

JOHN WICKSTROM, *The Humiliati: liturgy and identity*, in «Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum» (ISSN 0391-7320), 62, (1992), pp. 195-225.

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

Questo articolo è stato digitalizzato dalla 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.



THE HUMILIATI: LITURGY AND IDENTITY

BY
JOHN WICKSTROM

I. *The Beginnings of the Order and its liturgy*

The order of the Humiliati represented an unusual phenomenon in the turbulent atmosphere of northern Italy in the central middle ages. Originally groups of penitents, primarily lay men and women, the Humiliati had associated themselves with the Waldensians and other radical groups. But in 1199, some of these men and women asked Pope Innocent III for admission to the Catholic church as a religious order. The Pope accepted them as such and they continued in existence from 1201 until the suppression of the male branch in 1572.

The following study examines documents of the order during this period, particularly those relating to the divine office. It will emphasize the transformation of the Humiliati from a lay organization into a traditional religious order. The study will in particular examine the composition and character of the Humiliati office and offer a hypothesis concerning its origin. Finally, some suggestions will be offered, derived from this material, regarding the order's search for a distinctive identity, one that would be appropriate to a traditional religious order, but which also reflected its popular origins. This search is especially noteworthy for its connections with the younger Dominican order. That order was experiencing phenomenal growth and popularity in just those territories and activities where the Humiliati had earlier concentrated their efforts.

The semi-official history of the order of the Humiliati was told by two fifteenth-century chroniclers¹. Both were members

¹ *Joannis Braidensis chronicon... 1419 conscriptum*, printed in Hieronymus TIRABOSCHI, *Vetera Humiliatorum monumenta*, 3 vols., Mediolani 1766-68, 3:228-86 (hereafter cited as *VHM*), and *La Cronaca di Frà Giovanni di Brera del 1421*,

of the order and agreed on the essentials: in the year 1017, several Milanese townsmen were carried off to Germany by the emperor to prevent further troublemaking in the Lombard towns. These men experienced a religious conversion, symbolized by their assertion that without humility no one can attain heaven. To emphasize that point, they adopted a distinctive religious habit. The emperor was so impressed with their transformation that he allowed them to return home².

There they and their families lived simple lives of mutual exhortation, prayer, fasting, and good works. They also worked in the wool industry to avoid idleness and for their common welfare³. Thus originated what later became the "third order" of the Humiliati. As time went on, some of the married couples felt called to a higher life of chastity; they formed themselves into mixed communities of celibate religious, living often in separate parts of a common building, saying the office in tandem in a common chapel, or later, in separate oratories⁴. They became the "second order."

In the mid-twelfth century, a holy priest, Blessed John of Meda (or "of Como"), was inspired to join the order. Concerned at its lack of priests, Blessed John founded houses of clerics (and their female followers) devoted to the divine office and living under the Rule he gave them. The clerics and women worked in separate vegetable gardens during the intervals of the offices, and they carried on some commerce in the wool industry through delegated agents. Thus the first order of the Humiliati came into existence. Though created most recently, its members were called the first order "by reason of their dignity"⁵. Two groups of lay brothers, serving the first and second order respectively, carried on the domestic work of

(a later, shorter version of the first chronicle) printed in Luigi ZANONI, *Gli umiliati nei loro rapporti con l'eresia... nei secoli XII e XIII*, 1911; rpt. Roma 1970, pp. 336-44. *Fratri Marci Bosii chronicon... 1493 conditum*, printed in ZANONI, pp. 345-56.

² *Cronaca di Frà Giovanni di Brera*, 1: "sine ipsa [humilitate] nemo potest ascendere ad astra;" for the habit of the Humiliati, *ibid.*, "tunc induerunt se vestimento barratino."

³ *Cronaca di Frà Giovanni di Brera*, 3, "pro vitando otio"; 11, "pro comuni commoditate."

⁴ *Fratri Marci Bosii chronicon*, 5.

⁵ *Fratri Marci Bosii chronicon*, 5, "qui quidem ex dignitate nuncupati sunt primi ordinis."

the houses and churches⁶. In 1201, Pope Innocent III approved the customs of these three orders, each separately. A master-general was soon appointed, and so the Humiliati came down to the writers' own time, exhibiting an unusual combination of holiness and material prosperity.

This story, as recounted by the order's own historians in the fifteenth century, has largely dissolved in the light of documents close in time to the early history of the Humiliati. These provide no verification of the story of Milanese exiles carried off to Germany in the early eleventh century. The term "humiliati" does not appear as a title for this group before 1184⁷. Blessed John of Meda was at best no more than a local holy man in the Como region, appropriated by the fifteenth-century Humiliati historians in search of a pious founder, and he may have been pure invention⁸.

The Humiliati had need of a respectable history. The early groups resembled many lay associations in the turbulent Lombard towns of the twelfth century: pious but discontented working men and women who preached on street corners the simple holiness of apostolic times. They emphasized the dignity of the lay life and sharply criticized the current ecclesiastical establishment⁹. If they were not heretics in the strictest sense, they were viewed with deep suspicion, if not alarm, by the authorities. Pope Lucius III in fact condemned the Humiliati along with the Waldensians and other dissident groups in 1184¹⁰.

In the next generation, however, some Humiliati appear to have separated themselves from their more radical associates and submitted to ecclesiastical authority. In 1199 they asked Pope Innocent III to recognize them as a religious order. Innocent accepted them into the church in the form of three

⁶ Joannis Braidensis chronicon, 14.

⁷ Brenda BOLTON, *Innocent III's treatment of the Humiliati*, in *Popular Belief and Practice, Studies in Church History*, Vol. 8, Cambridge 1972, pp. 73-74.

⁸ *Acta sanctorum, Septembris*, tomus septimus, Antverpiae 1760, pp. 343-360.

⁹ "The Humiliati, indeed, having no authority or license from the hierarchy, put the sickle in a harvest not their own, preaching to the people and frequently taking it upon themselves to direct their lives, hearing confessions and disparaging the ministrations of the priests." *Chronicle of Burghard, Prior of Ursberg*, quoted in Rosalind BROOKE, *The Coming of the Friars*, London 1975, p. 202.

¹⁰ BROOKE, p. 78.

separate orders: a first order, composed of clerics and cano-
nesses; a second, consisting of lay men and women living in
enclosed communities; and a third order, made up of men and
women who remained in the world. The Pope's letters of 1201,
confirming their usages, make clear their dubious reputation.
He had submitted their claims to careful scrutiny, he said, in
order to "remove matter for suspicion" and "to extinguish the
scandal that has arisen in regard to you"¹¹. These letters show
further that, in 1201, the Humiliati were still largely lay commu-
nities with a few clerics in their midst. They still adhered to
suspect religious practices, some of which the innovative Pope
approved. He conditionally accepted the Humiliati's refusal to
swear oaths, and allowed members of the third order to con-
tinue their street-corner preaching so long as they avoided
discussion of doctrine or the sacraments. But the pope obliged
the third order to observe a seven-fold office of paternosters
and other simple prayers¹². This requirement emphasized their
status as an orthodox penitential order since such an obligation
was a distinctive mark of such groups¹³.

The pope established the first order as, essentially, a body
of canons¹⁴. These Humiliati thereafter began to evolve into a
conventional religious order, along with the associated commu-
nities of the second order. Complex liturgical offices, clericalism,
and general conservatism characterized the order by the end
of the thirteenth century¹⁵. In this as in much else, the Humi-

¹¹ "ad abolendam tamen suspicionis materiam... et scandalum exting-
uendum, quod contra vos fuerat obortum." *VHM*, 2:140.

¹² *VHM*, 3:132-3.

¹³ Carlo CICONETTI, *The Rule of Carmel*, trans. Gabriel Pausbeck, Darien
1984, p. 30.

