

SIMON TUGWELL O.P., *Dominican Profession in the thirteenth century*, in «Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum» (ISSN 0391-7320), 53, (1983), pp. 5-52.

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 PROFESSION IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

BY
SIMON TUGWELL OP

In his article, « La Profession Religieuse des Dominicains »¹, Fr A. H. Thomas deploys his enviable knowledge of the laws and observances of medieval monks and canons to situate the primitive Dominican rite and practice of religious profession. He is evidently convinced that the Dominican procedures can be largely explained in terms of this background, and he even maintains that, at least for a short time after the establishment of the first community at St Romain in Toulouse, the Dominicans used a conventional canonical rite of *professio super altare*. However, the fact remains that by the middle of the thirteenth century (as early as the mid 1230s, if we follow Fr Thomas) the Dominicans had a profession rite which was startlingly different from those of the monks and the canons, and this still calls for some explanation. And, owing to the lamentably incomplete nature of our evidence, there is a great deal which must remain controversial. It is therefore not inappropriate, I hope, to review the evidence once again, and to suggest a hypothesis rather different from that of Fr Thomas.

Our evidence is of various kinds, and much of it is problematic. First of all, there is the evidence of the primitive Dominican constitutions (with some textual uncertainties and with the inevitably conjectural nature of the dating of the various sections). Secondly, there is the evidence provided by our historical sources, such as the *Libellus*, the Canonization Process and the *Vitae Fratrum*, which again pose problems of textual criticism and of interpretation. Thirdly, we have the evidence of Dominican liturgical practice, much of which comes from a rather later date than one could wish.

¹ AFP 39 (1969) pp. 5-52.

THE PRIMITIVE CONSTITUTIONS

The text of the primitive constitutions (hereafter PC) in the famous codex Ruthensis contains three paragraphs which are relevant to our enquiry². Omitting material which is not directly pertinent, these read (with the paragraph numbering of Fr Thomas' edition):

I 14 *De recipiendis.*

Recipiendi ad nos uenientes, secundum tempus quod discrecio prelati uel quorundam seniorum prouiderit, ducantur in capitulum. Qui cum adducti fuerint, prosternant se in medio capituli. Et interrogati a prelato quid querant, respondeant: Dei et uestram misericordiam. Quibus ad iussum prelati erectis, exponat asperitatem ordinis, uoluntatem eorum requirens. Qui si respondeant se uelle cuncta seruare et seculo abrenunciare, dicat post cetera: Dominus qui cepit ipse perficiat. Et conuentus respondeat: Amen. Et tunc depositis uestibus secularibus et religiosis indutis in nostram societatem in capitulo recipiantur. Sed tamen adhuc, antequam stabilitatem et communitatem promittant et obedienciam prelato et successoribus suis faciant, tempus probationis assignetur ...

I 15 *De tempore probationis.*

Probacionis tempus statuimus sex mensium uel eo amplius, prout prelato uidebitur, ut et ipse austeritates ordinis et fratres mores experiantur ipsius, nisi forte aliquis maturus et discretus probacioni predictae renunciare uoluerit et instanter se offerat professioni faciende ...

I 16 *De modo faciendi professionem.*

Modus faciendi professionem talis est: Ego N. facio professionem et promitto obedienciam Deo et beate Marie et tibi N. magistro ordinis predicatorum et successoribus tuis, secundum regulam beati Augustini et institutiones fratrum ordinis predicatorum, quod ero obediens tibi tuisque successoribus usque ad mortem. Cum autem fit alii priori cuicumque, sic facienda est: Ego N. facio professionem et promitto obedienciam Deo et beate Marie et tibi N. priori talis loci, uice N. magistri ordinis predicatorum et successorum eius, secundum regulam beati Augustini et institutiones fratrum ordinis predicatorum, quod ero obediens tibi tuisque successoribus usque ad mortem.

Raymund's constitutions³ have essentially the same text, except that the aspirant says that he is seeking *misericiordiam Dei et uestram*, and he

² Rome, Arch. Gen. OP XIV A 4 pp. 63-5. A. H. Thomas, *De oudste Constituties van de Dominicanen* (Louvain 1965) pp. 324-7.

³ Ed. R. Creytens, AFP 18 (1948) pp. 38-41.

is required to say simply *se cuncta uelle seruare*, without any mention at this point of *seculo abrenunciare*. However Raymund inserts after the paragraph on the six month *tempus probacionis*:

Hec autem forma in recipiendis observetur: Ego N. voveo et promitto Deo et beate Marie me de cetero in religione victurum et numquam ad seculum reversurum; in huius rei testimonium subscribo. Hoc tamen ingredientis voluntati relinquatur.

I 14 can safely be dated essentially to 1216, as it is closely dependent on the Praemonstratensian constitutions. I 15, with its tell-tale *statuimus*, is unlikely to be earlier than 1221 (« de inleidende formule *statuimus* verraadt een interpolatie », as Fr Thomas says of another passage⁴). The profession formula in I 16, as it stands, probably dates from 1220 or 1221⁵. The formula supplied by Raymund for renouncing the world fits well with I 14, and should be accepted as a genuine part of the primitive text, in spite of its absence from Ruthensis⁶, but when it was added it is difficult to say. The final rubric in Raymund, together with the suppression of *et seculo abrenunciare* in I 14, is evidently due to papal pressure on the Dominicans and others to abandon the practice of *requiring* new recruits to sign away their freedom⁷.

The reading *Dei et uestram misericordiam*, although modestly supported by *Dei misericordiam et uestram* in the Sack Friars' constitutions⁸, must be dismissed as simply an aberration in Ruthensis; in all other Dominican texts and in the corresponding Praemonstratensian texts we find *misericordiam Dei et uestram*⁹.

⁴ Op. cit. p. 258.

⁵ Art. cit. p. 23.

⁶ Cf. R. Creytens' review of Thomas, RHE 61 (1966) pp. 868 f.

⁷ BOP I 90 (Potthast 10202); Potthast 8682 (Enchiridion de Statibus Perfectionis I, Rome 1949, § 53).

⁸ G. M. Giacomozzi, L'Ordine della Penitenza di Gesù Cristo (Rome 1962) p. 84. I have cited the text as it is found in British Library MS Cotton, Nero A XII 13 f. 160v. Giacomozzi's edition is not always reliable.

⁹ This formula is found in the Cistercian De nouiciis (Anal. S.O. Cist. 6 [1950] p. 112) as well as in the Praemonstratensian texts, and is probably to be regarded as complete, not as an incipit, even though it is manifestly insufficient. *Misericordiam Dei et uestram*, in itself, is simply a non-specific, all-purpose response for use in chapter when presenting a request (meaning, more or less, "I want to ask a favour of God and of you"): see Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum II pp. 72 f, III pp. 91 f. It is the same with *Misericordiam Dei et uestram miseracionem peto* at Cluny (M. Herriott, *Vetus Disciplina Monastica*, Paris, 1726, p. 276). Later Praemonstratensian texts supply a more explicit formula: *Misericordiam*

As usual, the significance of the Dominican constitutions emerges most clearly from a comparison with those of the Praemonstratensians. The Praemonstratensian text which is most valuable for these purposes is that printed by Martène¹⁰, although it is some decades earlier than the first Dominican constitutions. The interesting Glasgow manuscript (Mitchell Library 308892), to which Thomas drew attention¹¹, appears to be considerably later; it has a completely different version of the chapter *de novitiis*, which reads like a first draft of the corresponding chapter in the heavily revised constitutions of c. 1236¹².

The section corresponding to PC I 14 in Martène's text reads:

Novitii ad nos venientes secundum tempus quod discretio abbatis vel quorundam seniorum providerit ducantur in capitulum; qui dum adducti fuerint prosternant se in medio capituli. Interrogati ab abbate quid quaerant, respondeant: Misericordiam Dei et vestram. Quibus ad iussum abbatis erectis, exponat asperitatem ordinis, voluntatem eorum requires. Quod si responderint se velle cuncta servare, dicat post cetera: Deus qui coepit in vobis, ipse perficiat. Et respondeat conventus: Amen. Postea abrenuntiantes saeculo et proprietatibus communem vitam promittant, et ab hinc incipiant tempus probationis. (I 16).

Unfortunately the Praemonstratensian constitutions previous to the Glasgow text say nothing much about the procedure for profession.

A comparison between the Dominican and Praemonstratensian texts shows at once that the Dominicans have made some significant changes. In the first place, the renunciation of the world has been detached from the promise of *communis vita*, which the Dominican text saves up for

Dei et vestram huiusque (later et huius) ecclesie societatem (first found in a 13th century MS) (G. I. van den Broeck, *De Professione solemnī in ordine Praemonstratensi*, Rome 1938, p. 98), which corresponds to the formula of St Victor, *Dei misericordiam et vestram societatem* (E. Martène, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, Bassano 1788, III p. 266), or that of Cluny, *Dei misericordiam et vestram miserationem, vestramque societatem volumus habere* (Herrgott p. 164; cf. *St Bénigne*, Martène IV p. 219). Similar, even more elaborate formulae, are found in the English monastic customs and rituals (CCM III p. 85; Henry Bradshaw Society 23 p. 254; 28 p. 223).

¹⁰ Martène III pp. 321-336.

¹¹ A. H. Thomas, « Une version des statuts de Prémontré au début du XIII^e siècle », *Anal. Praemonstratensia* 55 (1979) pp. 153-170. The text is, in fact, rather later than Thomas supposed.

¹² Pl. F. Lefèvre, *Les Statuts de Prémontré réformés sur les ordres de Grégoire IX et d'Innocent IV au XIII^e siècle* (Louvain 1946) pp. 23-5.

later, where it is joined to a promise of stability and obedience which corresponds to nothing in the Praemonstratensian text. And it is noticeable that the Dominican text requires the aspirant to express his willingness to renounce the world before the rite of reception gets under weigh.

Secondly, the Dominican text adds at this point a rite of clothing and the granting of *societas*.

The requirement that the candidate should express his intention of renouncing the world is undoubtedly to be connected with Innocent III's attempt to clarify the very confused situation surrounding the pre-noviciate promise which had become customary:

Consulti sumus frequenter a multis, utrum is, qui monasterium ingressus est habitum sumendo novitii, si ante professionem emissam infra tempus probationis exire voluerit, licite possit absque apostasiae nota, praesertim cum debita morum correctione ad saeculum remeare. Licet autem super hoc senserint diversi diversa, nos tamen credimus distinguendum, utrum is qui convertitur proposuerit absolute vitam mutare, ut sub habitu regulari omnipotenti Deo de cetero famuletur, an conditionaliter experiri observantiam regularem, ut ita demum, si infra annum sibi placuerit, moribus emendatus ad statum revertatur pristinum. In primo casu debet, ut regulariter vivat, ad laxiorem saltem regulam pertransire. In secundo potest ad saeculum, non tamen ut vivat saeculariter, remeare. Ut ergo quae sit eius intentio plenius agnoscatur, propositum suum in principio protestetur¹³.

The Dominican constitutions clearly require just this protestation *in principio*. The formula which Raymund's text supplies clarifies even more precisely what the candidate is promising. The Praemonstratensians had likewise, even in their earliest constitutions, specified that the pre-noviciate promise was a promise of cenobitic life, so that if a novice left the Praemonstratensians he was obliged to transfer to some other religious community¹⁴. Innocent III leaves open the possibility of returning to the world, but the Dominicans obviously wanted to rule this out. (There is a similar concern in the constitutions of Arrouaise § 16: *Faciat eis promittere coram Deo et fratribus se ulterius ad saeculum non redituros*¹⁵). The failed Dominican novice is not obliged to any form of cenobitic life, however, which is striking.

¹³ Potthast 2209 (Enchiridion § 43).

¹⁴ R. van Waefelghem, *Les premiers Statuts de l'Ordre de Prémontré* (Louvain 1913) p. 38. Pl. F. Lefèvre & W. M. Grauwen, *Les Statuts de Prémontré au milieu du XII^e siècle* (Averbode 1978) I 16. Martène I 16.

¹⁵ L. Milis, *Constitutiones Ordinis Arroasiensis* (Turnhout 1970).

The rubric which makes this pre-profession optional is, of course, a later addition, no doubt prompted by the Bull of 1236. The Praemonstratensians, in response to similar pressure, simply abandoned the whole thing. In the Glasgow MS I 16 says:

Sciendum tamen quod nec in primo introitu suo neque quamdiu in probatione fuerint tenentur renuntiare seculo neque proprietati neque promittere vitam communem.

It is interesting that the Dominicans wanted at least to keep the option open.

The addition of a rite of clothing to the procedure for receiving novices may be due simply to a change in religious practice which was becoming fairly widespread by the early thirteenth century. In the older practice, the habit was given at profession, and this was the original Praemonstratensian practice too, but it is probable that by the early thirteenth century the Praemonstratensians had started giving the habit at the beginning of the noviciate (see Appendix II).

What is really unexpected in the Dominican text is the granting of *societas* in the rite of reception of novices. The Praemonstratensians, like other canons regular, treated the granting of *societas* very formally, and, as in nearly every other case, it comes at the conclusion of the rite of profession¹⁶. This is also the traditional monastic practice¹⁷. At St Victor, where *societas* was granted at the rite of reception, before profession, it is linked with an explicit promise of obedience until death¹⁸. At Cluny *societas* is requested by the candidate for reception, but it does not appear to be granted, and it seems that the request is repeated when the candidate applies for profession¹⁹. So there is no real parallel to the Dominican practice of granting *societas* at the outset, before any promise of life-long obedience is made.

