agen, Grenoble, Valence, Conques. Certainly we seem to be decidedly in the southern half of France, but further north than the province of Narbonne. In the responsories for Advent, we do indeed find confirmation of the fact that the breviary is from the South of France. In fact only eleven places agree with D as regards the responsories for the fourth Sunday of Advent. Some of these places however are far apart, as the same series of responsories occurs in Dax, Plaisance and Oloron; in Bordeaux and Saintes; in Clermont-Ferrand, Brioude, Valence, and Viviers; in Gap and Susa; and also in Vich in Catalonia. If we turn back to the third Sunday of Advent, we discover that nothing in Leroquais's note-books agrees with D. As the sixth responsory for this Sunday, D has *Festina ne tardaveris*, which is an unusual choice. It has been suggested that this sixth responsory may indicate an origin in Toulouse or Spain. However, Leroquais has found *Festina ne tardaveris* as sixth responsory in Agen, which once again draws us north, away from Narbonne. It must be admitted that, if we take Leroquais's note-books into account, it is possible to make a fairly impressive case for an origin north of Narbonne. In fact, the centres of Clermont-Ferrand and Valence occur in what may perhaps be a significant number of coincidences.

It is preferable however, while not abandoning all hope of a more precise identification, to be satisfied that the breviary is from the South of France, or perhaps from the North of Spain. The attempt to discover where this breviary originated should not obscure the issue. The usage which it contained is almost certainly not the usage which is the source of the Dominican usage. It is simply a breviary, which originally gave a non-Dominican use, which has been corrected in accordance with the Dominican use. The calendar is admittedly of real interest, as it was made into a Dominican calendar by the simple erasure of a number of mentions, and Fr Gignac suggests very plausibly that it shows how

the ancestor of the Dominican calendar may have been a canonical calendar of Cistercian origin.

Nothing in my study of this book in any way contradicts the idea that the breviary was at some time in the possession of St Dominic. It is the kind of breviary he must have carried, and it is from early in the 13th century. In fact a link with St Dominic would help to explain why a book of such little practical value was preserved with such care.

We retain, then, that the corrected calendar is Dominican, that the partial correction of the ordinal is Dominican, and that both corrections are probably from a very early period, from before 1228.

CONCLUSION

We may briefly sum up the findings of this study.

The primitive Constitutions of the Dominican Order, besides describing the general framework of the liturgy, contain a confirmation of the Office and a prohibition of innovations, which date from about 1228, at any rate from the period 1221-35.

The Acts of the General Chapters show us the efforts which were made to correct the Office during the ten years before Humbert's election as Master of the Order in 1254. They also supply us with certain details which allow us to refine the method of dating pre-Humbert liturgical manuscripts. They show us that the absence of the feast of St Elizabeth need not mean that a manuscript is from before 1243. In the change of date for the anniversary of Familiars and Benefactors they provide a very useful point of reference in the matter of datation.

Each of the six manuscripts, in the light of the legislative texts and of a comparative study, is seen to have its own importance.

First of all, there are the two recently discovered manuscripts, the diurnal of Engelberg and the Rau missal.

Engelberg shows itself to be a Dominican nuns' diurnal, from after 1235, probably not later than 1240. What makes it especially interesting is that it has been corrected twice, once according to the correction of the Four Friars, and then a second time according to the correction of Humbert. So it is a valuable witness to pre-Humbert Dominican liturgical activity. The calendar which is attached to it is from 1246-54.

The Rau missal is of course very important. As it incorporates a full gradual, it has a special place in the study of Dominican plainchant (the Paris missal, we recall, has no musical notation). Its calendar

is from 1246-54, most likely 1251 or soon after. The whole book was in all probability transcribed at the same time as the calendar.

As regards the four manuscripts which are already fairly well known, we may recall the following points.

The St Dominic breviary is of real historical interest. A canonical breviary, from the South of France or the North of Spain, it contains a corrected calendar which is certainly Dominican, and a series of second-hand corrections which also are Dominican. The correction of the calendar should be dated before 1228, and in all probability the correction in the body of the book was made at the same time. It would seem, however, that the usage contained in the original breviary has no special place in the history of the sources of the Dominican breviary.

A renewal of interest in the Copenhagen choir-book is fully justified. It is a witness to Dominican usage, including Dominican plain-chant, and it is from after 1228 and most probably before 1234.

The accepted datation of the Paris missal, soon after 1234, proves sound. This missal remains one of the most important points of reference known to us.

The breviary of the Four Friars reveals itself to be in fact the correction of the Four Friars, probably their final correction of 1251, the Metz correction. The arguments which caused liturgists to date it before 1243 are not conclusive, as is shown by a study of the legislative texts and the calendar of the Rau missal. The point at issue here is more than a question of datation; it is whether or not this manuscript presents us with the result of the Four Friars correction. The answer is that it does.

Comparison between the various witnesses and the *Ordinarium* of the Prototype shows that there is a remarkable continuity. The corrections of the Four Friars and of Humbert are seen to be precisely what the word "correction" suggests — the correction or putting in order of an already existing usage. The St Dominic breviary and the Copenhagen choir-book witness to this usage as far back as the period when the confirmation of the Office entered the early Constitutions. Of course six manuscripts cannot tell us how faithfully this usage was observed throughout the Order.

All through these manuscripts, the temporal is especially stable, although the supernumerary Sundays after Pentecost caused some difficulty, and there was some variation in Passiontide and Ascension. The sanctoral is less settled, and the feasts of Our Lady show many variations in the choice of text. In the manuscripts we see the Office of St Dominic becoming more and more proper, at the same time as the General

Chapters promoted his cult with some determination. The hymnals are quite stable, and the sequences show stability in the basic choices with change in the extra pieces.

Humbert's ordering of the Office and Mass involved simplification, standardization, and clarification. Many proper antiphons were eliminated. The common of the saints, both for Mass and Office, is simplified, and offers far fewer choices. Humbert's correction gives the impression of a very determined and efficient attempt to organize the liturgy once and for all; and indeed Humbert's writings show him to be nothing if not efficient.

Many problems invite further study. There is the complex question of the relation of the Dominican use to the usages of the South of France. Besides this, there is the problem of its relation to the Cistercian rite; its calendar shows an indirect Cistercian influence, as we know from Fr Gignac's work, and Fr Delalande¹¹¹ has shown that its gradual is of Cistercian inspiration. To what extent these manuscripts may bear out this Cistercian influence, and perhaps show by what channels the influence reached the Dominican use, remains to be seen. There is also the obvious question of what influence the Office of the Curia may have had, and one wonders what would be revealed by a study of the period 1254-67, during which Humbert's revision was getting under way.

For the moment, however, we content ourselves with this investigation into the internal history of the Dominican liturgy before 1254.

¹¹¹ D. Delalande, *Le graduel des prêcheurs. Recherches sur les sources et la valeur de son texte musical*, Paris 1949.