¹⁴ For the canonical status of the first order, see *VHM*, 2:141. The cano-
nical status of the Humiliati is discussed in Herbert GRUNDMANN, *Movimenti
religiosi nel Medioevo*, trans. M. Ausserhofer and L. Santini, Bologna 1974;
nuova edizione, 1980, pp. 91ff. See also Bolton, *Innocent III's treatment of the
Humiliati*, p. 78.

¹⁵ By 1249, clerics were to be given precedence in all Humiliati houses
owing to their high calling ("divinis laudibus specialiter sint adscripti"),
despite the earlier ascendancy of laymen in the order (*VHM*, 2:219-21). See
also the permission given, before 1317 (*VHM*, 3:99, note 1), for any second
order convent to join the first order, thereby strengthening the "Divinum
Cultum" (*VHM*, 3:112). In 1344, the order commanded that no house having
three priests was to elect a lay person as prelate (*VHM*, 3:175). The divine
office was to be recited in all houses containing four or more brothers after
1436. (This last order appears to restore a neglected custom). (*VHM*, 3:221-2).

liati were forerunners of the Dominican and Franciscan orders, which were also recognized by the papacy with some hesitation a few years later.

A Rule for the new first and second orders, *Omnis boni*, was adopted sometime between 1201 and 1227¹⁶. It drew material from the rule of Benedict, and from a ninth- or tenth-century recension of Saint Chrodegang's eighth-century rule for canons. This recension combined material from Chrodegang, and from the *Institutio canonicorum* of Aix-la-Chapelle with material of unknown origin¹⁷. (Hereafter this recension will be referred to as the Anonymous Rule.) However, the Humiliati rewrote some of this material and added other, wholly original sections to form their Rule. One of these rewritten sections retains traces of the order's radical history. Chapter thirteen purports to describe the origin of the hour of lauds. The original wording as it stands in the Anonymous Rule reads as follows: "Cassian says that ... in the early days, the office of solemn lauds was instituted in the monastery at Bethlehem, where our Lord Jesus Christ deigned to be born of a virgin for the redemption of mankind." The Humiliati Rule alters this statement as follows: "In the New Testament, from the time when our Lord Jesus Christ deigned to be born in Bethlehem, the morning office was established by the faithful."¹⁸ For the Humiliati, then, laymen rather than monks established the office, and the authority that underlay it was not John Cassian, but the New Testament itself.

The Rule not only reinterpreted the history of the office along radical lines; it also laid unusual stress on manual labor, even for an age that emphasized work as a central virtue of

¹⁶ The *Rule* first appears in Gregory IX's bull of confirmation, June 7, 1227 (VHM, 2:163-44). The *Rule* is printed in ZANONI, pp. 352-70.

¹⁷ *Canonicorum regula ab anonymo quopiam interpolatore ex Chrodegangi normam Concilii Aquisgranensis capitulis, atque aliunde consarcinata*, printed in Joannes MANSI, *Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 1757-98; rpt. Graz 1960, 14, col. 332-346.

¹⁸ "Cassianus autem dicit, matutinae sollemnitis officium, novo adhuc tempore institutum, primum in Bethlehem monasterio, ubi Dominus noster Jesus Christus pro redemptione humanae salutis ex virgine nasci dignatus est." MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum*, 14, col. 334, (reference to cap. 130 Aquisgranensis in *ibid.*, col. 237). Compare Humiliati *Rule*, chapter 13: "in novo testamento ex illo tempore quo dominus noster Jesus Christus in Bethlehem nasci dignatus est, matutinale officium a fidelibus est constitutum." (Zanoni, p. 359.)

conventual life. This emphasis probably reflects the working class origins of the community. The brothers were to work not only during the usual morning and afternoon intervals; they could continue their occupations from vespers till nightfall; and they could work on after compline as well, particularly if they could not read¹⁹. The Grand Silence itself could be interrupted if the "necessitas artium" required²⁰. The brothers and sisters were to earn their daily bread and clothing by the labor of their own hands, "that they might desire nothing from anyone at all."²¹

In the early thirteenth century, then, the Humiliati still consisted of largely lay communities of workers, celebrating a regular, but simple office. In the course of the century, however, all this changed. The first order, composed of clerics and canons, rose to preeminence in authority and numbers, slowly assimilating the second order, which consisted mostly of lay men and women. Lay-brothers emerged who carried out the tasks deemed unsuitable for clerics engaged in the celebration of the choral office and other high duties²². The third order, composed of men and women living in the world, originally the core membership, separated itself from the first two groups and by 1250 had disappeared from the historical record²³.

An indispensable element in the emerging clerical identity of the Humiliati was an office in traditional form. The Humiliati Rule contains the first evidence of such an office. The general nature of the Rule's liturgical provisions preclude any detailed reconstruction of the early office of the order. It appears to have been a traditional choir office suitable for a religious community consisting primarily of working lay people, many of whom were illiterate. The rubrics are modelled on the

¹⁹ *Rule*, 19, 21.

²⁰ *Rule*, 26. These exceptions form an intriguing antecedent to the Dominican mitigations of various monastic obligations for purposes of academic work.

²¹ "Nullius aliquid aliquando desiderent," *Rule*, 42. Not all communities of the newly formed order recognized the *Rule*. In 1226 the brothers and sisters of the convent of Brera, the chief house in Milan, and a center of the lay element in the order, refused to recognize it, saying, "se habere quamdam formulam quae erat a principio domus suae" (*VHM*, 3:245).

²² *Joannis Braidensis chronicon*, 14.

²³ See *Humiliés* in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, volume 7, part 1, Paris 1927, col. 315.

Rule of Benedict or on the Anonymous Rule. However, where these latter Rules become specific about psalms and reading, the Humiliati Rule substitutes generalities, or requires the recitation of a number of paternosters²⁴. Moreover, the few texts that are written out, no ably some *preces* at matins and the *Confiteor* at prime, show that the early thirteenth-century Humiliati office differed markedly both from liturgies of the two earlier Rules, and from the later usage of the order as contained in the extant full breviaries from the fifteenth century²⁵.

The *Confiteor* for prime in the Rule *Omnis boni* shows similarities to the Dominican formula. (See appendix D for the latter). As both medieval and modern writers have noticed, the Humiliati adopted much of the Dominican office²⁶. This borrowing may have begun as early as the 1230s²⁷. However, it consisted largely of structural elements (discussed below),

²⁴ Rule, 9. Compare these passages with similar material in the Anonymous Rule in MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum*, 14, col. 334. In Rule, 9, the more complex prayers to follow the paternosters are to be said aloud "si clericus adest"; otherwise each brother is to say them silently.

²⁵ Humiliati *Confiteor* text from Rule, 15: "Confiteor Deo et beate Marie et omnibus sanctis et tibi, frater, quia peccavi nimis cogitatione, delectatione, consensu, verbo et opere, mea culpa; propterea precor orate [sic] pro me... Misereatur tibi omnipotens Deus et dimittat tibi omnia peccata tua et perducatur animam tuam ad vitam eternam."

Text from the Anonymous Rule: "Confiteor Domino et tibi frater, quod peccavi in cogitatione et in locutione et in opere, propterea precor te, ora pro me... Misereatur tui omnipotens Deus indulgeat tibi peccata tua, liberet te ab omni malo, conservat te in omni bono, et perducatur te ad vitam aeternam." (MANSI, col. 334.)

²⁶ "In victu, in jejuniis, in abstinentiis, officio ecclesiastico assimilantur [viri primi ordinis Humilatorum] fratribus Praedicatoribus." STEPHANUS DE SALANIACO, *De Quatuor in quibus* (1278), MOPH, 22, Rome 1949, p. 182. See also EDWARD BRETT, *Humbert of Romans*, Toronto 1984, p. 97.