It is tempting to speculate that the text of PC I 14 as we have it is already the result of some development, and the temptation is reinforced

¹⁶ Anal. Praem. 8 (1932) pp. 295, 302; 37 (1961) p. 311. Cf. St Ruf; Martène II p. 180; A. Carrier, Coutumier du XI^e siècle de l'Ordre de Saint-Ruf (Sherbrooke 1950) p. 60. Marbach: J. Siegwart, Die Consuetudines des Augustiner-Chorherrenstiftes Marbach im Elsass (Fribourg 1965) § 144. Springiersbach: S. Weinfurter, Consuetudines Springirsbacenses-Rodenses (Turnhout 1978) § 272.

¹⁷ Rule of St Benedict 58:23; Martène II pp. 162, 165, 166.

¹⁸ Martène III p. 266.

¹⁹ Herrgott pp. 164-6.

by the unnecessarily emphatic *sed tamen adhuc* which introduces the caveat that no promise of stability, common life and obedience is exacted at this stage. Like the *sciendum tamen* in I 16 of the Glasgow Praemonstratensian constitutions, this *sed tamen adhuc* suggests that the author of this sentence intends to draw the reader's attention to something which he would not have expected. (It is interesting that Raymund's text is already less insistent, replacing *sed tamen adhuc* with a mere *verumtamen*; the c. 1236 Praemonstratensian constitutions have similarly toned down the Glasgow text).

With due caution we may consider the possibility that an earlier version of PC I 14 did not contain any separation between the initial reception of new recruits and their promise of stability, common life and obedience. If the rite being described was originally a rite of profession, or at least a rite of reception which contained a promise of obedience (such rites are well attested elsewhere²⁰), then the granting of *societas* becomes quite natural.

Let us postulate, quite hypothetically for the moment, an original form of I 14 which read something like this:

... Qui si respondeat se uelle cuncta seruare, dicat post cetera: Dominus qui cepit ipse perficiat. Et conuentus respondeat: Amen. Postea abrenunciantes seculo, stabilitatem et communitatem promittant et obedienciam prelato et successoribus suis faciant. Et tunc, depositis uestibus secularibus et religiosis indutis, in nostram societatem in capitulo recipiantur.

If this is correct, we might assume that a later chapter, presumably that of 1220, instituted a noviciate for the first time, with the general promise to renounce the world, emending the text of the constitutions accordingly to give us I 14 as we have it now. A later chapter still, possibly that of 1221, fixed the probationary period at six months.

Some such development as this is suggested also by the ruling inserted into the constitutions some time between 1220 and 1235 (appended to the chapter *De modo faciendi professionem* in Ruthensis, though edited by Thomas as part of I 15):

Nouicii non intersint capitulo nec in dormitorio cum aliis fratribus iaceant, ubi hoc comode poterit obseruari. (p. 65)

This rubric is not derived from the Praemonstratensians, who separated their unprofessed brethren only from the community chapter, not from

²⁰ Apart from St Victor, cf. especially Cluny: Herrgott p. 165.

the dormitory²¹. It is much closer to Cluniac legislation, in which novices were excluded from chapter and dormitory until their profession²². And this exclusion is a sign that the novices have not been granted *societas*²³. At St Victor, where novices were granted *societas*, though their admission to the chapter was delayed for a month or so, it is not dependent upon their profession²⁴.

It is certainly tempting to connect the introduction of legislation separating novices from the common chapter and dormitory in the Dominicans with the introduction of a noviciate proper, preceding profession. And this would confirm the suspicion that before 1220 Dominican recruits were professed immediately and granted *societas* with all its attending rights.

In spite of Innocent III's ruling in 1198²⁵, it is by no means inconceivable that the Dominicans should at first have made no provision for a noviciate. Exactly the same seems to be true of the Franciscans, who were first obliged to institute a year's noviciate by Honorius III in 1220²⁶. Even after that, they felt free to make exceptions and profess some of their recruits immediately, as we learn from Hugh of Digne²⁷.

We also have evidence that Dominicans continued for some time to make a practice of professing people on the very day of their arrival. Eccleston reports what seems to have been a protracted quarrel between the Franciscans and the Dominicans on this point:

Ipse (sc. frater Albertus Pisanus) recepit mandatum domini papae Gregorii, quod fratres praedicatores nullum obligarent, quominus posset ad quamcum-

²¹ I 16 in Martène. A similar practice among the Dominicans is implied in PC I 2.

²² Herrgott p. 165; cf. CCM III pp. 86 f (Lanfranc).

²³ Contrast the treatment accorded at Cluny to newcomers who, though not Cluniacs, are already monks: they are formally granted *societas* and admitted to the common chapter (Herrgott, p. 168).

²⁴ Martène III pp. 266 f.

²⁵ Pothast 434 (PL 214:430): Prohibendum est abbatibus ne passim ante tempus probationis quoslibet ad professionem recipiant. The original Benedictine practice insisted on a full year's probation: Rule of St Benedict 58, CCM I p. 467:1 (other refs. given in the note there); but this had long since been abandoned, especially in the ambiance of Cluny (see CCM III p. 87:12, with Knowles' note).

²⁶ BF I 6 (Pothast 6361, Enchiridion § 50): Auctoritate vobis praesentium inhibemus, ne aliquem ad professionem vestri ordinis, nisi per annum in probatione fuerit, admittatis.

²⁷ David Flood (ed.), Hugh of Digne's Rule Commentary (Grottaferrata 1979) p. 101:5-8.

que vellet religionem intrare, nec fratres suos novitios, nisi completo anno probationis, ad professionem reciperent. Consueverunt enim ipso die ingressus sui, si vellent, profiteri, sicque fecit bonae memoriae frater R. Bacun. Ipsi ergo plurimum commoti impetraverunt a domino papa Innocentio IV quod nullus frater minor suos obligatos reciperet, quod si faceret, esset excommunicatus de facto; et ipsi similiter annuerunt de nostris. Obligaverunt ergo tot modis et in tantum hoc privilegium publicaverunt, quod vix aliquem dimitterent. Sed non diu duravit ista tribulatio. Nam bonae memoriae frater W. de Notingham et frater P. de Teukesbury ostenderunt domino papae, quid predecessor statuerat, et ipse circumventum se dicens, licet cum molesta dilatione hoc fieret, revocationem eis concessit²⁸.

Evidently in the 1230s and 1240s the Dominicans were keen to bind their recruits to the order from the time of their arrival, and immediate profession was the surest way to do this. The Bulls trying to stop this practice keep on arriving, presumably to little effect: 1236, 1244, 1256, 1268 ...²⁹.

The quarrel with the Franciscans was not the only reason for wanting to profess people before the canonical year's probation was completed. In 1246 the Dominicans of Milan obtained permission to profess converts from heresy *infra annum*³⁰. Gregory IX was not just being polite in ascribing the Dominican practice to "zeal for souls"³¹.

A reluctance to impose a time of probation is apparent also in the Dominican General Chapters. In 1236 Gregory IX at least implied that no one was to be professed until he had finished a year's noviciate, and this becomes fully explicit in Innocent IV's Bull of 1244³². But the first sign of any legislation on the matter in the Order is in 1250, when an inchoation is made:

In capitulo de recipiendis, ab illo loco ubi dicitur: Probacionis vero tempus VI mensium etc. usque ad illum locum: Nullus recipiatur nisi requisitus an etc., deleatur totum et dicatur sic.: Probacionis vero tempus unius anni sta-

²⁸ A. G. Little, *Tractatus fr. Thomae de Eccleston de Adventu Fratrum Minorum in Angliam* (Paris 1909) pp. 100-2.

²⁹ BOP I 90 (Potthast 10202), I 144 (Potthast 11416), I 305 (Potthast 16378), I 495 (Potthast 20408).

³⁰ BOP I 168 (Potthast 12273).

³¹ BOP I 90 (Potthast 10202).

³² *Districcius duximus inhibendum ne ante annum probationis elapsum... quemquam ad professionem vestrorum ordinum presumeritis recipere seu ad renuntiationem seculi faciendam...*

tuimus, ut ipse recipiendus austeritatem ordinis et fratres mores experiantur ipsius.

This is surely a response to the popes' pressure, and it is all the more interesting that, though this change in the constitutions was approved in 1251, it was dropped again in 1252³³. In 1255 a new inchoation is made, whose effect is quite contrary to papal wishes:

In capitulo de recipiendis, ubi dicitur: Tempus probacionis assignetur, addatur: ut et ipsi austeritates ordinis et fratres mores experiantur eorum, et deleatur totum quod sequitur: Probacionis vero etc. usque ad illum locum: Nullus recipiatur.

In spite of the Bull of 1256, this new inchoation was approved and confirmed in 1256 and 1257³⁴. The addition to the old I 14 was, however, dropped in Humbert's constitutions³⁵. The result of all this legislation was to leave the Order with no rules at all about any time of probation except the totally vague *tempus probacionis assignetur*.

It appears, then, that well into the 1250s and even into the 1260s the Dominicans were reluctant to commit themselves to a statutory time of probation for their novices.

This now brings us back to PC I 15. According to Thomas³⁶, the ruling of I 15 (which he dates to 1220) is intended to introduce the possibility of a dispensation from the time of probation. But it is equally possible that it is an attempt to *impose* a time of probation more rigorously, laying down stricter conditions for a dispensation from it. If this is the correct interpretation, then it is possible to read the evidence as indicating that originally there was no provision for a time of probation at all, and that, even after such provision was made, immediate profession remained a fairly common practice in the order. In 1221 or thereabouts an attempt was made to restrict this practice to suitably mature candidates, an attempt which is entirely in accord with the repeated attempts of General and Provincial Chapters, to prevent the order becoming overloaded with useless young men³⁷. But, in spite of

³³ MOPH III pp. 52, 56.

³⁴ Ibid. pp. 75, 79, 84.

³⁵ ASOP III p. 53.

³⁶ AFP 39 (1969) p. 50.

³⁷ E.g. MOPH III p. 17 (1240), 32 (1245), 44 (1249); C. Douais, *Acta Capitulorum Provincialium* (Toulouse 1894) p. 22 (1242), 28 (1245), 40 (1250);

all the risks, and in spite of papal pressure, the order apparently could not quite bring itself to insist on a full year of probation for everyone.

HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

Let us now turn to the evidence that we have of what Dominicans were actually doing in the early years.

Unfortunately we know nothing about how and when and if Dominic's earliest associates made their profession as Dominicans. All we have is Jordan's statement, about the years between Diego's death in 1207 and the first foundation in Toulouse in 1215:

Licet interdum aliqui sequerentur, non tamen ei quasi per obedientiam tenebantur. Ex his autem suis sequacibus erant memoratus Guilielmus Clareti et frater Dominicus quidam Hispanus, qui postmodum in Hispania prior exstitit de Manionio³⁸.

The first people we hear of attaching themselves formally to Dominic are Peter Selhan and Thomas:

Ingruente tempore quo ad Lateranense Romam episcopi adire coeperunt, obtulerunt se servo Christi Dominico probi viri et idonei de Tholosa, quorum unus fuit frater Petrus de Salam, postmodum prior Lemovicensis, alter Thomas, vir admodum graciosus et sermone facundus ... A quo tempore coeperunt primo apud Tholosam ... commorari, atque ex tunc omnes qui cum eo erant coeperunt magis ac magis ad humilitatem descendere et religiosorum se moribus conformare³⁹.

This certainly suggests that Dominic and his other companions form themselves into a religious community at this stage, and we may presume that they had made some sort of religious profession by the time Fulk gives them canonical status in his diocese: *in paupertate evangelica pedites religiose proposuerunt incedere et veritatis evangelice verbum predi-*

MOPH XX p. 17 (1254); Hugh of St Cher, Letter of 1257, in J. J. Berthier, Humberti de Romanis Opera de Vita Regulari (repr. Turin 1956) II p. 508.

³⁸ Jordan, Libellus 31. I give the text from Jordan's original version, contained in the Bollandists' MS printed by Cuyper in Acta Sanctorum, but using the convenient paragraph numbering in MOPH XVI. For a brief account of the textual problems, and the reasons for preferring the Bollandists' MS, see Simon Tugwell, Jordan of Saxony: On the Beginnings of the Order of Preachers (Dominican Sources, Chicago & Dublin, 1982) pp. xiii-xiv.

³⁹ Libellus 38.

care ⁴⁰. The Bull of confirmation in 1216 speaks of them as having made profession ⁴¹.

All that we know about directly, though, is the self-oblation of Peter and Thomas. Jordan does not tell us in what form they made their self-oblation, but it is likely that they made it *in manibus Dominici*. This would have been a natural procedure, comparable to the occasion witnessed by Dominic in 1207 at Pamiers, when Arnaud de Crampagna

renuntiavit pravitati heretice et in manus domini Oxomensis episcopi obtulit se et sua ⁴²,

or the case reported by Bernard Gui of a citizen of Bordeaux who wanted to endow a Dominican house there in 1230, when he was dying,

renuntians prius omnibus que habebat in manibus prefati archiepiscopi, in quibus posuit se et sua ⁴³.