²⁷ The fifteenth-century Humiliati breviaries contain an old form of the Dominican collect for Saint Dominic: "Deus qui ecclesiam tuam beati Dominici confessoris tui illuminare dignatus es gloriosis meritis et exemplis..." The latter phrase was changed to "meritis et doctrinis" at the Dominican chapter of 1244. See *Acta capitulorum generalium ordinis praedicatorum*, Volume 1 (1220-1303), MOPH, 3, Rome 1898, p. 29 (variant reading). See also P. GLEESON, *Dominican Liturgical Manuscripts from before 1254*, AFP 42 (1972), pp. 89-90. The similarity of the *Confiteor* in the Humiliati Rule (adopted before 1227) to Dominican usage suggests an even earlier date. However, debate continues over how early the Dominicans had a common office; scholars suggest a date after 1230 (See P. GLEESON, *Dominican Liturgical Manuscripts from before 1254*, pp. 81-135; and WILLIAM BONNIWELL, *A History of the Dominican Liturgy*, New York 1944, p. 61f). Perhaps this *Confiteor* was a common north Italian usage adopted both by the Humiliati and the Dominicans.

since the Humiliati did not ordinarily adopt the texts of the Dominican office. There is an independent textual tradition in the Humiliati office that probably preceded Dominican influence. Until the end of the medieval period, the Humiliati guarded their original office texts as one of the few symbols of their identity, and as a memorial to their origins²⁸.

II. *The Humiliati office and the north Italian cathedral traditions*

Whence came the original office texts of the Humiliati? Scholars have recently pointed out the dependency on local liturgical traditions of new religious orders, even those such as the Carthusians and Cistercians, who had determined on radical reforms of the office²⁹. The Humiliati originated in the north Italian cities of Milan, Pavia, Vercelli, Ivrea, and in nearby communities. The analysis below will suggest that the Humiliati office is closely associated with two of these: particularly with Ivrea, and, to a lesser degree, with Vercelli. The Humiliati usage may have been originally identical with one or another of these. The 350 years that elapsed between the eleventh- and twelfth-century Ivrea and Vercelli antiphonaries and the fifteenth-century Humiliati breviaries (the only copies extant), could well account for many disparities that now appear among them. The adoption of Dominican material in the interim could explain others. We will see that, early in their history as an orthodox order, the Humiliati adopted, or adapted, local north Italian cathedral usages for their liturgy. Only later was it influenced by the Dominican office, which was probably not available before the 1240s or early 1250s.

The similarities between the usage of the Humiliati and these north Italian cathedral liturgies are particularly interest-

²⁸ In 1436 the Humiliati adopted the Benedictine Rule, but they retained their traditional office, "quod in presentiarum usitatur ab Ordine; & quod susceptum fuit per antecessores praedictorum Praepositorum... usque a principio, quo habitum Ordinis susceperunt". (*VHM* 1:88-9.)

²⁹ Chrysogonus WADDEL, *The Pre-Cistercian Background of Cîteaux and the Cistercian Liturgy*, "Goad and Nail: Studies in Medieval Cistercian History," No. 10, Kalamazoo 1985, 109-132; Paul TIROT, *Un "ordo missae" monastique: Cluny, Cîteaux, La Chartreuse*, Rome 1981, Introduction.

ing in light of Pope Innocent's acceptance of the order in 1201. The pope's letter ordered three commissioners to "examine and correct" the *proposita* that the Humiliati had presented. The evidence suggests that these commissioners took an active role in structuring the first two orders in accord with established models. Two of these commissioners were Cistercian abbots. Hence the letters of recognition state that visitation procedures were to be carried out "as in the Cistercian order"³⁰. The third was Albert, bishop of Vercelli, later patriarch of Jerusalem, and author of the primitive Rule for the Carmelite order. Albert had begun his career as prior of the cathedral chapter at Mortara³¹. The papal letters of recognition allowed the priests of the Humiliati order to celebrate solemn mass "according to the custom of Mortara"³², a complex liturgical provision probably worked out by Albert, who was also a canonical scholar. As a newly recognized, orthodox religious community, the Humiliati were in need of an office. Albert, with expertise in liturgy and in new religious orders, may well have recommended that the new order adopt appropriate elements from the office of his own cathedral chapter of Vercelli, or perhaps that of another nearby usage, such as that of Ivrea³³.

Whatever the precise origin and original shape of the Humiliati office may have been, the extant manuscripts show that its textual core was anchored in the north Italian cathedral tradition. This core lay beneath Dominican structural elements, which were added later. These facts become clear through a comparison of the Humiliati office manuscripts with material drawn from three important modern studies.

³⁰ "Sicut in Cisterciensi Ordine," *VHM*, 2:144.

³¹ For Albert's career, see *Acta sanctorum Aprilis*, tomus primus, Paris 1866, pp. 764-99, and CICONETTI, *Rule of Carmel*, pp. 70-84. The bishops of Vercelli and Pavia were later designated protectors of the Humiliati (*VHM*, 2:329f).

³² "Secundum consuetudinem Mortariensis Ecclesiae," *VHM*, 2:143; for Mortara as the home of Albert, originally a canon regular there, see BOLTON, *Innocent III's treatment of the Humiliati*, 78.

³³ Albert later appeared at Milan as an expert in resolving liturgical questions, and was as well the author of the primitive rule of the hermits of Mount Carmel. The first Carmelites were remarkably similar in their structure and membership to the early Humiliati, and Albert's Rule for the Carmelites contains provisions for a simple office similar to that observed by the early Humiliati (See chapter 8 of the *Vitae formula*, in CICONETTI, *Rule of Carmel*, p. 147).

The first of these is René-Jean Hesbert's collection of 500 nine-lesson "Roman" (or cathedral) traditions for the matins responsories and their verses in his monumental *Corpus antiphonarium officii*. Using this material and other sources, Appendix A below shows the connections of the Humiliati usage to the Ivrea and Vercelli cathedral office, to the Dominican tradition, and for the sake of contrast, to the influential office of the Roman Curia.

Hesbert limited his study to the responsories used on the four Sundays of Advent and the associated Ember Days³⁴. As Appendix A shows, for the first Sunday of Advent, the precise relationship of the Humiliati to the other traditions is unclear. Sharing responsories 1 through 9, the fifteenth-century Humiliati breviaries, the thirteenth-century Dominican breviary-antiphonary, the contemporary Roman curial office, and the eleventh-century Ivrea chapter MS 106 all appear to reflect a widespread usage. The local Italian traditions of Ivrea chapter MS 64 and Vercelli chapter MS 72 have the same texts, through they are arranged differently owing to the presence of additional responsory texts.

The patterns of the verses within the responsories is of less significance, since they changed more easily over time and distance than did the responsory material proper. However, the arrangements of such verses is often suggestive of relationships among traditions. On the first Sunday of Advent the Humiliati and Vercelli share a pattern for the first six verses: BABAAA. They then diverge for the final nocturn, as commonly happened among related usages. The similarity suggests they represent closely related usages, despite the different arrangement of responsory texts. The Dominican and Curia verses show a pattern that seems related to this: AABAAA, and they are clearly related to each other. It is noteworthy that both Ivrea chapter manuscripts show a distinctly different pattern for these first six verses: BBAABB³⁵.

³⁴ Renatus-Joannes HESBERT, *Corpus antiphonarium officii*, 6 volumes, "Rerum ecclesiasticarum documenta, series major," Fontes 7-12, Roma 1963-79. (Referred to below as CAO). Hesbert's tables for the days discussed in this paper are contained in volume 5 as follows: first Sunday of Advent, pp. 35-41; second Sunday of Advent, pp. 62-68; third Sunday of Advent, pp. 86-92; fourth Sunday of Advent, pp. 108-114; Ember Days of Advent, pp. 483-89.

³⁵ For the tables of verses in Hesbert, see CAO, vol. 6, p. 56 (Dominican MS); p. 60 (Humiliati and Ivrea MSS); p. 68 (Vercelli MSS). In those tables,

The evidence for the second Sunday of Advent is particularly intriguing. At first glance, the Humiliati and Dominican traditions seem identical. They share all nine responsory texts (including the distinctive #70B). However the texts are in a different order, and closer examination reveals the significance of these discrepancies. Appendix A shows that, considering position as well as texts, the more closely related usages are those of the Humiliati and of Ivrea chapter MSS 64 and 106. Only one text varies: the Humiliati used #70 as responsory three while the Ivrea MSS employed #23; otherwise the texts and their positions are identical, and Ivrea chapter MS 64 uses responsory 70B as an additional responsory. The arrangement of the Dominican texts on the other hand, reveals that usage is probably to be associated with a quite different tradition, illustrated here by the Vercelli and Roman Curia texts. The verse evidence for this Sunday, more ambiguous as usual, is nonetheless interesting. There are two discrepancies between the Humiliati and Dominican texts (#29 and #70); but only one between the Humiliati usage and Vercelli (#24). The verses used at Ivrea on this day are, however, remote from all these traditions.

The evidence from the third Sunday in Advent is much less ambiguous. Here the Humiliati breviaries and Ivrea chapter MS 64 share all nine responsory texts in the same arrangement³⁶. Of the 500 manuscripts that Hesbert examined, these two sources alone exhibit this pattern. Given their geographical propinquity, and other parallel usages, this evidence confirms a very close relationship between the Humiliati and Ivrea traditions, perhaps indeed an original identity. That the accompanying verses do not show a high degree of correlation (only one of nine texts is shared) is not countervailing evidence, owing to the ease with which these elements shifted.

The Humiliati texts for the fourth Sunday of Advent, as they presently stand are, in Hesbert's term, *isolé*: that is, the texts and their arrangement in the Humiliati breviaries is unique

Dominican Aix-la-Chapelle, cathédral MS XXIII = Hesbert # 103; Ivrea, Biblioteca capitolare, MS 64 = Hesbert # 263; Ivrea Biblioteca capitolare, MS 106 = Hesbert # 264; Vercelli, Biblioteca capitolare, MS LXXII = Hesbert # 576 (CAO, 5, pp. 5-18).

³⁶ Ivrea MS 64 does not, however, share the important ninth responsory with Ivrea MS 106 and the Humiliati manuscripts.

among the 500 manuscripts included in his study. However, it is likely that this ordering of texts is not the original one. The second responsory for this Sunday was probably exchanged at some point for the second responsory of the neighboring office of Wednesday in Ember Week (that is, Hesbert's #52 and #42 have been interchanged). If these two responsories are restored to their probable original positions (thereby paralleling all other usages), the Humiliati texts for this Sunday show a strong relationship to the local tradition of Ivrea and Vercelli. The Humiliati texts and their arrangement correspond to the Ivrea and Vercelli chapter MSS in eight of nine responsories. As usual, the correspondences between verse texts are less numerous.

The evidence from the Advent Ember Days points up the hybrid character of the mature Humiliati office³⁷. In order to demonstrate this, an exchange of responsory texts #42 and #52, as suggested above, must be carried through. Once this is done, the dependence of the Humiliati on the Dominican tradition becomes evident. Of the 500 manuscripts that Hesbert compared for the Ember Day offices, the arrangement of the first five responsory texts (#51, 52, 54, 55, 53) is found only in the Humiliati and Dominican manuscripts. The verses attached to these five responsories are also identical. However, the Dominican and Humiliati liturgies do not share the ninth and final responsory—a text that often determines liturgical families. The Humiliati instead share this text (#90) with the Ivrea and Vercelli manuscripts (and with the Curia), indicating a relationship with them as well for this Sunday.

A second modern collection of data of particular use to this study is that of Raymond Le Roux, published in 1961³⁸. Though less comprehensive than Hesbert, Le Roux's work is equally valuable since he compares over a hundred usages for one of the most solemn celebrations of the liturgical year, Christmas and its octave. Recent studies have suggested that texts used in such celebrations are often particularly useful

³⁷ The Ember Day series are group of three responsories each, spread over three or four days. However, the pattern of these responsories suggests that they follow the usual rules of ordering for nine-lesson days.

³⁸ Raymond LE ROUX, *Aux origines de l'Office Festif: Les antiennes et les psaumes de Matins et de Laudes pour Noël et le 1^{er} janvier*, "Etudes grégoriennes", 4 (1961), 65-170.

for revealing original usages, since these texts are especially resistant to change³⁹. Using different textual elements than those employed by Hesbert, Le Roux compares the psalms and antiphons for matins and lauds of 110 different traditions. A comparison of the Humiliati usage with these show that, for Christmas, the Humiliati office is part of a pervasive Roman pattern (Le Roux's « R3 »). R3 consists of a large group of 27 manuscripts from all over Europe, and includes the office of the Roman Curia. It also includes the two early Ivrea manuscripts we have already examined: Ivrea chapters MS 64 and 106. It is noteworthy that the Dominican usage for this feast is proper to the order, and unrelated to the north Italian tradition⁴⁰.

Le Roux published a similar study in 1979, which examined matins responsories for the Triduum, Easter Sunday, and its octave⁴¹. (See Appendix B below). This analysis is also very useful for locating the dependencies, and to the possible origins, of the Humiliati usages. For Holy Thursday, Le Roux's tables show that the Humiliati usage is identical to his "Group 60"⁴². This group consists of twenty-one manuscripts, most representing central and northern Italian usages, among which is Ivrea chapter MS 64, and other northern Italian usages such as Pavia and Monza. Ivrea chapter MS 106, though not part of this group, is also close to the Humiliati usage: the texts of the responsories for the third nocturn are identical in both observances, but are arranged in reverse order. It is noteworthy that the Dominican schema for Holy Thursday is very different, belonging to a widespread tradition that probably originated in southern France⁴³.

For Good Friday, on the other hand, the Humiliati breviamaries do not correspond closely with any north Italian usage but Dominican usage is even more remote⁴⁴. However, the Humiliati

³⁹ On this point, see Le Roux, pp. 66-72; 117-131 and Joseph LE MARIE, *Le bréviaire de Ripoll*, Abadia de Montserrat 1965, esp. pp. 69-71 and p. 91 note 58.

⁴⁰ For Tradition R3 see LE ROUX, 73-6 and table facing p. 170. For the Dominican usage for Christmas, see Tradition 15, *ibidem*. p. 80.

⁴¹ Raymond LE ROUX, *Répons du Triduo sacro et de Pâques*, "Études grégoriennes", 18 (1979), 157-76.

⁴² *Ibid.* pp. 168-9.

⁴³ *Ibid.* The Dominican usage for Holy Thursday = Le Roux's Tradition 89.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 170-1. The Italian usages for Good Friday = Le Roux's Tradition 1. The Dominican observance = Tradition 12.

breviaries do agree with the influential ninth-century antiphonary of Compiègne, with which they in fact correlate highly throughout the liturgical year⁴⁵ This ancient Frankish usage may be a major source of many north Italian observances, since they were being formed in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, just when German penetration of the northern Italian towns was at its height. The agreement between Compiègne and the Humiliati manuscripts may suggest a mediating north Italian usage, no longer extant, from which the Humiliati and the other local Italian usages (such as Ivrea's), evolved.

On Holy Saturday, the relationship obtaining between the traditions on Holy Thursday repeats itself. Here the Humiliati usage corresponds to Roux's Tradition 5, a largely north Italian group which among others includes Lucca, Monza, Pavia Vercelli—and Ivrea MS 64⁴⁶. On Holy Saturday the Dominican usage is unique to the order, as it is on Easter⁴⁷.

Comparing the Humiliati texts with Le Roux's manuscripts for Christmas, its octave, and for the Triduum does indeed seem to disclose very early, perhaps original liturgical usages relatively unaffected by changes over time. The Humiliati texts for these days reveal a close affinity with the northern Italian traditions, particularly with the usages of Ivrea. There is no trace of Dominican influence, so evident in the Humiliati office for lesser feasts and seasons. This evidence seems to support the hypothesis that early in their history as an orthodox order, the Humiliati adopted, or adapted, local north Italian usages, with Dominican influence coming in only later⁴⁸.