Fr Thomas agrees that it is likely that Peter and Thomas gave themselves to Dominic with the gesture of *immixtio manuum*, but denies that we can consider this act « comme une profession religieuse à titre définitif » ⁴⁴, in this disagreeing with Vicaire and Hinnebusch, the former of whom comments: « Le terme dont se servent les sources pour désigner cet acte, ' obtulerunt se ', n'a qu'une interprétation possible. Ils se lièrent à lui par une profession religieuse, pour former une communauté » ⁴⁵. We have really no way of knowing whether or not Peter and Thomas subsequently made a more formal religious profession; all that we can say is that we have no evidence that they did, and Jordan plainly considers this first *oblatio sui* as a turning point in the development of the order.

The next person we hear of is John of Spain, who tells us about his entry in the course of his evidence during the Bologna Canonization Process. Unfortunately there is considerable uncertainty about the text

⁴⁰ MOPH XXV p. 57.

⁴¹ Ibid. p. 73.

⁴² Pierre de Vaux Cernai, *Historia Albigensis*, ed. P. Guébin & E. Lyon (Paris 1926-39) § 48.

⁴³ MOPH XXIV p. 82.

⁴⁴ Art. cit. p. 45.

⁴⁵ M. H. Vicaire, *Histoire de St Dominique* (Paris 1982) I p. 338; W. A. Hinnebusch, *The History of the Dominican Order I* (New York 1966) p. 39.

of the Canonization Process, since we have two different versions which it is impossible to reduce to a single text. For our present purposes we need to bear in mind at least the evidence of the version contained in Borselli's *Cronica Generalium Magistrorum* (B), and that of the version contained in the lost Carcassonne manuscript printed in Quétif-Échard (C) together with the Venice manuscript, Marciana lat. 3287 (V)⁴⁶.

B appears to have only a summary of the opening of John's testimony:

Quintus testis adiuratus fuit Iohannes Yspanus ordinis predicatorum, qui receptus fuit ad ordinem a beato Dominico Tholose in eclesia sancti Romani tempore concilii Innocentii tertii (f. 23^r).

The CV version appears to be essentially trustworthy here (and there are only insignificant variants between C and V):

Frater Iohannes Hispanus ... iuratus dixit quod in illo anno quo confirmatus fuit ordo fratrum predicatorum in concilio domini Innocentii pape III, ipse testis intravit ordinem istum. Et in festo sancti Augustini proxime venturo erunt decem et octo anni, sicut firmiter credit de tempore, quod recepit habitum de manu fratris Dominici plantatoris ipsius ordinis et primi magistri et ipsa die fecit professionem in manu predicti fratris in eclesia sancti Romani apud Tholosam. (§ 25)

Unfortunately the sense of John's testimony is disputed. Since the church of St Romain was not given to the friars until 1216, while "eighteen years ago" (if John's memory is to be trusted) would bring us to 1215, some people have argued that John was clothed in 1215 and professed in 1216 on the same day of the year⁴⁷. Fr Thomas introduces a

⁴⁶ On the textual problems surrounding the Canonization Process, see V. J. Koudelka, AFP 42 (1972) pp. 47-61; Simon Tugwell, *Early Dominicans* (Classics of Western Spirituality, New York 1982) pp. 474 f. The text of Borselli is in Bologna, Bibl. Univ. lat. 1999 (I give folio references); C is printed in Quétif-Échard I pp. 44-56. The text in Flaminio, *Vitae Patrum Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Bologna 1529) ff. LXVI-LXXVIII, in spite of the differences in form and language, is essentially close to that of CV. The excerpts in Modena, Bibl. Estense, Campori γ 0.3.25 derive from a text close to that of V. Dietrich of Apolda's epitome is too brief to be of any use. Tæglio (AGOP XIV 53 ff. 131-5) appears to be copying directly from B. Paragraph references are to Walz's edition in MOPH XVI.

⁴⁷ T. M. Machi, *Annales Ordinis Praedicatorum* (Rome 1756) p. 409; F. Balme, P. Lelaidier & J. Colomb, *Cartulaire ou Histoire Di-*

complication (whose purpose I do not understand): he supposes that John entered the order in 1215, but was clothed and professed in 1216; he then goes on to wonder whether the *professio in manu* should be understood as a pre-profession going with the rite of clothing, or whether the clothing should be understood as part of the rite of profession proper, in which case, according to Thomas, *in manu* must be an anachronistic application to 1216 of terminology which only became appropriate later on⁴⁸.

It certainly seems most natural to take *ipsa die* as meaning "on the same day" rather than "on the same day one year later". But then it would seem to be simplest to suppose, with Vicaire and Hinnebusch⁴⁹, that the whole sentence refers to a single occasion in 1215. As Vicaire points out, there is no difficulty about the friars having the use of St Romain before it was formally given to them — much the same thing happened with St Jacques in Paris and with Santa Sabina in Rome⁵⁰. And it is understandable that 1215, rather than 1216, should be remembered as the year in which the order was confirmed, as the confirmation was intimately linked with Innocent III and the presence of Fulk and Dominic at the Lateran Council.

When John says that he was professed *in ecclesia sancti Romani*, this does not necessarily mean, as Fr Thomas appears to believe, that the profession took place actually in the church. *Ecclesia* is regularly used in medieval Latin to cover religious buildings attached to a church⁵¹. And if John's profession occurred in 1215, it is not clear that it would make much difference anyway whether he was professed in the church or in some other part of the site, since he could hardly give himself to a church which did not yet belong to the order.

Our next witness is Reginald of Orléans, who joined the order in 1218. Dominic visited him while he was ill in Rome,

plomatique de St Dominique II (Paris 1897) p. 51¹; V. D. Carro, Domingo de Guzman (Madrid 1973) p. 362.

⁴⁸ Art. cit. p. 46.

⁴⁹ Vicaire, op. cit. I pp. 356; Hinnebusch, op. cit. p. 40.

⁵⁰ The Dominicans were given the use of St Jacques in 1218 (*Libellus* 53), but only gained possession of it in 1221 (*MOPH* XXV pp. 160-2). They moved into Santa Sabina in February 1221, but only gained possession of it in 1222 (*Cecilia*, *Miracula* 14; *BOP* I 15).

⁵¹ J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* (Leiden 1976) s.v. *Ecclesia* 5; Vicaire, op. cit. I p. 267. There are clear examples in the Bologna Canonization Process 36 and 46.

et exhortans eum ad paupertatem Christi et ad ordinis sui consortium, liberum et plenum ab eo suscipiendae religionis huius consensum elicit, ita ut se voto obstringeret.

After his miraculous recovery, Reginald fulfilled his original intention of going overseas, *licet iam professione ordini teneretur*⁵². As soon as he returned, he went to Bologna, where he immediately began to act as Dominic's "vicar"⁵³. In spite of Thomas' hesitation, it seems inescapable that Reginald's sickbed profession was indeed his Dominican profession, and that he made no noviciate of any kind. At what stage he adopted the Dominican habit we do not know.

One of Reginald's most impressive converts to the order was Moneta of Cremona, who

ei (sc. Reginaldo) statum suum et occupaciones exponens, in manibus eius professus est. Et quia erat multipliciter impeditus, de licentia ipsius fratris Reginaldi, per annum et amplius remansit in habitu seculari.⁵⁴

This means that Moneta made his profession, *in manibus*, eighteen months before he put on the habit and began to live in the order. It is, of course, possible, as Thomas argues, that in 1218 he only made a promise to join the order, but this does not seem to be what Gerald de Frachet intends us to think.

In 1219 we hear of Paul of Venice and Frugerius making their profession. According to the CV text of the Canonization Process (§ 41)

Frater Paulus Venetus ... iuratus dixit quod xiiii anni sunt et plus quod intravit ordinem predicatorum Bononie et professionem fecit in manibus magistri Reginaldi et recepit habitum in dominica in qua cantatur evangelium Cananee.

The B text has:

Octauus testis iuratus fuit frater Paulus Venetus ordinis predicatorum qui annis xiiii ante recepit habitum Bononie et professionem fecit in manibus magistri Reginaldi. (f. 25^v)

Once again it looks as if the B text is abridged, in which case we may probably take it that Paul mentioned profession before clothing, which

⁵² Libellus 56, 58.

⁵³ MOPH I p. 25.

⁵⁴ MOPH I p. 170.

suggests, though it does not prove, that he was professed before he was clothed. Whether the two rites occurred on the same day is not specified, though it seems likely that they did. There is no doubt that the profession was made *in manibus*, and there is nothing to indicate that we are dealing with anything other than Paul's definitive religious profession.

With regard to Frugerus, CV and B tell the same story (§ 46). I quote only the CV version:

Frater Frugerus Pennensis ordinis predicatorum iuratus dixit quod xiiii anni fuerunt in quadragesima proxime preterita quod ipse intravit ordinem predicatorum et fecit professionem in manibus magistri Reginaldi et ab eodem recepit habitum apud ecclesiam de Mascarella.

This time there is no uncertainty about the order of things: profession is mentioned before clothing, and it seems very probable that the two are meant to be understood as forming one continuous rite. Again we notice that profession was *in manibus*, and that there is nothing to suggest that Frugerus was not referring to his religious profession.

Also in 1219, we have a dramatic account of how Stephen of Spain became a Dominican. Here the texts of CV and B diverge more significantly, but fortunately not in such a way as to affect our present concern. I quote from B (f. 24^v; cf. § 36):

Item dixit quod cum studeret Bononie ipse testis, uenit Bononiam beatus Dominicus, ubi et predicabat. Cum autem confessus fuisset peccata mea cum eo, quodam sero cum cenarem cum sotiis in domo ubi hospitabamur, misit beatus Dominicus duos fratres ad me dicentes: Frater Dominicus mandat quod ueniatis ad eum. Quibus cum dixissem quod irent, et quod post cenam uenirem, dixerunt: Dicit quod nunc ueniatis. Relictis ergo omnibus ueni ad eum et inueni eum cum multis fratribus apud ecclesiam sancti Nicolai. Astantibus autem fratribus dixit: Cito instruite eum qualiter petat ueniam. Venia facta, misit se in manibus eius. Tunc beatus Dominicus recepit eum ad ordinem, dicens: Do tibi arma cum quibus toto tempore uite tue poteris diabolo repugnare. Ipse uero testis miratus fuit tunc et postea quo instinctu ipse frater Dominicus uocauit eum et induit eum habitu fratrum predicatorum.

It certainly looks as if Stephen is telling the story of his profession as well as his clothing: *venia, oblatio sui in manibus*, then clothing.

In the next paragraph (in B and CV) Stephen refers to himself as a novice, but this does not necessarily mean that he was unprofessed. The

Roman Provincial Chapter of 1244 refers to *novitii licet professi*⁵⁵, which also incidentally warns us that Dominican texts indicating special provision for new recruits *infra annum* are not necessarily evidence for a year's probationary period before profession⁵⁶.

In 1219 or 1220 (before the General Chapter) Ventura joined the Order. According to the B text (f. 21^r, cf. § 2)

intrauit ordinem predicatorum monitione et inductione beati patris Dominici, fundatoris ordinis predicatorum et primi magistri, et in manu eius professionem fecit et ab eo habitum sumpsit.

CV tells the same story, in slightly different words. Once again, we appear to have a single rite of profession and clothing, in that order.

In Paris a very significant recruit joined the order: Jordan of Saxony, bringing his friend Henry with him. Jordan describes his approach to the order in several stages. First

fratre Reginaldo ... strenue predicante, ego divina praeventus gratia concepì et vovi intra memetipsum ordinem istum assumere.

After this he labours to persuade Henry, who eventually *ad ipsum fratrem Reginaldum properanter accedens votum emisit*⁵⁷. At some stage Jordan himself had done the same, as we learn from his account of the vision he had when Reginald died:

Visum est mihi nondum quidem secundum habitum fratri, sed in ipsius manibus iam professo ...⁵⁸

The two friends *distulimus usque ad quadragesimae tempus tirocinium nostrum* and took the habit dramatically enough on Ash Wednesday⁵⁹.

Reginald was dead by the time Jordan and Henry actually took the habit, but Jordan expressly claims that they were the only two in Paris

⁵⁵ MOPH XX p. 3.

⁵⁶ Cf. Humbert, ed. cit. II p. 215; Si autem viderit expedire, debet (the novice master) suggerere priori quod adhuc ad maiorem humilitatem et informationem sit (a newly professed friar) cum aliis novitiis in capitulo eorum et sub cura sua ad tempus, secundum quod utilitas illius et ordinis requirit.

⁵⁷ Libellus 69, 74.

⁵⁸ Ibid. 65.

⁵⁹ Ibid. 74.

whom Reginald received *ad professionem ordinis*⁶⁰, so he must mean that the vows which they had made before actually entering the order were their Dominican profession.

In the period before the General Chapter of 1220, then, the evidence that we have, limited though it is, suggests that at least some people (and not all of them obviously mature men) were admitted to profession without a preliminary time of probation, and that clothing might precede or follow profession, the latter however being more normal, and that in special circumstances the clothing might follow profession after a considerable interval. In each case for which we have evidence, profession was made *in manibus*. There is evidence of people doing a noviciate, but this is apparently after profession. There is no evidence — though here we must proceed cautiously, as our evidence is so meagre — of anybody doing a probationary period before profession. And, if Stephen's case is to be taken as a case of religious profession, then there is a clear continuity between Dominican *professio in manibus* and the *oblatio sui* which Peter and Thomas made in 1215.

We also have a certain amount of evidence concerning the nuns. The Chronicle of St Agnes, Bologna, tells us that in 1219, when Dominic was in Bologna, Diana

ipsum tota animi affectione diligere cepit, ac cum ipso de anime sue salute tractare. Tandem non multo post in manibus ipsius se misit ac professionem fecit, presente magistro Reginaldo et aliis fratribus coram altare beati Nicolai.