No large-scale studies such as Hesbert's and Roux's for the *temporale* have been carried out for the *sanctorale*. Such comparisons would be particularly enlightening since the *sanctorale* material is extremely varied, relative to the *temporale*; it is clear that various localities exercised much more freedom in shaping the constantly evolving and localized calendar of saints' days

⁴⁵ Compiègne = Le Roux's Tradition 1, *ibid.* p. 170.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 172-3.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.* The Dominican sage for Holy Saturday = Le Roux's tradition 17. This study also contains the matins responsories for Easter Sunday and its octave, but the usages are so idiosyncratic that no conclusion can be drawn about related traditions from this material (pp. 174-6). On these days, for example, major variations occur even among the usually identical Dominican usages.

⁴⁸ See note 27.

than in adapting the relatively fixed temporal cycle. Therefore, in *sanctorale* material, correspondence between traditions in both texts and their arrangement is particularly good evidence of originally identical offices, or of the dependence of one usage on another.

Appendix C to the present study attempts a preliminary comparison of matins responsories for selected feasts of the *sanctorale*. It parallels a fifteenth-century Humiliati breviary (H 267 inf.) with selected secular antiphonaries edited by Hesbert in *Corpus antiphonalium officii*. The early Dominican breviary-antiphonary from Santa Sabina is added to these, as is the thirteenth-century office of the Roman Curia. Fortunately, Ivrea cathedral MS 106 is one of the manuscripts included in Hesbert, as are two other northern Italian manuscripts from Verona and Monza. Still, since so few manuscripts are involved, any conclusions are tentative compared with those based on the hundreds collected by Hesbert and Roux for the *temporale*.

Nonetheless, the correspondences between the Humiliati and Ivrea offices are numerous and striking. Those involving the feast of All Saints are particularly so, since this office shows more variations among traditions than any other major feast. Yet in the Humiliati breviary and Ivrea chapter MS 106, eight of the nine matins responsories are identical, both in text and position. They also share four of nine associated verses. The Dominican tradition is especially remote, having only one responsory and its verse in common with the Humiliati breviaries and Ivrea MS 106.

The feast of the Assumption is another feast of varying texts across traditions, and the evidence here of relationship between Ivrea MS 106 and the Humiliati is even more remarkable. Eight of the nine matins responsories, and their verses as well, correspond in both text and position (with one displacement) in these two traditions. Only one text (#6F), appears in any of the other antiphonaries surveyed here, including the Dominican rite.

Feasts such as the Conversion of St. Paul demonstrate a somewhat different pattern⁴⁹. The Humiliati and Ivrea MS 106

⁴⁹ For comparison, the Ivrea texts for the feast of St Paul on June 30 must be used (CAO 1, pp. 263-5). The text for January 25 follows a different tradition, although both feasts appear under the same title: *Nativitas S. Pauli*.

share eight of nine responsory texts and six of nine associated verses, but significant variations appear in the positions of these texts. The other traditions surveyed also use these texts in similar patterns, so any parallels probably witness to an evolution away from a single original text. It should be noted that the Dominican tradition shares the fewest texts with the other traditions.

Most important, the pattern of this last feast is rather more typical of the relationship of these traditions for the *sanctorale* material than are the feasts of All Saints and the Assumption. This pattern is best illustrated by the office of the Nativity of the Virgin, in which the Humiliati breviary and Ivrea MS 106 share seven of nine responsories and five of nine associated verses. However, frequent variations occur in the positions of these texts. More significant, the texts and patterns common to the Humiliati breviary and Ivrea MS 106 are equally evident in the other traditions surveyed. The Dominican tradition, for instance, has six responsory texts and six verse texts in common with the Humiliati and Ivrea.

There seem to be a large number of such *sanctorale* feasts, perhaps a majority, whose texts and patterns are shared among a large number of traditions. From such feasts as this, no hypothesis can currently be offered about the relationship of the Humiliati usages to those of other traditions. In general, solid conclusions from *sanctorale* material await larger collections of *sanctorale* manuscripts, comparable in scope to Hesbert's and Roux's editions of the *temporale*. Nonetheless, some feasts, such as All Saints and the Assumption, make clear the close relationship between the Humiliati and Ivrea.

It may be useful at this point to summarize graphically the relations between usages established above:

First Sunday of Advent	Humiliati	Ivrea	Vercelli	Dominican	+ many others
Second Sunday of Advent	Humiliati	Ivrea		Dominican	
Third Sunday of Advent	Humiliati	Ivrea			

Fourth Sunday of Advent	Humiliati	Ivrea	Vercelli		
Ember Days of Advent	Humiliati	Ivrea?	Vercelli?	Dominican	
Christmas Day	Humiliati	Ivrea	Vercelli	Dominican	+ many others
Holy Thursday	Humiliati	Ivrea			+ others
Good Friday	Humiliati				Compiègne
Holy Saturday	Humiliati	Ivrea	Vercelli		+ others
All Saints	Humiliati	Ivrea			
Assumption	Humiliati	Ivrea			
Conversion of Paul	Humiliati	Ivrea			
Nativity of the Virgin	Humiliati				

This evidence indicates that, in the beginning, the Humiliati adopted for their office one or more northern Italian cathedral offices—most likely that of Ivrea—or perhaps they appropriated some neighboring usage, as yet undiscovered.

III. *The Humiliati and the Dominican tradition*

Still, abundant evidence indicates a strong Dominican influence on the Humiliati office. As noted above, this is to be found primarily in the structures of the office rather than in its texts. A number of these structural peculiarities existed in the north Italian cathedral traditions as well. Nevertheless, taken altogether, they constitute clear evidence of borrowing by the Humiliati of Dominican liturgical structures soon after a distinctive Dominican office appeared in northern Italy, perhaps as early as the 1230s.

The most notable of such shared structures include the following: a single antiphon employed *super psalmos* at I vespers, followed by five *Laudate* psalms, and a long responsory after the *capitulum*; at matins, a ninth responsory was always included even when the *The Deum* was sung, and a variable versicle was intoned by the presiding officer before the opening of lauds. For a time the Humiliati may have followed the Dominican custom of singing matins and lauds together shortly after midnight⁵⁰.

It is the structure of the hour of compline, so beloved, and elaborated, by the Preachers that provides the clearest evidence of Humiliati dependence on the Dominican liturgy (See Appendix D). In the Roman office and the traditions dependent on it, compline was largely invariable throughout the year. But this hour in Dominican houses included a number of variable texts: a variable antiphon *ad psalmos*, and another at the *Nunc dimittis*. Seasonal hymns replaced the invariable Roman *Te lucis*, while the Marian antiphon, *Salve Regina*, which always closed the hour in the Dominican rite was, in the Roman tradition, changed seasonally⁵¹. The Dominican *Confiteor* at the beginning of the hour and the *preces* and *oratio* at its conclusion also exhibit distinctive texts and a characteristic brevity. All of these elements are evident in the texts of the Humiliati breviaries as well. But it is most important to notice that, despite using very similar structures, the variable texts that the two orders employed were often different. Such variations suggest that the Humiliati rearranged their traditional texts around structural elements borrowed from the Dominicans.

Brevity of text and celebration is usually given as the reason for the popularity of the Dominican office and its consequent

⁵⁰ For the custom of singing matins and lauds without an interval, see *Consuetudines fratrum predicatorum*, Distinctio 1.1, in A.H. THOMAS ed., *De oudste constituties van de Dominicanen*, Louvain 1965, pp. 312-14; and William HINNEBUSCH, *The History of the Dominican Order*, 2 vols., New York 1966, 1:349. For the imitation of this custom by the Humiliati, see *Cronaca di Frà Giovanni di Brera*, 13, "sui successores post confirmationem regulae faciebant intervallum a nocturno a laude".

⁵¹ Legislation regarding this antiphon also shows the extent of Humiliati imitation of Dominican usages. In 1334, the Dominican general chapter ordered the daily recitation of the *Salve*: BONNIWELL, *History of the Dominican Liturgy*, pp. 209ff. The General Chapter of the Humiliati passed an identical rule in 1374 (*VHM*, 3:177). The Marian antiphons do not appear in the thirteenth-century office of the Roman Curia.

adoption by a large number of religious orders and dioceses⁵². The "advantage" of brevity has a certain plausibility as a reason for the Humiliati's adoption of elements of the Dominican office. Like the Preachers, the Humiliati were busy, combining a cloistered and liturgical life with preaching and work among the sick. Moreover, they supported themselves in the wool industry, first through manual labor, and later through commercial ventures.

However, it is not certain that the Dominican office was shorter than the north Italian tradition that the Humiliati had originally adopted. Ivrea MS 106, for example, has only a few elements in excess of the Dominican usage; and a comparison of the chant of Ivrea with that of the Dominicans does not reveal relative brevity in the latter⁵³. Psychological and political motives probably moved the Humiliati as much as any considerations of brevity. In every age, the charism of one religious order has captured the imagination of Catholic Christianity: the Benedictines in the early Middle Ages, the Cistercians in the twelfth century, the Jesuits in the sixteenth. In the thirteenth century, the mendicants, the Franciscans and the Dominicans in particular, enjoyed that distinction. In order to participate in the esteem and advantages accorded to the mendicants, other religious communities, often quite different from the mendicants in origin and function, adopted their liturgy, their Rules, even their mode of dress.

The Carmelites provide perhaps the best known example of such imitation. In origin they were a Near Eastern community of contemplative hermits. Forced back to Europe as the Crusades failed, and in search of a less suspect identity than

⁵² "Hore omnes in ecclesia breviter et succincte... dicantur" (*Consuetudines fratrum predicatorum*, Distinctio 1, 4, in THOMAS, *De oudste constituties*, p. 316. For examples of Dominican liturgical *brevitas*, see the breviary-antiphonary, AGOP, MS XIV L 2. (This important document is analyzed by Ludovicus ROUSSEAU, *De ecclesiastico officio*, "Analecta Sacri Ordinis Praedicatorum", 17 (1925-26) 711-30; 744-66; 813-25; 18 (1927-28), 104-20; 142-63; 193-203; 252-73. Among those adopting the Dominican office in whole or in part included the Knights Templars, the Mercedarians, the Servites, the Holy Cross canons, and a number of towns and dioceses in northern and eastern Europe (BONNIWELL, *History of the Dominican Liturgy*, pp. 164ff).

⁵³ See fac-similé 4 in Hesbert, CAO, 1 for the notation of Ivrea MS 106. This text may be compared with the Dominican breviary-antiphonary (see note 52) which is notated throughout. No notated Humiliati antiphonary is extant.

that of wandering hermits, they became a city-dwelling mendicant order. Their liturgy was "corrected" by Dominican theologians, and their new habit could be distinguished from the Preachers' only by its brown and cream colors⁵⁴.

The Humiliati followed a similar pattern. Occupying much the same territory in northern Italy, the Humiliati and the Dominicans had experienced a particularly close association. The two orders exchanged ecclesiastical properties and competed as preachers and confessors to the townspeople⁵⁵. One example will serve to illustrate the situation. In 1252, the Humiliati purchased a parcel of property in Milan abutting the cloister of the major Dominican priory of Sant'Eustorgio. This parcel included a high wall overlooking the priory's garden. The Dominicans complained to the pope that the Humiliati were about to put windows in the wall and so destroy the Preachers' privacy. More important, the new church would block the Dominicans' access to the thoroughfare from downtown Milan. The faithful of Milan would thus more easily find themselves at the Humiliati church for services and sermons rather than at the priory of the Dominicans where preaching was, in the words of the complaint, "their special duty and care."⁵⁶

The Humiliati encroached upon the Dominicans in other ways: they asserted that the term "frater" described their official canonical status⁵⁷. Their rules for fasting and abstinence (and later mitigation of the same) followed Dominican legislation⁵⁸. The Humiliati lay-brothers not only resembled the Dominican *laici* in function, they adopted as well the distinctively large outer scapular of the Dominican lay brother. To maintain some measure of distinctiveness, the scapular adopted by the Humiliati *laici* was green as opposed to the black or undyed garment

⁵⁴ CICONETTI, *The Rule of Carmel*, pp. 187ff; BONNIWELL, *History of the Dominican Liturgy*, pp. 164-5.

⁵⁵ For property exchanges, see *VHM*, 2: 60, 64, 223, 236f. On the preaching of the Humiliati, see the excerpt from JACQUES DE VITRY, *Historia Occidentalis*, printed in ZANONI, p. 259f, and his *Letter*, in ZANONI, 261. There is a large literature on the economic activity of the Humiliati. Several aspects are discussed by ZANONI, *Gli umiliati*, parts 2 and 3.

⁵⁶ "Cum eorum officium, et studium proprie in praedicatione consistat," *VHM*, 2:239.

⁵⁷ *Joannis Braidensis chronicon*, 19.

⁵⁸ See note 26 above. For mitigation, e.g. *VMH*, 2:200, 207, 257, and several other instances.

of the Dominican lay-brother⁵⁹. The adoption by the Humiliati of distinctively Dominican liturgical usages was most likely part of this imitative rivalry. Indeed, the Dominican historian, Stephen of Salanhac, found the Humiliati office to be the most notable of their imitations of his order⁶⁰.

IV. *The Search for Identity*

Despite their radical origins and imitation of the Dominicans, the Humiliati did not follow the Preachers in maintaining at least some elements of apostolic poverty in the later middle ages⁶¹. Indeed by 1300 the involvement of the Humiliati in the wool industry had reached capitalistic proportions⁶². They spoke openly about their commercial activities and their prosperity, and they attributed it in part to their celebration of the office from the order's earliest days. Though as laymen at the time, they had not been bound to it⁶³.

The most famous story told of blessed John of Meda, the supposed founder of the first order of the Humiliati, is illustrative of their later materialism. One night, far from home and penniless, John was visited by the archangel Gabriel who gave the holy man a sackful of gold. One of these coins became a chief relic of the order, having been miraculously preserved from theft, according to a later story⁶⁴. It is difficult to imagine a gold coin serving as a remembrance of Dominic.

So it is unsurprising that the Humiliati did not produce a single saint of any consequence. They claimed a list of holy members, but most are either spurious or of purely local repu-

⁵⁹ For the Humiliati lay brother's habit, see *VHM*, 3:145, 239; for the Dominican lay brother's habit, see HINNEBUSCH, *The History of the Dominican Order*, 1:341.

⁶⁰ See note 26 above.

⁶¹ In 1374, the Humiliati added the vows of poverty and chastity to their profession (*VHM*, 3:183); but this was, again, in imitation of the mendicants, and occurred after the latter had abandoned the practice of corporate poverty.

⁶² See in general, ZANONI, *Gli umiliati*; see also Raoul MANSELLI, *Gli Umiliati, Lavoratori di lana*, in *Produzione commercio e consumo dei panni di lana (nei secoli XII-XVIII)*, Firenze 1976, pp. 231-6. In 1358, the General Chapter ordered that prelates were to be merchants in wool rather than simple woolworkers (*VHM*, 3:232).

⁶³ *Fratris Marci Bosii chronicon*, 4.

⁶⁴ *Joannis Braidensis chronicon*, 11.

tation⁶⁵. The fifteenth-century Humiliati breviaries contain not a single celebration of a saint of the order. Even the feast of the supposed holy founder, John of Meda, was included only when a new breviary was adopted in 1548⁶⁶. In the Humiliati communities there were no theologians, and no outstanding prelates, only a long anonymous line of woolworkers-preachers; and by 1350, many Humiliati, perhaps most, were members of distinguished mercantile families who simply continued the family business in the order's atmosphere of religious respectability⁶⁷.