It is clear that she at least regards herself as having vowed to be a Dominican nun:

Interim prememorata domina Dyana voti sui non immemor, cum beato Dominico cepit tractare qualiter votum suum posset reducere ad effectum. Quadam igitur die beatus Dominicus coadunans fratres suos ac requirens beneplacitum ipsorum, videlicet de edificanda domo dominarum que ordinis diceretur et esset...

It was not, of course, until 1233 that the Dominican monastery was actually ready, and some time within the Octave of the Ascension in that year Diana and four other ladies moved in.

⁶⁰ Ibid. 66. I do not know on what authority Borselli claims that Jordan professionem fecit tertia die sui ingressus (op. cit. f. 7^r).

In festo autem apostolorum Petri et Pauli susceperunt a predicto patre magistro Iordane habitum ordinis.

The following year, during the General Chapter, Jordan received letters from the pope putting the new monastery under his jurisdiction, and forthwith

idem magister recepit in manibus suis sororem Dianam una cum toto conventu ad professionem ⁶¹.

The significance of this profession is clear: it formalises the juridical link between the monastery and the Master of the Order. This is why it could not have taken place before the reception of the papal letters and the Chapter's acceptance of the house as a house of the order. (The nuns made profession again, a few years later, to Raymund, for exactly the same reason, after the juridical link had been called into question ⁶²).

Cecilia provides us with some evidence about the beginning of San Sisto. She proudly announces that she *de manu Dominici habitum accepit et in manibus ipsius tribus vicibus professionem fecit* ⁶³. (She must also have made profession twice more at Bologna, once to Jordan and once to Raymund). The first profession occurred when the abbess of Santa Maria in Tempulo and all the nuns except for one accepted Dominic as their superior. The second occurred as a re-affirmation of the first, after the nuns had been upset by their friends and relations and had begun to regret what they had done. The third profession occurred when the nuns actually moved into San Sisto:

Et prima omnium soror Cecilia, que habebat tunc forte decem et septem annos, in ipso introitu porte a beato Dominico habitum accepit et in manibus eius tunc tertia vice professionem fecit, et post eam abbatissa et omnes sanctimonialia monasterii sui ⁶⁴.

The nuns' evidence clarifies the position usefully. It is clear that the giving of the habit goes with the actual entry into the community, while profession (always *in manibus*) goes with the establishment or ratification

⁶¹ M. G. C a m b r i a , *Il Monastero Domenicano di S. Agnese in Bologna* (Bologna 1973) pp. 227-9.

⁶² *Ibid.* p. 230.

⁶³ C e c i l i a , *Miracula*, ed. A. W a l z , AFP 37 (1967) pp. 5-45, Prologue.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.* 14.

of a juridical link between Dominic (or his agent or successor) and the parties making profession. The relationship between these two factors is undefined and flexible. No relationship can be discerned between profession and the completion of a probationary period.

What we learn from the nuns seems to apply equally well to the evidence we have considered from the brethren.

The practice of the order after 1220 we have already considered in a general way, but a few more details will help us to understand the development of the Dominican practice more fully.

On April 3, 1223, Honorius III issued a letter in favour of a student at Bologna:

Humili nobis confessione monstrasti quod, cum in etate tenera, circa sextumdecimum annum uidelicet, dum Bononie scholasticis disciplinis insisteres, in quamdam grauissimam egritudinem incidisses, a quodam de ordine predicatorum presbytero penitentia et dominici corporis communionem receptis, suasionem dicti presbyteri circumuentus, minus prudenter suscepturum te ipsorum predicatorum habitum promisisti. Cum tamen tam per egritudinis passionem, quam per infirmitatem etatis, quod faceres tunc temporis ignoraris, nec per hoc ad prefati ordinis obseruantiam quam penitus nesciebas intenderis obligari. Cum autem post conualescentiam de promisso huiusmodi notitiam non haberes, fratres eiusdem ordinis ad uerbum presbyteri memorati compellere te per interminationem excommunicationis ut eorumdem assumeres ordinem uoluerunt. Unde, cum per talem promissionem renuntiare seculo uel districtioni iam dicti ordinis obligari nullatenus intendisses, suppliciter postulasti, ut te ad ipsius nuntiaremus obseruantiam ordinis non teneri. Quare nos tuis postulationibus inclinati presentibus nuntiamus quod per hec ad illorum obseruantiam uel ordinem non teneris⁶⁵.

Presumably the episode referred to had taken place fairly recently. Whether the Dominican priest in question distinguished as sharply as the pope does between a promise to join the order and profession in the order, and between the promise to join the order and the promise to renounce the world, we cannot tell.

In 1224 Honorius III similarly declares that a certain Nicholas, a cleric of Florence, whom the Dominicans had persuaded to receive the habit while he was convalescing after a serious illness, is not obliged to be a religious, because

⁶⁵ Epitome BOP n. 111.

infra tempus probationis, non facta professione, recessisti ab eis, ipsorum licentia ⁶⁶.

Here we have unambiguous evidence of the Dominicans allowing a time of probation before profession; unfortunately nothing is said about any promise to renounce the world, so we do not know whether or not Nicholas had made such a promise.

The licence to leave before profession is also mentioned in the *Vitae Fratrum*, but Gerald de Frachet clearly implies that it is not approved of — it is, in fact, a “diabolical temptation”, happily overcome in Gerald’s story, which he tells to illustrate the claim that Jordan a special grace

ut numquam culpa sua vel negligentia sua perdiderit aliquem, ut cum Christo dicere possit: Pater, quos dedisti michi, non perdi ex eis quemquam ⁶⁷.

We also have evidence of a time of probation, though less than six months, in the case of Gerald de Frachet himself: according to Bernard Gui, he entered the order on November 11, 1225, and was professed the following year on March 25 ⁶⁸.

There is an interesting case in 1229, when Gregory IX orders someone (whose name is now lost) to investigate the claim of a cleric called Raynerius, who

exposuit coram nobis, quod cum olim in anno quartodecimo constitutus ordinem fratrum predicatorum ingressus, facta professione, infra eundem annum ordinem ipsum dimiserit, quidam ex hoc sibi notam apostasie moliuntur ⁶⁹.

In spite of the fact that Raynerius had made profession, the pope rules that, if the facts are as reported, the young man is not bound to remain in the order.

In 1231 we have evidence of someone joining the order and making a formal promise to renounce the world, which the pope evidently feels bound to uphold:

⁶⁶ Ibid. n. 123.

⁶⁷ MOPH I pp. 114 f.

⁶⁸ MOPH XXIV p. 60. Gui claims to have this from an autograph of Gerald himself.

⁶⁹ Epitome BOP n. 207.

Iohanni et Wenero canonicis ecclesie Zouigensis Constantiensis diocesis in nostra presentia constitutis, dilectum filium magistrum B. de Vercellis cappellanum nostrum concessimus auditorem, coram quo Iohannes proposuit memoratus, quod cum ipse olim a ... preposito et capitulo eiusdem ecclesie, nulla ibidem uacante prebenda, receptus fuisset in canonicum et fratrem, demum eodem W. fratrum predicatorum ordinem assumente, ipse prebendam eiusdem tamquam uacantem sibi ab eis petiit assignari; sed ipsis eam conferre sibi differentibus, idem W. ab ordine ipso infra probationis tempus, non facta professione, discessit. Lite igitur super his coram eodem auditore legitime contestata, prefatus W. in iudicio fuit confessus, quod antequam ordinem predictum intraret, per annum intrandi propositum habuit, et cum intrauit, requisitus a priore suo seculo renunciauit omnino, et in religione seruiturum Domino perpetuo se deuouit, sicque habitum assumpsit in ordine prenotato. Verum quia post hec prefatus W. tamquam contumax ab apostolica sede discessit, idem auditor, habito prudentum uirorum consilio, ipsius absentia presentia Dei repleta, predicto W. duxit super eadem prebenda perpetuum silentium imponendum⁷⁰.

These cases fill out the picture whose outline we were able to sketch on the basis of our consideration of the Dominican constitutions. Against a background of sustained papal pressure to leave recruits entirely free for their first year, the Dominicans begin to allow for a probationary period, though they do not accept that it needs to last a whole year; and they clarify the options open to people: immediate profession, profession in under a year, promise to renounce the world without immediate profession in the order, a promise to join the order without yet making profession in it. This process accounts for the development of more precise formulae, such as we find in Raymund's constitutions.

Gregory IX's Bull of 1236 is admirably clear about what he wants the Dominicans to stop doing:

Nos ipsi statuimus ut positi in probatione novitii ante susceptum religionis habitum qui dari profitentibus consuevit, seu ante professionem emissam, ad statum pristinum redire possint libere infra annum. Et ad omnem ambiguitatem penitus amouendam, cum in quibusdam locis religiosi novitiorum habitus non distinguatur ab habitu professorum, professionis tempore benedicantur vestes, que profitentibus conceduntur, ut novitiorum ac professorum habitus discernantur. Licet igitur zelum animarum habentes, eas lucrari Domino solícite cupiatis, quia tamen decet et expedit ut conscientie puritati non desit iudicium rationis, ne unde spiritalis profectus queritur, inde salutis dispendium subsequatur, presentium vobis auctoritate districtius inhibemus

⁷⁰ Ibid. n. 278.

ne ad susceptionem vestri ordinis ante professionem aliquem obligare vel infra probationis spatium quod est maxime in subsidium fragilitatis humane regulariter institutum, quemquam facto vel verbo ad profitendum seu ad renuntiandum de necessitate seculo inducere presumatis, nec constitutum in probatione novitium aliquatenus impedire, quominus infra tempus probationis ad aliam religionem quam maluerit transeat, sicut de sua processerit libera voluntate ⁷¹.

We also have evidence that the nuns were engaging in similar "malpractices". Thomas of Cantimpré tells us of the determination of Yolanda of Vianden to be a Dominican nun:

Illa autem alias intendens, matrem animo sollicitavit dicti loci sorores inuisere. Quo ubi uenit, alias cum militibus et familia matre intenta, filia, ut prius ordinauerat, uocatis in capitulum sororibus, uotum religionis fecit, habitum induit, et impositum responsorium, Regnum mundi, ipsamet inchoauit ⁷².

LITURGICAL EVIDENCE

The fullest liturgical evidence we have comes from the *Directorium* in codex Ruthensis, dating from about 1300, but most of the rites described there are attested earlier as well.

The rite for receiving novices follows the outlines in PC I 14. The aspirant is brought into chapter, where he prostrates himself. The superior asks, *Quid petitis?*, to which he replies, *Misericordiam Dei et uestram*. He is then told to stand up, while the superior warns him of the austerities of religious life in general and Dominican life in particular. He is also asked whether he is legally free to join the order and whether he has any hidden infirmities. The superior then assigns him a probationary period of one year, and asks whether he wishes to proceed. If he says he does, the superior says, *Dominus qui cepit, ipse perficiat*, to which the community respond, *Amen*. The aspirant is then clothed in the habit, and led into choir, while the brethren sing *Veni Creator Spiritus*. For the rest, we are referred "elsewhere" (to the *Ordinarium*, in fact) ⁷³.

⁷¹ BOP I 90 (Potthast 10202).

⁷² De Apibus II xxix 39 (Douai 1605 pp. 318 f). Cf. Quellen und Forschungen XXIV p. 62; AFP 5 (1935) p. 89; 18 (1948) pp. 97 f.

⁷³ Ed. R. Creytens, AFP 26 (1956) pp. 116-8. I have corrected *perficiet* (which is in the MS) to *perficiat*.

The similar text in John of Monthléry⁷⁴ reveals that, apart from the formulae actually contained in the constitutions, the superior is free to choose his own words (in John's text, the superior enquires into the aspirant's status before telling him about the austerities of the order, and the formal enquiry into both the status of the aspirant and his readiness to proceed are couched in slightly different words).

The assumption that the probationary period lasts a year is already attested in Gerald de Frachet and Thomas of Cantimpré⁷⁵, and in Humbert's *De Officiis*, which is probably to be dated some time after 1263⁷⁶.

That the clothing takes place in Chapter even before 1220 is attested by the account given in the *Vitae Fratrum* of the clothing of Roland of Cremona⁷⁷.

The only part of the rite which does not correspond to the constitutions is the singing of the *Veni Creator* and the procession into church. For this we have more details in the *Ordinarium*:

Dum novitius incipit in capitulo indui, cantor incipiat cantando hymnum *Veni creator*. Et cum indutus fuerit, vel induti si plures fuerint, egrediatur conventus processionaliter ad ecclesiam, iunioribus precedentibus, magistro novitiorum ultimo ducente novitium vel novitios usque ad gradum altaris, ibique faciat eos prosternere. Finito hymno et dicto *Kyrie* et *Pater noster*, dicat qui recepit novitium: *Et ne nos. V Emitte. V Salvum* vel *Salvos. Dominus vobiscum*. Oratio *Deus qui corda*, oratio *Pretende*. Et dicantur eo modo quo dicuntur orationes ad horas diei, et terminentur sub uno *Per Christum*. Finitis orationibus, elevetur novitius a magistro eorum, interim stante prope eum, et ducatur ad receptorem, qui, amoto caputio de capite novitii aliquantum, aspergat eum aqua benedicta cum aspersorio sibi a sacrista delato, et postea recipiat eum ad osculum pacis, et similiter faciant omnes fratres sequentes in choro suo. Postea alii de alio choro eodem ordine⁷⁸.