All these developments indicate a weak sense of religious identity and mission. This in turn may explain some of the radical liturgical changes which occurred in the order during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In 1437, perhaps to dissociate itself from the declining popularity of the mendicant orders, the General Chapter declared that the Humiliati would thereafter observe the Rule of Benedict. The office alone was exempted from the provisions of that Rule: the Humiliati would keep the office which they had used since the order's beginnings⁶⁸. But even this perhaps nostalgic commitment to the order's tradition did not long endure. In 1548, the order abandoned its medieval office for a new humanist version⁶⁹. Thus the order once again joined the newest fashion: classicizing the liturgy.

By this time the male branch of the order consisted of a few leisured gentlemen living from the profits of several centuries' work in the wool trade. In 1500, only 97 men inhabited 107 houses of the order. In 1570 as the Renaissance gave way to the Roman Reformation, the papacy ordered

⁶⁵ VHM, 1:193-257.

⁶⁶ See the discussion of this reform in J. Wickham LEGG, *The Breviary of the Humiliati*, in *The Divine Service in the 16th Century*, London 1890, pp. 272-95.

⁶⁷ See note 63 above. Artistic patronage by the Humiliati, especially in Florence, has been treated in an unpublished paper by Julia Miller, "Giovanni da Milano's Ognissanti Polyptych: Propaganda for the Umiliati," presented at the International Congress on Medieval Studies, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1988. Zanoni argues that a major weakness of the Humiliati was their limitation to a single geographical area; unlike the mendicant orders, the Humiliati never freed themselves from local interests, which tied them ever more closely to the economy of their native region (*Gli umiliati*, pp. 108ff).

⁶⁸ See note 28.

⁶⁹ LEGG, *The Breviary of the Humiliati*, pp. 283ff.

the Humiliati to be reformed, but they responded by attempting to assassinate the papally appointed reformer, their bishop, Charles Borromeo. A member of the order discharged an arquebus at him during Mass and the male branch of the order was forthwith suppressed. It is a nice irony that the pope who ordered the suppression was the Dominican, Pius V⁷⁰.

This study has attempted to show how the various transformations of the Humiliati were reflected in their liturgy. We have seen how it changed from a simple office for a largely lay community into a traditional clerical liturgy, borrowed from north Italian cathedral traditions, probably associated with Ivrea. By the 1240s or early 1250s, the Humiliati were borrowing heavily from the popular Dominican rite. Finally in the mid-sixteenth century, they abandoned their medieval office entirely for a classicized Renaissance liturgy.

The continuing willingness of the Humiliati to alter their office, usually a cherished element of an order's character suggests a larger problem of identity. The Humiliati evolved from a lay organization of laborers in wool, to mixed religious and lay communities, to a highly clericalized, conventional order that borrowed heavily from the mendicant tradition. The order's initial dedication to work became enthusiasm for money and commerce. Although such transformations are not unknown among the mendicant orders, the Humiliati's open pursuit of wealth was particularly remarked on⁷¹. The increasingly worldly values of the order help explain its violent reaction to demands for reform in 1570 and its quick suppression two years later. The Humiliati passed away unmourned. Still, the Rule and the liturgical usages they left behind move us closer to understanding the complex history of medieval religious orders.

⁷⁰ For details of the order's last days, see *VHM*, 1: Dissertatio 8; also Max HEIMBUCHER, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche*, 2 vols. Paderborn 1933, 1:200. The female branch had gone out of existence by 1810: LEGG, *The Breviary of the Humiliati*, p. 282.

⁷¹ « Degli Umiliati il popolo, prima che vengano i capitoli mordaci del Cinquecento, farà bonaria giustizia, loro applicando con scettico sorriso il motto di S. Paolo: 'Nihil habentes et omnia possidentes'; e Salimbene li fisserà nelle sue pagine come affaristi insaziati, una volta tanto delusi." ZANONI, pp. 109-110.

APPENDIX A

Responsories (numerals) and their associated verses (letters) for Sundays in Advent and Ember Days in Advent¹.

First Sunday of Advent

	Humiliati ²	Ivrea 64 ³	Ivrea 106 ³	Vercelli ⁴	Dominican ⁵	Curia ⁶
1.	11B	11B	11B	11B	11A	11A
2.	12A	12B	12B	12A	12A	12A
3.	13B	13A	13A	13B	13B	13B
4.	14A	14A	14A	14A	14A	14A
5.	15A	15B	15B	15A	15A	15A
6.	16A	16B	16B	16A	16A	18B
7.	17C	17A	17B	17A	17A	17A
8.	18A	18A	18A	18B	18A	16A
9.	63—	62A	63—	19B	63—	63—
		19A	18A	63—		
		61A	62A	62B		
		63—	61A			

¹ Conventions used in this appendix follow those of Hesbert in *Corpus Antiphonarium Officii*. Arabic numerals refer to matins responsories as analyzed in CAO, vol. 5. Capital letters refer to associated verses as arranged in CAO, vol. 6.

² Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS H 267inf. and MS I 97inf. (late fifteenth century).

³ Ivrea, Biblioteca capitolare, MS 106 (eleventh century), and MS 64 (twelfth century).

⁴ Vercelli, Biblioteca capitolare, MS 72 (twelfth century).

⁵ AGOP, XIV, L 2 (Breviarium-antiphonarium, thirteenth century).

⁶ Stephen J. P. VAN DIJK ed. *The Order of the Breviary by Haymo of Faversham (1243-4)*, in *Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy*, 2 vols., Leiden 1963, 2:17-203.

Second Sunday of Advent

	Humiliati	Ivrea 64	Ivrea 106	Vercelli	Dominican	Curia
1.	21A	21A	21A	21A	21A	21B
2.	22A	22B	22B	22A	22A	22A
3.	70B	23—	23—	24B	24A	24A
4.	24A	24B	24B	25A	25A	25A
5.	25A	25B	25B	26A	26A	26A
6.	26A	26B	26B	27A	27A	27A
7.	27A	27B	27B	28A	28A	28A
8.	28A	28B	28B	29A	70A	92A
9.	29A	29B	29A	60D	29B	77A
		64F	92B			
		60A	64F			
		67—	60A			

Third Sunday in Advent

1.	31A	31A	31A	31A	31A	31A
2.	32F	32B	32B	32A	32A	32A
3.	33A	33B	33A	33A	33A	33A
4.	34A	34B	34B	34B	34A	34B
5.	35A	35B	35B	35B	35B	35B
6.	36B	36A	36A	36A	36A	36A
7.	37A	37C	37C	37A	37A	37A
8.	38A	38B	38B	38A	38A	38A
9.	82A	82A	39B	92B	39C	70A
		81B	70B			
		70B	94B			
			71A			
			83—			

Fourth Sunday in Advent

1.	41C	41B	41B	41C	41A	41A
2.	52A/42C?	42A	42A	42A	43—	43—
3.	43—	43—	43—	43—	44B	44B
4.	44A	44A	44A	44A	45A	91B
5.	45A	45B	45B	45B	46A	45A
6.	46A	46B	46B	46A	47A	46A
7.	47A	48A	47B	47B	48B	47A
8.	48A	47B	48A	48A	49B	48B
9.	92A	49A	49A	91A	60A	49B

Ember Days in Advent

	Humiliati	Ivrea 64	Ivrea 106	Vercelli	Dominican	Curia
1.	51A	51B	51B	51B	51A	51A
2.	42C/52A?	52B	52B	52A	52A	52A
3.	54A	53B	53B	53B	54A	53A
1.	55A	54B	54B	54A	55A	54A
2.	53A	55B	55B	55A	53A	55A
3.	56A	56A	56A	56A	56A	56A
1.	57F	57A	57A	57B	57A	57A
2.	58E	90A	90A	58A	58A	90A
3.	90C	58A	58A	90A	59A	58A
1.	94G	59B	59B	94A		
2.	59J	92B	93A	82D		
3.	60A		91A			