At least in germ, this rite must have existed in the mid 1230s, because it is incorporated into the constitutions of the Sack Friars (I 14):

⁷⁴ Printed in Humbert, ed. cit., II pp. 525-7.

⁷⁵ MOPH I p. 113; *De Apibus* II xxviii 12.

⁷⁶ Ed. cit. II p. 215. For the dating, see F. Heintke, Humbert von Romans (Berlin 1933) pp. 83 f; E. T. Brett, The Life and Works of Humbert of Romans (University Microfilms 1981) pp. 155 f.

⁷⁷ MOPH I pp. 26 f.

⁷⁸ F. M. Guerrini, *Ordinarium iuxta ritum S. O. Fratrum Praedicatorum* (Rome 1921) § 486.

Depositis uestibus secularibus et religiosis induti, in nostram societatem recipiantur. Post hec cantor incipiat ymnum *Veni Creator*, et intrent processionaliter ecclesiam. Quibus cantantibus iaceat frater nouicius prostratus ante altare. Ympno uero peracto, incipiat prelatus subscriptos uersiculos ...

At this point, annoyingly, the manuscript breaks off, and the text is only resumed after a long lacuna.

It is likely that the use of *Veni Creator* in the rite of reception even as early as 1219 can be inferred from the account of Roland of Cremona's clothing, though there is no mention there of any procession into church, and it is possible that Gerald is simply describing a spontaneous outburst of hymnody ⁷⁹.

The rite of profession, as the *Directorium* indicates, begins in exactly the same way as the rite of clothing, except that the superior addresses the novices in slightly different terms. After the superior has asked the candidate whether he wishes to make profession, and the candidate has replied that he does, the superior, once again, says, *Dominus qui cepit* etc., and the community replies, *Amen*. Then the candidate.

flexis genibus ante prelatum sedentem, positis manibus suis inter manus prelati, professionem faciat et verba professionis proferat bene et distincte et in tali voce quod audiatur plane a quolibet fratre in capitulo existente. Tunc prelatus, dato pacis osculo iam professo, surgens et stans, vestem benedicat sicut in constitutionibus est cautum ⁸⁰.

Essentially the same rite is presupposed by Humbert ⁸¹, though there is nothing about it in the *Ordinarium*.

The gesture of kneeling before the superior, with the candidate's hands in those of the superior, is vouched for by an illustration in an antiphonar from St Agnes, which, it is argued, cannot be later than 1234 ⁸².

Several things immediately call for comment in these rites. First, there is a striking similarity between the two rites — a similarity all the more impressive if we re-insert the earlier promise of renunciation in the rite of clothing. Secondly, the rite of profession is startlingly unlike the elaborate ritual customary among monks and canons: its

⁷⁹ MOPH I pp. 26 f.

⁸⁰ AFP 26 (1956) pp. 118 f.

⁸¹ Ed. cit. II p. 215.

⁸² Cambria, op. cit. p. 115.

central feature is the gesture of *immixtio manuum*, which is not found in the traditional rites, the whole rite takes place in chapter, and there is no trace of the ceremonies in church and at the altar which occur in all monastic and canonical rites. Thirdly, the Dominicans, uniquely, solemnise the rite of clothing (reception of novices), not the rite of profession.

Since it is clear that both the Dominican rites are related to the Praemonstratensian constitution *de recipiendis*, we must first consider whether the Praemonstratensian liturgy sheds any light on that of the Dominicans. (For a fuller discussion of the development of the Praemonstratensian profession rite, see Appendix II).

A Praemonstratensian manuscript from the late twelfth century, now in Ghent, contains a profession ritual which bears a definite resemblance to that of the Dominicans. The novice is brought into chapter, where he makes a prostration. The abbot asks, *Quid queris?*, to which he replies, *Misericordiam Dei et vestram*. He then stands, while the abbot expounds *asperitatem ordinis*. If the novice declares, *Omnia libenter pro Christo servabo*, the abbot says, *Deus qui in te cepit, ipse perficiat*, to which the community reply, *Amen*. Then the novice *abrenuntiet seculo et proprietatibus et obedientiam usque ad mortem promittat*. There follows a blessing of the habit and a clothing⁸³.

This is clearly very similar to the rite of reception described in the Praemonstratensian constitutions — in fact Lefèvre says of the promises made in the two rites of reception and profession that « une même cérémonie préside aux deux actions »⁸⁴. It is also obviously very similar to the Dominican profession rite. And, since the Dominicans gave the habit during the rite of reception, it is easy to see why they would drop the vestition from the profession rite.

Unfortunately, though, the similarity between the rites of the two orders is deceptive. In the first place, the blessing of the habit was only introduced into the Dominican profession rite in 1236, in response to the explicit command of Gregory IX⁸⁵. The capitular ruling of that

⁸³ Pl. F. Lefèvre. « Les Cérémonies de la Vêture et de la Profession dans l'Ordre de Prémontré », *Anal. Praem.* 8 (1922) pp. 298 f.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.* p. 291. Van den Broeck, *op. cit.* p. 14, rightly points out that this is not true of the earlier period, when the habit was not given until profession, and we may presume that when the habit was given at reception, it remained unblest until profession. But otherwise what Lefèvre says is probably true of the situation in the early 13th century.

⁸⁵ MOPH III p. 8; BOP I 90 (P o t t h a s t 10202).

year must mean either that previously the habit was not blessed at all ⁸⁶ or that it was blessed during the rite of reception.

Secondly, the Ghent manuscript only gives us the beginning of the Praemonstratensian rite. For its continuation we may turn to a slightly later manuscript from Grimberghen, which is worth quoting extensively as it highlights just what the Dominicans were not doing:

Post offertorium misse, stante conventu in choro et habente vultum ad altare, stante etiam abbate ad dextrum cornu altaris, veniat novicius, alba indutus, ante gradus presbiterii et stans dicat tercio hunc versum: Suscipe me Domine secundum eloquium tuum et vivam et non confundas me ab expectatione mea. Conventus respondente per intervalla tertio hunc versum: Suscepimus Deus misericordiam tuam in medio templi tui. In fine subiungitur: Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto — Sicut erat in principio et nunc et semper et in secula seculorum Amen. Deinde, prostrato novicio super gradus, dicantur hii psalmi: Miserere mei Deus. Gloria Patri. Ecce quam bonum. Gloria Patri. Quibus finitis incipiat cantor, vel si non affuerit succentor, ad pulpitum chori solus letaniam Kyrieleison. Cristeleison. Kyrieleison et cetera. Choro respondente, et finiat letaniam sic: Omnes sancti orate pro eo subiungendo: Christe audi nos. Kyrieleison. Christeleison, Kyrieleison. Pater noster. Et ne nos. Sequuntur preces: Salvum fac servum tuum. Mitte ei Domine auxilium. Esto ei Domine turris. Nichil proficiat. Domine exaudi orationem. Dominus vobiscum.

Oremus. Deus qui non mortem ...

Oremus. Deus amator castitatis ...

Oremus. Deus qui nos a seculi vanitate conversos ...

Oremus. Deus qui renunciantibus ...

Tunc surgat novitius et legat cartam suam demisso capite super altare sic dicens: Ego, frater N., offerens trado meipsum ... Deinde faciat signum crucis de incausto in carta et ponat eam super altare, dicens hunc versum ter per intervalla: Confirma hoc Deus quod operatus es in nobis a templo sancto tuo quod est in Jerusalem. Conventu ter similiter respondente eundem versum. Deinde prelatus det novitio communem societatem. Postea dicat orationem hanc: Dominus vobiscum. Oremus. Omnes quamvis per gratiam baptismi ...

Tunc prelatus et omnes ministri altaris, deinde omnes fratres ecclesie osculentur eum, et ponatur ultimus in choro ⁸⁷.

The monastic practice generally included a blessing and imparting of the habit between the profession formula and the concluding kiss of peace, but otherwise the Praemonstratensian rite is quite typical.

⁸⁶ This appears to be the situation at St Victor (Martène III p. 266) and St Ruf (Martène II p. 180; Carrier, op. cit. p. 56).

⁸⁷ Lefèvre, art. cit. pp. 300-2; van den Broeck pp. 95-7.

In the context of the full rite, it becomes clear that the Ghent text contains only the preliminaries. Later on the Praemonstratensians built up these preliminaries to constitute a genuine form of profession in themselves; a late sixteenth century version explicitly says, during the rite in chapter, *Tunc profiteatur*, and then gives the regular profession formula, in spite of the fact that exactly the same formula is repeated later on in church⁸⁸, and so it became possible for some Praemonstratensians to argue that the chapter rite, even without the subsequent rite in church, constituted a valid profession⁸⁹. However this is quite certainly a misunderstanding. The rite in chapter is simply the equivalent of the *scrutinium* which is found, in one form or another, in many monastic rites as a preliminary to profession, and which naturally takes much the same form as the rite of reception, the aim of both being to ensure that the candidate's intentions are fully declared and that he knows what he is doing⁹⁰.

After all, then, the Praemonstratensian rite explains very little. It may explain why the Dominicans develop a profession rite similar to the rite of reception, but it does not explain why the profession rite stops short at the conclusion of the preliminaries, without moving on to a proper ceremony of profession. Nor does it explain the *immixtio manuum*. It may perhaps explain why, in the rite of clothing, the procession into church follows a vestition in chapter rather than culminating in a vestition in church, as the monastic parallels would lead us to expect, but it does not explain why this rite is attached to the reception of novices rather than to their profession.

To find a significant parallel to the Dominican *professio in manibus* we have to leave the monks and the canons. The only parallels they can provide are, surely, unhelpful: the profession of *conversi* in the Cistercian rite and at Oigny⁹¹, and the rite of reception at St Victor⁹². The relevant parallel, apparently not noticed by Fr Thomas, comes from the Franciscans. Unfortunately no early Franciscan rite of clothing or profession is known, but the 1458 ritual specifies that when profession is made

⁸⁸ Van den Broeck p. 104.

⁸⁹ Ibid. p. 85.

⁹⁰ Cf. Martène II pp. 173 f, IV pp. 223b-224a, 224a, 224b-225a. CCM II pp. 58 f, III p. 87. HBS 23 pp. 264 f, 383 f. A. Wilmart, « Les Ouvrages d'un Moine de Bec », Revue Bénédictine 44 (1932) pp. 36 f.

⁹¹ Thomas, art. cit. pp. 41 f; Pl. F. Lefèvre & A. H. Thomas, Le Coutumier de l'Abbaye d'Oigny en Bourgogne (Louvain 1976) § 65.

⁹² Martène III p. 266.

gardianus accipiat manus novicii sic iunctas cum carta intra manus suas ab extra positas⁹³.

At least this part of the rite appears to be primitive. In *Admonitiones* 3:3 Francis says:

Ille homo relinquit omnia quae possidet et perdit corpus suum, qui se ipsum totum praebet ad obedientiam in manibus sui praelati.

And, even more clearly, there are two papal letters, from 1220 and 1221, about a *prepositus* whom the Franciscans claimed as a professed friar:

magistro fratrum minorum ... in cuius vovisse manibus ... dicebatur⁹⁴.

Whether the Franciscans had an elaborate ritual to accompany profession is not known, though it seems unlikely; the 1458 ritual is plainly not evidence for the details of any earlier practice. It does however indicate that the Franciscan rite developed quite independently of those of the monks and the canons.

The strangeness of the friars' profession rites is surely part and parcel of the strangeness of their orders. According to the *Scripta Leonis* Francis deliberately rejected any identification of his order with either of the traditional categories of "monk" and "canon"⁹⁵. And the *professio super altare* symbolised an attachment to a particular church or monastery which would have been totally inappropriate to either order of friars. Franciscan profession linked the individual friar to the church as a whole: the friars promised obedience to Francis, and he promised obedience to the pope⁹⁶. Dominican profession similarly established the juridical link between the individual friar and Dominic, and so to the ecclesial mission given to the order through him. As Jordan understood very well, what brought the Dominican Order into being was precisely the self-oblation of Peter and Thomas to Dominic, and all subsequent recruits likewise joined the order by giving themselves to Dominic or his successor⁹⁷.

⁹³ Archivum Franciscanum Historicum 65 (1972) p. 405.

⁹⁴ BF I 7 f.

⁹⁵ R. B. Brooke, *Scripta Leonis* (Oxford 1970) pp. 286-8.

⁹⁶ Regula non Bullata, ProL. 3 f, Regula Bullata 1:2 f.

⁹⁷ Jordan, *Libellus* 31, 38. It is significant that Dominicans and Franciscans both claim that the friars' obedience is more unconditional than that of other religious. Thomas of Cantimpré, *De Apibus* Lxxii 1 (ed. cit. p. 86); Hugh of Digne,

We have, so far, gained some light on the similarity between the Dominican rites of clothing and profession, and on why the Dominicans abandoned the *professio super altare*. But it is still not clear why they simplified the profession rite so drastically, and why they chose to solemnise clothing rather than profession.

The solemnising of the clothing rite is not illuminated by the Praemonstratensians at all, except perhaps that they account for the time and place of the vestition. They offer no parallel to the procession into church, the singing of *Veni Creator*, the sprinkling of the newly clothed with holy water, and the kiss of peace.

The kiss of peace elsewhere belongs almost without exception to the rite of profession, not that of reception (it is, after all, the expression of the granting of *societas*). The same is true of the blessing of novices—indeed, the rite of monastic profession is generally designated *benedictio novitiorum*, and a twelfth century monk of Bec can maintain that the blessing of a novice, even without express profession, is tantamount to profession⁹⁸.

The only blessing connected with the reception of novices is a blessing of the *corona* of novices who are to be tonsured⁹⁹. The account of the Dominican clothing rite given by John of Monthléry concludes, actually, with the tonsuring, and does not mention any sprinkling with holy water¹⁰⁰, from which it might be possible to infer that the Dominican rite was no more than a blessing of the tonsure. But I do not believe this to be the right interpretation. As described in the *Ordinarium* the aspersion with holy water belongs with the *Veni Creator* and the kiss of peace, and this sequence corresponds to one solidly, if not widely, attested as the concluding ceremony of monastic profession, though there it always goes with a blessing of the habit too. The essential elements of the Dominican rite are all there: the prostration of the novices at the altar step, *Veni Creator*, holy water, kiss of peace. The only variable is that sometimes it is the cowl that receives the holy water,

ed. cit. p. 108:15 ff (Huius regulae obedientia praeminet, dum obligat ad maiora, dum certorum taxationem locorum et limitatos secundum instituta aliis obedientiae terminos excedit); J. Pecham, *Tractatus tres de Paupertate*, ed. C. L. King-sford, A. G. Little & F. Tocco (Aberdeen 1910), p. 31 (Altior est obedientia que ad nullum locum artatur, nullo terre fine concluditur).

⁹⁸ Martène II p. 171; Wilmart, art. cit. p. 35.

⁹⁹ Herrgott pp. 165, 255 f; Martène IV p. 219b; CCM II p. 29:31, III p. 86:17; HBS 23 p. 257.

¹⁰⁰ Humbert, ed. cit. II p. 527.

and sometimes it is the novice and the cowl. In each case the formal vestition occurs between the *Veni Creator* and the kiss of peace. This rite is found with aspersion of the cowl at Jumièges, Bec and Evesham¹⁰¹. Lanfranc adds an aspersion of the novice before that of the cowl, and this is one form found in the Canterbury customary; it is also found at Westminster and at Eynsham¹⁰². Slightly later we find, at Westminster and Canterbury, an aspersion of the cowl before vestition, and then an aspersion of the novice¹⁰³.

There is also some trace of the use of *Veni Creator* in the profession rite of some canons. At Conches the hymn is used before the reading of the actual profession formula, then later there is an aspersion of the habit and the novice before vestition¹⁰⁴. And a Spanish manuscript of the Marbach customary has *Veni Creator* at the beginning of the profession rite (but with no aspersion of habit or novices)¹⁰⁵.

The only instance known to me of the use of *Veni Creator* in the rite of reception is found in the constitutions of Oignie, dating from about 1250, and there is no mention there of holy water or a kiss of peace, and the hymn is sung before the clothing¹⁰⁶.

It certainly looks as if the conclusion of the Dominican reception rite derives from a profession rite, and it is striking that it is not taken over to provide a procedure for the actual vestition, as the monastic parallels would lead us to expect. The Dominican vestition is much closer to that of the Praemonstratensians; the *Veni Creator* sequence is pillaged precisely for the elements which belong properly to profession, namely the blessing and the kiss of peace.

In view of the evidence adduced above, we may surely conclude, with increased confidence, that originally the Dominicans had a single, continuous rite of reception, profession and clothing. We can even reconstruct this rite with a fair degree of plausibility: the aspirant comes into chapter and prostrates himself; in response to the prelate's enquiry what he wants, he replies *Misericordiam Dei et vestram*. The aspirant then stands up, while the prelate expounds the toughness of the order's life and probes his intentions. If the aspirant expresses a readiness to proceed, he goes to the prelate, kneels at his feet, puts his hands in

¹⁰¹ Martène II p. 164; CCM IV p. 182; HBS 6 col. 31 ff.

¹⁰² CCM III p. 89; HBS 23 p. 385; HBS 28 p. 228; CCM II p. 62.

¹⁰³ HBS 5 col. 1190, 23 p. 267.

¹⁰⁴ Martène II p. 179.

¹⁰⁵ Ed. cit. § 135 (app. crit.).

¹⁰⁶ Martène III p. 341.

those of the prelate and makes his profession (essentially promising obedience until death). He is then clothed with the Dominican habit, apparently without any dialogue at all (unlike the corresponding Praemonstratensian rite). Possibly the habit was blessed before the clothing. The community then processions into church, singing *Veni Creator*. The novice prostrates himself at the altar step until the end of the hymn and the subsequent versicles and prayers. He then gets up and goes to the prelate, who blesses him with holy water. The rite concludes with a kiss of peace, signifying the acceptance of the new recruit into the community of the order.

This rite was not necessarily developed all at once in 1216, but it must have been established in all essentials before 1220, or before the possibility of a clothing without profession was introduced, otherwise it is difficult to account for the presence of important elements of the profession ceremony in the rite of clothing instead of in the rite of profession. In 1220, probably, the rite was modified to allow for a general promise of renunciation of the world instead of profession, but otherwise it remained intact. Profession, when it occurred, would simply be a matter of supplying what had been omitted before: apart from the profession formula itself, with the gesture of *immixtio manuum*, only the preliminaries would be repeated, to fulfil the requirements of the *scrutinium*, on the Praemonstratensian model. And, rather superfluously, there was another kiss of peace.

In the case of people like Reginald and Moneta, who made profession long before they actually entered the order, we may presume that their entry was solemnised with some kind of clothing rite, but without the normal preliminaries, since their intention was already declared. In the case of Cecilia, and possibly John of Navarre, the habit was probably given first to signify actual entry into the order, with profession following (without ceremony?) to explicitate the juridical consequences. In the case of John of Navarre, though, it is possible that his mention of clothing before profession indicates their relative importance rather than their relative timing. And anyhow he joined the order before it had formulated its laws and so presumably before it had formulated its ceremonies.

Although this is a conjectural reconstruction, it does seem to fit and to illuminate the evidence we have been examining, though it still leaves some features insufficiently explained. But it would probably be a mistake to imagine that the early Dominicans immediately developed a fully formal rite, which they then regarded as binding on them. It

is much more likely that they adopted certain practices, which eventually hardened into a rite, as in the case of the *Salve Regina* after Compline¹⁰⁷. Dominic's reception of Stephen of Spain into the order appears to be very informal, and if Jordan and his companions literally received the habit while the brethren were engaged in the liturgy of Ash Wednesday, it is hard to see how there could also be any proper liturgy of reception¹⁰⁸. Later on, when John of St Giles made his dramatic entry into the order in 1230 in the middle of his own sermon, it seems improbable that his assumption of the habit involved more than the barest minimum of ceremony¹⁰⁹. We also hear of Jordan receiving novices in places where there was not a Dominican convent, so at least the procession into church must have been omitted¹¹⁰. Several stories in the *Vitae Fratrum* suggest a festive, even jocular, atmosphere, in which it is difficult to imagine any rite being carried out very formally — perhaps the chapter room in these early days carried something of the connotation of our present recreation rooms. When Roland of Cremona arrived unexpectedly in the chapter room in 1219, demanding to be received into the order, *nulla prolocutione premissa*, Reginald immediately takes off his own scapular and clothes him in it. While the brethren try to sing *Veni Creator*, the sacristan starts ringing the convent bell, evidently out of sheer exuberance of spirit, and before long the population of Bologna is there in force to find out what is going on¹¹¹. In Paris, on a later occasion, Jordan jokes about a youth who has already been turned down because he is too young almost forcing his way into the order by coming forward with a whole crowd of candidates. And there are so many people in the chapter room that the vestiarian is unable to get out to fetch an extra habit¹¹². It is difficult to envisage this as a formal liturgical occasion!

There is also some doubt as to how formal profession was. In some cases there may not even have been any formal profession. If my reconstruction of the original form of PC I 14 and of the original continuous rite of reception is in any way correct, then Dominican “pro-

¹⁰⁷ Jordan, *Libellus* 120.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.* 75.

¹⁰⁹ N. Trivet, *Annales*, ed. T. Hog (London 1845) pp. 211 f.

¹¹⁰ MOPH I pp. 144, 174 f.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.* pp. 26 f.

¹¹² *Ibid.* p. 109. We learn from Bernard Gui that the youth in question was Bertrand of Beauchastel, who was evidently a successful and useful Dominican (MOPH XXIV p. 112).

fession" was originally little more than a part of the *scrutinium* preparatory to clothing. The *Vitae Fratrum* consistently communicates an ethos in which the all-important thing is not profession, but entry into the order or being received into the order, and in which entry into the order is regarded as definitive. Anyone who leaves the order, even someone with a clear legal right to do so, is seen as succumbing to the devil, not exercising his legitimate freedom¹¹³. And this is explicitly stated by Humbert in his model sermons for Solemn Reception of Novices and for Profession of Novices (see Appendix I). Humbert makes it painfully clear that he is not optimistic about the salvation of novices who leave before profession, even if they are proposing to transfer to another order.

Bearing in mind the general recognition of "tacit profession" in the church¹¹⁴, we may wonder whether at least some people were not simply accepted into the order on the basis of some initial declaration of intent, without ever making any more formal profession. The lawyer in Vercelli who rushed into the place where Jordan was staying one day in 1229 and prostrated himself, saying, *Ego sum Dei*, and was promptly clothed by Jordan, *nulla alia facta examinatione vel responsione premissa*, with the words, *Ex quo sitis Dei et nos in nomine eius consignamus vos ei*¹¹⁵, is a case in point. Did he ever make a more explicit profession?

The question arises chiefly because of a succession of stories in the *Vitae Fratrum* concerning people who are tempted to leave the order, but then do not. These stories cover the period from 1219 onwards, but since they all fall into the same pattern, I have reserved them all for discussion together.

In 1219 in Bologna the brethren were becoming disheartened, and evidently some of them were inclined to doubt whether the order had any future. Two of them obtained permission from Cardinal Ugolino to move to the Cistercians. But then the whole atmosphere changed suddenly with the entry of Roland of Cremona. The two friars who had intended to become Cistercians

prosilientes in medium (sc. capitulum) se male fecisse fatentur, et renunciantes litteris perseveranciam ordinis profitentur¹¹⁶.

¹¹³ Ibid. pp. 114 f, 180.

¹¹⁴ Cf. H i n n e b u s c h, op. cit. p. 294; M a r t è n e IV p. 229.

¹¹⁵ M O P H I pp. 174 f.

¹¹⁶ Ibid. pp. 25-7.

If my reconstruction of events is correct, then these friars must already have been professed, and there is nothing in the text to indicate that they were not. Indeed the need to obtain letters from Ugolino to authorise their move to the Cistercians implies that they were professed. So what are we to make of this new profession? It can surely be compared to the multiple profession of the nuns, which we noticed above, especially the nuns in Rome. Profession signifies not only the establishment but also the re-affirmation of a juridical link that has been endangered because of some change in circumstances or attitudes. "Profession", apparently, is not thought of as a once-and-for-all occurrence.

Also in 1219 we hear of another friar in Bologna who is tempted to leave the order. Nothing is said to indicate whether or not he was professed, but we may presume that he was. Gerald de Frachet is usually careful to indicate when he is talking about novices. Reginald subjected the unfortunate individual to a severe beating, exorcising him the while. At the conclusion of this, the friar says, *Pater audi me ... Vere dico tibi quod dyabolus recessit et promitto tibi stabilitatem*¹¹⁷. This unmistakably echoes the language of PC I 14, suggesting that this too is a kind of "profession", presumably to be explained in the same way as the previous case.

The next case concerns a novice, and it is explicit that he can be given leave to depart. But Jordan pleads with him to wait one more day, and in the meantime he gets the brethren to say the *Veni Creator*. They are, of course, in chapter. Before the hymn is finished, the novice

in medio capituli se proiecit, petens misericordiam et ordinis perseveranciam deinceps promittens¹¹⁸.

Are we to take this as his profession? The whole situation is suggestive of it, but it seems a very casual way to receive a novice's profession. If it is not profession, what is the significance of the promise? And, if it is profession, the question must arise whether he would ever have made profession if he had not been tempted to leave.

Finally, we hear of a novice in Besançon who was tempted to leave the order, raise some money on an inheritance which was due to him, and then return to the order bringing the money with him. The advice of a kindly friar brings him to his senses in time, and

¹¹⁷ Ibid. p. 153.

¹¹⁸ Ibid. pp. 114 f.

promisit incontinenti, quod Deo et beate Marie in perpetuum in hoc ordine deserviret¹¹⁹.

It is not clear to whom he makes this promise, and again the significance of it is unclear, but there must be at least the suspicion that a promise of this kind might serve as sufficient profession.

It is unfortunate that these tales in the *Vitae Fratrum* are so unclear for our purposes, and I offer my comments only very tentatively. But, with all due caution, I suggest that we must slightly adjust the reconstruction I proposed above, to say that, rather than a genuine "rite", the Dominicans had, by 1220, developed a range of practices, which they were free to apply with considerable latitude. The essential rite was entry into the order, ritualised in the form of reception of the habit. Some kind of declaration of intent was needed before this, and this might be made either at the time or in advance, and it might take the form of profession or renunciation of the world, or something quite informal like, *Ego sum Dei*. How and when and where and even whether the remaining ceremonies of reception and profession took place depended on circumstances, but in any case the initial entry into the order was felt to be definitive, even when it was not so in law. The practice of singing *Veni Creator* and welcoming new recruits to the kiss of peace, even if not always observed, was sufficiently well-established early enough to survive as part of the rite of reception, when reception and profession began to develop more formally as two separate occasions.