APPENDIX B

Matins Responsories for the Sacred Triduum

Holy Thursday

	Humiliati	Ivrea 64	Ivrea 106	Vercelli	Dominican	Curia
1.	A	A	A	A	A	A
2.	B	B	B	B	B	B
3.	C	C	C	E	C	C
4.	D	D	D	D	D	D
5.	E	E	E	F	F	E
6.	F	F	F	G	G	F
7.	G	G	I	I	H	G
8.	H	H	H	J	I	H
9.	I	I	G	L	J	I
10.		K L				

Good Friday

1.	A	A	A	A	A	A
2.	B	B	B	B	B	B
3.	C	C	C	C	C	C
4.	D	D	D	D	D	D
5.	E	G	E	G	E	E
6.	F	F	G	K	G	F
7.	G	E	H	H	H	H
8.	H	H	I	I	I	I
9.	I	K	K	J	C	x
10.		J N				

Holy Saturday

1.	A	A	Not available	A	A	I
2.	B	B		B	B	B
3.	C	C		C	C	C
4.	D	D		D	D	D
5.	E	E		E	E	E
6.	F	F		F	J	F
7.	G	G		G	F	N
8.	H	H		H	G	G
9.	K	K		K	H	A

APPENDIX C¹Selected Matins Responsories from the *Sanctorale*

All Saints

	Humiliati	Ivrea	Dominican	Compiègne ²	Monza ³	Verona ⁴	Roman Curia
		106					
1.	1A	1A	11O	19W	26f	12P	40y
2.	2B	2B	12P	17X	27g	3o	41z
3.	3C	3J	13Q	20Y	9h	34p	41Aa
4.	4D	4D	4D	21Z	28i	4q	43Bb
5.	5E	5E	14R	10a	29j	5e	44Cc
6.	6F	6K	15S	22b	30k	6K	22b
7.	7G	7L	16T	23c	31l	30K	44Dd
8.	8H	10M	17U	24d	32m	27g	45Gg
9.	9I	9N	18V	25e	33n	33r	46Ff
						35s	
						36t	
						37v	
						38w	
						39x	

Assumption

1.	1A	1A	11K	19U	19U	19U	19U
2.	2B	2B	12L	12L	12L	12L	12L
3.	3C	3C	13M	20V	13X	13X	13X
4.	4D	4D	14O	21W	17Y	17Y	22Z
5.	5E	10J	15P	13X	22Z	22Z	17Y
6.	6F	5E	6Q	15—	18T	25c	6F
7.	7G	7G	16R	17Y	6F	21W	20V
8.	8H	8H	17S	22Z	6F	20W	6F
9.	9I	9I	18T	23a	24b	6F	2B
						18T	
						26d	

¹ This appendix assigns numerals to different responsory texts from the various manuscripts, beginning with Humiliati #1 and moving through the series down and to the right. Letters are assigned to associated verses, using the same convention.

² Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS 17436 (ninth century), edited in Herbert, *CAO*, vol. 1.

³ Monza, Biblioteca capitolare MS 12.75 (eleventh century), edited in *ibid.*

⁴ Verona, Biblioteca capitolare MS XCVIII (eleventh century), edited in *ibid.*

Conversion of Saint Paul

	Humiliati	Ivrea 106	Domi- nican	Compiè- gne	Monza	Verona	Roman Curia
1.	1A	1A	11K	1A	1A	1A	1A
2.	2B	2B	3E	2B	3E	18R	3E
3.	3C	3E	13M	3E	5E	20T	5E
4.	4D	5E	14N	4D	20T	3E	8H
5.	5E	8B	15O	5E	18R	22W	7G
6.	6F	4D	6F	18R	19S	21V	26a
7.	7G	10J	8H	19S	22W	23X	10b
8.	8H	7G	16P	20T	21V	24Y	4D
9.	9I	6F	17Q	21V 22W	6F	25Z 6F	6F
				and 6 others			

Nativity of the Virgin

1.	1A	11G	1A	1A	1A	1A	1A
2.	2B	1A	3C	2C	23	2C	2G
3.	3C	2G	13M	3B	3B	4T	3A
4.	4D	4D	58 ¹	4—	5C		20C
5.	5E	3A	4F		4D		GL
6.	6F	G3 ¹	14N		9I		4U
7.	7G	5L	8H		16P		21V
8.	8H	8C	7G		17Q		9—
9.	9I	9I	15O		18R 19S		

¹ For this feast, several manuscripts use the responsory texts of other usages to create a verse text and vice versa. To emphasize these relationships, this Appendix uses a special code. For example, Ivrea #6 uses the text of Humiliati verse #7 (= G) to create its responsory; then it uses the text of Humiliati responsory #3 = (3) to create its verse. Thus the appendix assigns Ivrea #6 the code: G3.

APPENDIX D

Compline for Lent

Dominican Office

Blessing and lesson
read in refectory.

V. Adjutorium.
Pater noster.

Confiteor Deo omnipotenti, et beatae Mariae semper Virginiae, et beato Dominico Patri nostro, et omnibus sanctis, et vobis fratres: quia peccavi nimis cogitatione, locutione, opere et omissione, mea culpa: precor te vos orare pro me.

Misereatur tui omnipotens Deus, et dimittat tibi omnia peccata tua: liberet te ab omni malo, salvet et confirmet in omni opere bono, et perducatur te ad vitam eternam.

V. Converte.
V. Deus in adjutorium.
Ant. ad pss: Misere.
Pss. Cum invocaverem, In te, Qui habitat, Ecce nunc.

Humiliati Office

Blessing and lesson
read in refectory.

V. Adjutorium.
Pater noster.

Confiteor: follows Dominican language, omitting «beato Dominico patri nostro».

V. Converte.
V. Deus in adjutorium.
Ant. ad pss:
Tu autem cum.
Pss: as in Dominican Office

Office of the Curia

Jube. Noctem quietam. Fratres.

V. Adjutorium.
Pater noster.

Confiteor Deo omnipotenti, beatae Mariae semper Virgini, beato Michaeli Archangelo, beato Joanni Baptistae, sanctis Apostolis Petro et Paulo(omnibus sanctis et vobis fratres, quia peccavi nimis cogitatione verbo et opere, mea culpa. Ideo precor beatae Mariae etc... orare pro me ad Dominum Deum nostrum. Misereatur tui omnipotens Deus et dimissis peccatis tuis, perducatur et ad vitam aeternam.

V. Converte.
V. Deus in adjutorium.
Ant. ad pss: Misere.
Pss: as in Dominican office.

Cap: Tu autem.
R. In pace in idipsum.
Hymn: Christe, qui lux.

V. Custodi nos.
Ant. ad Nunc:
Weeks I and II: Evigila super.
Weeks III and IV: Media Vita.
Week V: O Rex gloriose.
Preces: Kyrie. Christe. Kyrie. Pater.
V. In pace.
Credo. V. Dignare, domine.

Oratio: Visita.
Ant: Salve.

Cap: Tu autem.
Hymn: Christe, qui lux.
R. In manus tuas.

V. Custodi nos.
Ant. ad Nunc:
Weeks I and II: Gregem tuum.
Week III: Vigila.
Week IV: Media vita.
Week V: Vigilate.

Preces: Follows Dominican usage.

Oratio: Visita.
Ant: Salve (after 1374).

Cap: Tu autem.

R. In manus tuas.

V. Custodi.
Ant. ad Nunc: Salva nos.

Preces: Kyrie. Christe. Kyrie. Pater. Credo. (Eight verses and their responses follow. The texts differ from those of the Dominican and Humiliati usages.)

Oratio: Visita.