And now, at last, after we have surveyed all the major evidence, we can perhaps understand why the Dominicans did not develop a "proper" rite of profession, and why they solemnised clothing rather at the expense of profession.

There were several reasons for maintaining the drama of a man's first entry into the order as the most significant episode, even if profession was to follow as a separate event. First of all, as we have seen, the Dominicans were reluctant to abandon the conviction that, whatever the law might say, entry was the decisive factor. This is undoubtedly the most important reason for playing up clothing and playing down profession. But also there is evidence that Jordan, at least, was aware of the apostolic and recruiting potential of the clothing of novices. The *Vitae Fratrum* makes it plain that, when he clothed new recruits, there was likely to be a whole crowd of their friends, particularly fellow-students, there to watch. So he took the occasion to preach to them and to en-

¹¹⁹ Ibid. pp. 201 f.

courage others to join the order too¹²⁰. A great deal of the impact would have been lost if the major rite had occurred some time after the initial entry of the new recruits into the order; what Jordan wanted students to see was precisely the "conversion" of some of their every day associates. And it is no doubt a similar motive that makes Humbert, in his model sermons, treat the solemn reception of novices as the occasion to address the world at large, whereas profession seems to be the occasion simply to address novices.

The substitution of a bare *immixtio manuum* for the full-blooded kind of profession rite that monks and canons employed is already in part explained by various factors which we have already considered, but it still remains to ask why the Dominicans did not adapt a full-blooded profession rite to provide them with their continuous rite of reception, profession and clothing. Why did they choose rather to have something relatively informal, which remained slight even when it became more formal?

The Franciscan parallel already noticed suggests the most plausible answer. The very notion of being a friar, *frater*, rather than a *dominus monachus* or a *dominus canonicus*, implies a certain rejection of status. Francis' refusal to be identified with monks or canons is expressly presented in these terms. Dominic too renounced his official title as a canon, and became simply "brother Dominic"¹²¹. *Abbas* was abandoned as a title in the order, in favour of what was taken to be a less pretentious term, *magister*¹²². That this refusal of status is relevant to the lack of a "proper" profession rite is strongly suggested by a curious detail which Humbert recalls in the constitutions of the Dominican nuns:

Nolumus autem quod aliquae sorores benedicantur, cum beatus Dominicus hoc ordinasse dicatur circa illas que fuerunt in suo tempore, et huiusmodi benedictio soleat aliquibus esse occasio ut super alias se extollant¹²³.

There was no reason why Dominican nuns should not receive the normal blessing, except to avoid the kind of vanity which accompanies status (the modern equivalent would be the class-consciousness generated in

¹²⁰ Ibid. pp. 108-110.

¹²¹ Scripta Leonis pp. 286-8; Jordan, Libellus 21.

¹²² Libellus 48.

¹²³ ASOP III p. 343. It is worth noticing also the admonition in the 1254 Provincial Chapter of Provence (C. Douais, Acta Cap. Prov., Toulouse 1894, p. 54): moniales de Pruliano non vocentur domine, set sorores.

some religious by the distinction between solemn and simple vows, between *moniales* and *sorores*). This suggests that Dominic may quite deliberately have refused to have the kind of profession rite which would give his friars the recognised status of *domini*, preferring a more homely, fraternal, style befitting his order of friars.

THE PROFESSION FORMULA

It remains only to consider the Dominican formula of profession, which is curious in several ways. First of all, its pleonastic and syntactically unpleasant form (*promitto obedientiam ... quod ero obediens*) cries out for explanation and strongly suggests that the formula has a more natural prehistory.

Secondly it is, so far as I know, without monastic or canonical parallel to promise obedience to God and our Lady as well as to the superior.

The formula, as it stands, cannot be earlier than 1220¹²⁴. Before that we can guess that some formula was used involving a promise of *stabilitas*, *communitas* and *obedientia prelato* (PC I 14)¹²⁵. It is therefore antecedently probable that the new formula is indeed the result of a process of evolution.

Elsewhere in the usual profession formulae, where we find a mention of our Lady or some other saint, it is in connection with a canon's dedication of himself to the service of a particular church, or the mention of the patron saint or saints of a monastery. So we find in the Praemonstratensian formula:

Ego frater N. offerens trado meipsum ecclesie sancte genetricis Dei¹²⁶ ...

The formula of St Ruf is particularly suggestive:

Ego frater ille offerens trado meipsum Deo, ecclesiae sancti N., et promitto obedientiam secundum canonicam regulam sancti Augustini domo N. praefatae ecclesiae abbati et successoribus eius¹²⁷ ...

A slightly different version is found at Maguelone:

Ego frater N. offerens trado meipsum Domino Deo et ecclesie sancti illius et promitto stabilitatem loci et obedienciam secundum regulam sancti Augustini domino N. praefate ecclesie episcopo et successoribus eius¹²⁸.

¹²⁴ Thomas, art. cit. p. 23.

¹²⁵ Cf. Vicaire, op. cit. II p. 52.

¹²⁶ Thomas, art. cit. p. 21.

¹²⁷ Martène II p. 180.

¹²⁸ Carrier, op. cit. p. 59.

It would not be difficult to construct a formula on the basis of this text, which would remove the awkwardnesses of the Dominican formula and do justice to PC I 14.

The difficulty, though, would be to account for the presence of our Lady in the formula rather than St Romain. It is tempting to suppose that there is another influence at work, and this is surely to be traced to the oblate formula used at Prouille. There are striking similarities, anyway, as we can see from the examples in the *Cartulaire*:

Ego, Ermengards Godolina et vir meus, Sancius Gascus, bono animo et gratuita voluntate, damus et laudamus nosmetipsos et omnia nostra Domino Deo et beatae Mariae et omnibus sanctis Dei et sanctae Praedicationi et domino Dominico de Osma et omnibus fratribus et sororibus qui hodie sunt vel in futuro erunt¹²⁹.

Notum sit quod Poncius Stephanus et eius uxor, Catalana, eorum sponte, dederunt se et concesserunt seipsos, scilicet animas suas et corpora sua, Domino Deo et beate et gloriose virgini Marie, matri sue, et fratri Ramundo Catalano, priori domus Prolyani, et omnibus successoribus et omni conventui eiusdem domus presenti atque futuro¹³⁰ ...

Sometimes it is specified that the donation is made *Sancte Marie de Prolano*¹³¹. After the statement of self-oblation, the texts go on to explain exactly what its legal content is.

If we assume that, in the profession formula, the initial *promitto obedientiam* replaces an earlier form of words expressing self-oblation, then we can analyse it as containing a self-oblation to God, our Lady (of Prouille) and Dominic (or whoever was in charge), followed by a statement of what exactly was being promised (obedience to the Master of the Order in accordance with the Rule and Constitutions). This would account both for the presence of the obedience to God and our Lady, and for the unnecessary reduplication of the promise of obedience. The change in the text would have been made, presumably, to avoid the implication that the person making profession was specifically giving himself to Prouille. The reference to our Lady would survive simply for devotional reasons; even in some of the Prouille documents

¹²⁹ J. Guiraud, *Cartulaire de Notre-Dame de Prouille* (Paris 1907) II § 234; MOPH XXV p. 15.

¹³⁰ Guiraud § 237.

¹³¹ *Ibid.* § 235, 236; MOPH XXV pp. 19, 21.

she appears to be mentioned for devotional reasons as well as because she is the patron of the monastery (*motus amore Dei et beatae Mariae* ¹³²).

The nearest analogue to the Dominican profession formula is that of the Franciscans, which we first find in the Narbonne constitutions of 1260:

Ego frater N. voveo et promitto Deo et beatae Mariae virgini et beato Francisco et omnibus sanctis et tibi, pater, toto tempore vitae meae servare regulam fratrum Minorum per dominum Honorium papam confirmatam, vivendo in obedientia, sine proprio et in castitate ¹³³.

Unfortunately we cannot tell when this formula was evolved. The phrase *vivendo in obedientia, sine proprio et in castitate* comes from the *Regula Bullata* 1:1, but the earlier Rule contains a very similar phrase (1:1). The promise to keep the Rule is clearly ancient. It is referred to in *Reg. Bull.* 2:11, *Epist. toti Ordini* 39, *Testamentum* 34. The last two texts also say that the promise to keep the Rule was made "to the Lord" (*Domino*). Elias' letter of 1225-6 refers to

sanctam regulam nostram per dominum Innocencium approbatam et nuper per dominum Honorium adhuc superstitem confirmatam, quam promisistis Deo ¹³⁴.

Whether there was always the reference to our Lady and all the saints, we cannot tell. The addition of St Francis probably occurred in 1260, when his name was added to the Franciscan *Confiteor*, which previously ran:

Confiteor Deo omnipotenti et beate Marie semper virgini et omnibus sanctis et tibi, pater ¹³⁵ ...

We may even wonder whether the profession formula was not influenced by the *Confiteor*.

Suggestive though it is, in the present state of our knowledge the Franciscan parallel sheds little light on the Dominican formula of profession.

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ AFH 34 (1941) p. 40.

¹³⁴ MGH SS XXX pp. 294 f.

¹³⁵ S. J. P. van Dijk, *Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy II* (Leiden 1963) p. 419; id., *The Ordinal of the Papal Court from Innocent III to Boniface VIII* (Fribourg 1975) p. XXV.

APPENDIX I

HUBERT OF ROMANS: TWO MODEL SERMONS

I have edited these sermons from the following manuscripts:

- A Avignon, Musée Calvet 327 (15th century)
- B Bologna, Bibl. Univ. 2323 (15th century— interpolated)
- P Paris, B.N. nouv. acq. lat. 1742 (14th century)
- R Reims 612 (14th century)
- S Segovia, Cathedral, Vetr. 28 (1477)

In the apparatus I have ignored the interpolations in B and the all too frequent lunacies of S; and otherwise only significant variants are reported.

In solemnī receptione nouiciorum

Notandum quod in solemnī receptione nouiciorum solent interdum multi concurrere ad spectaculum huiusmodi, et est decens ut talibus fiat aliqua exhortatio salutaris in huiusmodi receptione. Notandum ergo quod tria sunt consideranda in huiusmodi receptione: primo quid faciat talis uel tales nouicii, secundo quid faciat eis ordo quem intrant, tertio quid faciendum sit hoc intuentibus.

Primo, nouicii intrantes ordinem tria faciunt ualde magna. Relinquant enim omnia, implentes in se illud apostolicum Math. 19, «Ecce nos relinquimus omnia»¹; quod est contra multos qui dicunt, «Relinquam, relinquam», et numquam faciunt. Immo prius relinquant eos omnia quam ipsi ea relinquant.

Item exponunt carnem afflictioni perpetue, imitantes in hoc martires, de quibus dicit ecclesia, «Tradiderunt corpora sua propter Deum ad supplicia»².

Item ponunt se propter Deum in subiectione ultima; non est enim aliquod genus subiectionis, siue mulieris ad uirum siue serui ad dominum, ita magnum sicut obedientie. Et sic offerunt Deo tria munera preciosa, scilicet munus a rebus et munus a corpore et munus a corde, uoluntatem suam subiicientes huiusmodi seruituti.

Ordo uero facit eis tria. Examinat enim eorum uoluntatem, cum queritur si habent uoluntatem ista omnia sustinendi propter Deum; coacta enim seruitutia non placent Deo. Item inuocat Spiritum Sanctum dicendo *Veni Creator*

7 primo R porro ABPS 8 in se om. R apostolicum ABPS euangelicum R 8-9 relinquimus APRS reliquimus B (Vulg.) 9 relinquam² om. BPR 16 Deo ABPS Domino R 21 Deo om. R

¹ Matthew 19:27.

² Matins for Many Martyrs, First Nocturn, 3rd responsory, and Third Nocturn, 2nd antiphon (British Library, MS Addit. 23935 f. 364^v).

in adiutorium eorum, quia res quam aggrediuntur ardua est, et eam sine adiutorio eius non possunt perficere. Item mutat eis uestes in signum quod ueterem hominem conuersionis pristinae debent deponere et induere nouum qui
25 secundum Deum creatus est³.

Tria autem sunt que sunt facienda aspicientibus predicta. Debent enim Deum glorificare qui talia inspiciunt. Item ipsos nouicios non fatuos reputare sed in Domino commendare. Item super seipsos gemere, quibus datum non est talia facere.

30 Materia de predictis. Thema. Ps.: « Venite et uidete opera Dei terribilis in consiliis super filios hominum »⁴. Hec siquidem non sunt opera humana sed diuina procedentia a consiliis diuinis terribilibus, que Deus excogitauit super homines. In huiusmodi autem opere sunt tria attendenda etc. Vide ut supra.

35

In solenni professione nouiciorum

Notandum quod interdum conueniunt multi ad professionem nouiciorum uidendam, quibus conuenit interdum alique edificatoria proponere de re huiusmodi. Notandum ergo quod inueniuntur interdum aliqui nouicii qui experti asperitatem ordinis non consummant quod inceperunt, sed recedunt
40 ante professionem. Isti sunt sicut homo qui incepit edificare et non potuit consummare, et ideo uertuntur in derisum mundi. Luce 19: « Omnes qui uident incipient ei illudere, dicentes quia hic homo cepit edificare et non potuit consummare »⁵.

Item sunt sicut homo fugiens de prelio. Religio enim est sicut acies Domini ordinata⁶. Regum 4: « Ego sum qui ueni de prelio et ego qui de acie fugi »⁷. Et ideo gloriatur diabolus contra tales dicens, « Preualui aduersus eum »⁸.

Item sunt sicut auis fatua, que postquam fouit oua sua in nido suo aliquanto tempore postea recedit et pulli pereunt. Prou. 27: « Sicut auis transmigrans de nido suo, sic uir qui relinquit locum suum »⁹.

50 Tales igitur uertuntur in mundi fabulam, incurrunt exultationem inimici et propria bona incepta interimunt.

22 eam om. R 23 perficere ABPS proficere R 27 inspiciunt AP aspiciunt R inspirat B om. S 33 etc. Vide *conieci* etc. R et inde AP et uide B uide S 39 asperitatem R austeritatem APS austeritates B 42 uident PR uiderint AS uident eum B 49 relinquit BR reliquit APS

³ Ephesians 4:22-4.

⁴ Psalm 65:5.

⁵ Luke 14:28-30.

⁶ Cf. Cant. 6:3 (reference given in P).

⁷ I Samuel 4:16.

⁸ Psalm 12:5 (in psalmo B).

⁹ Proverbs 27:8.

Notandum uero quod aliqui in sui excusationem non perseuerantes in incepto transeunt ad aliam religionem. Sed nec hoc est laudabile. Huiusmodi enim homines sunt sicut homines uagi qui modo sunt in una domo, modo in
55 alia, contra quos Luce 10; « Nolite transire de domo in domum »¹⁰.

Item sunt sicut plantula in diuersis locis frequenter transplantata et ideo carens fructu. Seneca: « Arbor transplantata, » id est frequenter transmutata, « non fert fructum »¹¹.

Item isti sunt qui modo per unam uiam, modo per aliam, uolunt ire in
60 paradysum, et ideo impediunt semetipsos et in fine non illuc perungunt, sed uadunt ad maledictionem eternam. Ecclesiastici 2: « Ve peccatori ingredienti terram duabus uiis »¹².

Sic patet quod tales instabilitatis uicio uiles redduntur, et inepti sunt ad fructum et ad eternam maledictionem tendunt.

65 Alii uero, quod peius est, ad statum seculi reuertuntur. Osee 9: « Reuersus est Israel in Egiptum »¹³. Isti sunt contrarii apostolo qui posteriorum oblitus ad anteriora se extendebat¹⁴. Ipsi uere faciunt e contrario. Iere. 7: « Facti sunt retrorsum et non in ante »¹⁵.

Isti etiam sunt qui mittunt manum ad aratrum et postea retro respiciunt,
70 et ideo non sunt apti regno Dei, ut dicitur Luce 9¹⁶. Immo uertuntur in statum salis, quam lambunt pecora diabolica. Gene. 19¹⁷.

Isti iterum sunt qui nauigare incipientes et inuenientes uentum contrarium reuertuntur ad portum retro pre timore, et ideo numquam transfretant, sicut dicitur in Vitis Patrum¹⁸. Quo contra dicitur Ecclesiastici 5: « Non te
75 uentiles in omnem uentum »¹⁹, sequendo scilicet uentum. Immo tunc est magis conandum contra uentum quando est contrarius.

Sic ergo patet quod huiusmodi homines sunt animalia retrograda, et inepti ad regnum et in mari huius mundi inabiles ad nauigandum.

55 quos PR quod ABS 56 locis R ortis ABP locis ortorum S 60 pertinent BPR pergunt A perueniunt S 63 et inepti sunt ABPS inepti R 67 extendebat BR extendit APS

¹⁰ Luke 10:7.

¹¹ Not genuine Seneca. Maybe derived from PL 73: 902A: Dixit senex, Sicut arbor fructificare non potest si saepius transferatur, sic nec monachus frequenter migrans potest fructificare. Quoted in the same connection in the Eynsham customary (CCM II p. 123:4).

¹² Ecclus. 2:14.

¹³ Hosea 9:3.

¹⁴ Phil. 3:13 (reference given in P).

¹⁵ Jer. 7:24.

¹⁶ Luke 9:62.

¹⁷ Genesis 19:26.

¹⁸ Reference not identified.

¹⁹ Ecclus. 5:11.

80 Quia ergo tot inconuenientia sequuntur non profitentes, siue ad aliam religionem transeant siue ad seculum reuertantur, confidendum est bono uiro in Dei adiutorio, et non obstantibus aduersis aliquibus debet in loco sue uocationis stabiliter perseuerare, iuxta illud Ecclesiastici 11: « Confide in Deo et mane in loco tuo »²⁰.

85 Materia de predictis. Thema. Cor. 7: « Unusquisque in ea uocatione in qua uocatus est, in ea permaneat »²¹, non recedens neque ad aliam religionem transeundo neque ad seculi statum reuertendo²².

85 est in ea BPS in ea A est R

²⁰ Ecclus. 11:22.

²¹ 1 Cor. 7:20.

²² In his *De Officiis* (ed. cit. II p. 216) Humbert mentions the possibility of novices being dismissed, if there is absolutely no prospect of their ever being any good as Dominicans, but he evidently views this as an extreme last resort, and the initiative lies entirely with the superiors, not with the novices themselves; and the novice master is to do all he can to help dismissed novices find some other form of religious life in which they can settle down. No mention is made of their returning to secular life.

APPENDIX II

THE PRAEMONSTRATENSIAN PROFESSION RITE

Our earliest evidence for the Praemonstratensian profession rite comes from the section on the novice master in the most ancient known version of the constitutions, which tells us that it is part of his job

ad iussum abbatis eos in capitulum adducere et pro ipsis qui legere nesciunt in ecclesia professiones legere et cum eis *Suscipe me Domine*, illum verum ante gradum, dicere, aquam benedictam et vestes preparare et eos ibi exuendos et induendos adiuvere¹.

This meagre hint is sufficient to show that, at this stage, the Praemonstratensians were using a profession rite essentially similar to that of the Cistercians, with the reading of the profession formula (no doubt at the altar during Mass), followed by *Suscipe me* etc. at the altar step, followed by the blessing of the habit and the clothing, in church².

By the middle of the twelfth century, the rite has clearly undergone considerable alteration. A manuscript from Scheffarn gives us what is evidently a rite of profession, in spite of its opening words:

Noviter quis veniens ad canonicam professionem, non facile est recipiendus, nisi persona nota a domino fuerit, ut utilitatem ecclesie conferat ... Si autem recipi eum placuerit, exuat eum prelatus seculari veste, et induat regulari, dicens ita: *Exuat te Deus veterem hominem* etc.

The text then jumps straight to the offertory at Mass. At this point the novice genuflects three times in front of the altar, saying *Suscipe me* etc. Various psalms and litanies follow, then *Pater noster*, versicles and a collect. Then comes the reading of the profession formula, which is placed on the altar after it has been read. Then the superior grants the newly professed *communem societatem congregationis*. Then, after more prostrations, psalms and prayers, rather unexpectedly, we find a blessing of the habit plus another clothing rite, followed by a prayer for the newly professed³.

This text, as it stands, is clearly rather a mess. The opening words are an unsuitable doublet of the constitutional text on *recipiendi*, and the

¹ Ed. van Waefelghem p. 23.

² Cf. Anal. S.O. Cist. 6 (1950) pp. 112-4; 12 (1956) pp. 263-5.

³ Lefèvre, Anal. Praem. 8 (1932) pp. 294-8.

blessing and (second) imparting of the habit sit awkwardly with the fact that the habit has already been given at the beginning of the rite. Lefèvre and, even more expressly, van den Broeck, suggest transferring the blessing and giving of the habit to the beginning of the rite, but some explanation still has to be given for their actual placing in the manuscript⁴.

It is not difficult, in fact, to see what has happened. The introductory rubric gives the game away. Whereas the previous rite, like the section in the constitutions on *recipiendi*, was taken, directly or indirectly, from the Cistercians⁵, the new text, *Noviter quis veniens*, is taken word for word from some canonical source, possibly St Ruf, and the subsequent rite follows closely the St Ruf rite of clothing (without a blessing of the habit) and profession⁶. Evidently the Praemonstratensians are in the process of blending their original, Cistercian-type, profession rite with one closer to that of other canons. But whereas the St Ruf rite attached clothing to the initial reception of new recruits, and so did not include any blessing of the habit, the Praemonstratensians want to retain a clothing as part of the profession rite (and, if we are to take seriously the rubric, *Exuat eum prelatus seculari veste*, this must still be the first occasion on which the habit is given). Though we lack the details of the earlier Praemonstratensian rite, it is surely likely that the blessing and giving of the habit in the Schefflarn text are simply a survival from that rite.

The new rite reversed the order of events in the profession rite, and the mid-twelfth century constitutions accordingly change the instructions to the novice-master (II 9), telling him

ad iussum abbatis eos in capitulum adducere, aquam benedictam et vestes preparare, et eos ibi exuendos et induendos adiuvere, et pro ipsis qui legere nesciunt in ecclesia professiones legere, et cum eis *Suscipe me Domine*, illum versum ante gradum presbiterii dicere⁷.

The next stage in the evolution of the rite is attested in a manuscript at Ghent from the end of the twelfth century. It begins with *Noviter ad conversionem veniens*, but, significantly, an attempt has been made to erase the introductory passage. The rite begins, as we have seen above,

⁴ Ibid. p. 291; van den Broeck, op. cit. pp. 91-2.

⁵ Cf. Anal. S.O. Cist. 6 (1950) pp. 112-4.

⁶ Martène II pp. 179 f. Cf. III p. 300; Marbach, § 1.

⁷ Mid-twelfth century text (ed. Lefèvre & Grauwen).

in the way indicated in the constitution *de recipiendis*, but after *Deus qui cepit* etc. we read:

Tunc abrenunciet seculo et proprietatibus et obedientiam usque ad mortem promittat.

There follows a blessing of the habit, but the old prayers have been replaced by *Domine Ihesu Christe qui tegmen* (also used by the Dominicans⁸). There follows the clothing, with the words, *Exuat te* etc. It is noticeable, however, that the rubric no longer says that the superior removes the candidate's *secular* clothes. Various versicles and a collect follow, the whole procedure at this point being in fact identical with that of Marbach⁹.

As is pointed out by van den Broeck¹⁰, the promise of obedience until death makes it almost certain that the Ghent text is a profession rite, not a rite for receiving aspirants. The renunciation of the world and of private property reduplicates that still made during the rite of reception of aspirants — exactly the same reduplication is found at Arrouaise (§ 216f).

There can also be no question of the Ghent text providing the complete rite of profession. There is not the slightest reason to suppose that the Praemonstratensians ever abandoned the full-blooded rite at the altar in church during the Mass. What the Ghent MS gives us is the first part of the complex rite, which took place in chapter. The whole rite involves the appearance of a kind of double profession, which remained characteristic of the Praemonstratensian rite for centuries and led to some curious speculation, though, as explained above, it is easily explainable in the light of the monastic *scrutinium*, and, in fact, a very similar double promise of obedience is found at Cluny¹¹.

An early thirteenth century rite avoids the pleonasm by eliminating the first promise¹², but the chapter rite survived nevertheless, and is attested in the Glasgow constitutions (I 16) and in the later revision from c. 1236 (I 14).

The Glasgow MS gives the following account of profession:

⁸ ASOP III p. 55; MOPH III p. 10.

⁹ Lefèvre, art. cit. pp. 298 f; Marbach 131-3.

¹⁰ Op. cit. p. 16.

¹¹ Herrgott p. 167.

¹² Lefèvre, art. cit. p. 300.

Si remanere voluerint et retineri meruerint, ad nutum abbatis venientes in capitulum renuntiabunt seculo et proprietati et promittent vitam communem et tunc, si clerici fuerint, benedictis vestibus suis induantur cum his verbis: *Exuat te Deus veterem hominem cum actibus suis* etc. Et ad missam quam cantabit abbas, facient professionem.

The reduplication is softened here, in that the first promise is simply the old pre-profession transferred. It is noticeable that the habit in which the novice is to be clothed is already "his".

The 1236 text restores the full double promise of obedience:

Si remanere voluerint, ad nutum abbatis in capitulum venientes, renuntiabunt seculo et proprietati, promittentes obedientiam, castitatem et vitam communem. Et tunc, si clerici fuerint, benedictis ibidem vestibus, abbas exuat eos cappa dicendo cuilibet, *Exuat te Deus veterem hominem cum actibus suis*, et induat eos tunicis benedictis dicens cuilibet, *Induat te Deus novum hominem, qui secundum Deum creatus est in iustitia et sanctitate veritatis*. Postea ad missam, quam abbas cantabit, faciet novitius professionem hoc modo: Ego frater N. etc.

The fairly clear hint that the habit has already been given on a previous occasion is even more obvious in the early thirteenth century ritual:

Aspergatur vestimentum aqua benedicta et exuendo eum dicat, *exuat te ...* Iterum induendo eum dicat, *Induat te* etc.¹³.

This probably entitles us to infer from the elimination of all reference to the removal of *secular* dress in the Ghent ritual that already by the end of the twelfth century the rite for reception of novices included a giving of the habit. Evidently the merging of a Cistercian-type rite with a St Ruf-type rite led to an interaction between the rite of reception and the rite of profession, so that each acquired some features of the other, with the result that the profession rite came to include a preliminary ritual in chapter largely derived from the rite of reception.

If this reconstruction is correct, then the Praemonstratensians had indeed developed a ritual in which the reception of novices and the first part of the profession rite were remarkably similar, and they had developed it early enough for it to be a possible influence on the Dominicans.

¹³ Ibid.