Introduction

A new alleluia had been composed for St Dominic's feast day. The scribe was stumped. He had been hired to copy the first 'exemplar' manuscript of the newly authorised Dominican liturgy; he knew that a new chant should be inserted here, but he did not know or have access to the new words. He left a space, and continued copying the rest of this section, before passing it to a professional music notator (see Figure 7.2, p. 215). The notator, too, was in the dark, notating the chant books in full but skipping over the unknown alleluia. What to do about the missing alleluia? The friar of St-Jacques, Paris, who oversaw the book's production may have provided assistance, either inserting the words himself or calling on another friar who could. The hand of whoever eventually provided this alleluia does not feature elsewhere in the book, but crucially they knew the relevant verse text: *Pie pater dominice tuorum memor operum sta coram summo iudice pro tuo cetu pauperum* (Oh holy father Dominic, mindful of your works, stand before the highest judge for your gathering of the poor). Now all that was required was the accompanying melody. This was added by a different notator, who had been employed elsewhere in the manuscript. Finally, this section of the book was returned to the first scribe, who checked everyone's work and made a small correction to the text and notation of 'iudice'. St Dominic's feast day could now be celebrated with an alleluia fitting for the saint, with a melody later described by Dominican music theorist Jerome of Moravia as 'pulchrior' (more beautiful).[1]

This vignette, deduced from palaeographical study of Rome, Santa Sabina XIV L 1, introduces the two key themes explored in this monograph. The first concerns the making of Dominican liturgical books, and in particular the three thirteenth-century exemplars, which acted as a blueprint for the Dominican liturgy for centuries to come. Who was involved in copying and notating them, and how did they work together? The second theme concerns the making of the Dominican liturgy and chant in terms of its content. What sources did the early Dominicans draw on, what

[1] Paris, BnF lat. 16663, f. 60v; Meyer, Lobrichon, and Hertel-Geay, *Hieronymi de Moravia*, 165.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009712217.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

revisions did they make, and why? How were the exemplars and their contents conceptualised to disseminate a uniform liturgy? This study of the physical and conceptual making of the liturgy, considered in dialogue, illuminates the development of the Dominican liturgy, granting us new insights into the practices and values of those involved.

From its roots in the early thirteenth century, the Order of Preachers, commonly known as the Dominicans or Blackfriars, spread quickly. Dominicans settled in urban centres, integrating themselves into the burgeoning university system.[2] The first Dominican community was a group of Cathar women that had been converted to Catholicism by Dominic's preaching circa 1207 in Prouille in southern France. In 1215, Dominic gathered a group of men into a community in Toulouse, receiving the approval of the local bishop to establish a community of preachers. Dominic received papal confirmation of his new order in 1216.[3] The Dominicans became one of the main mendicant orders, which rejected the stable enclosed life of monastic orders such as the Benedictines and Cistercians, and instead were itinerant, had greater contact with the outside world through their religious activities, and took vows of poverty.[4] Dominic's vision was to create an order of well-educated preachers who would convert and redeem heretics. Drawing on his previous experience at the Cathedral of Osma in Spain as a canon regular under the Rule of St Augustine (c. 400), Dominic chose the Augustinian Rule for his new order. The friars adopted the *regula recepta*, a version of the Rule that had become widespread by the end of the twelfth century, while the nuns adopted the *regularis informatio*, a version of the *regula recepta* adapted for women.[5] The male and female branches are known as the so-called First Order and Second Order, respectively. (A note on terminology here: I follow Dominican norms where 'monastery' refers to a cloistered house of nuns, and a 'convent' in this period is synonymous with a priory.)[6]

[2] Hinnebusch's two-volume study on the history of the order remains unparalleled: Hinnebusch, *History of the Dominican Order*.

[3] Laurent, *Monumenta historica S.P.N. Dominici*, no. 74.

[4] Other mendicant orders include the Franciscans (Greyfriars), Carmelites (Whitefriars), and Augustinian friars.

[5] Jones, *Fixing the Liturgy*, 72–73. A critical examination of the various different texts of the Rule of St Augustine is found in Verheijen, *La règle de Saint Augustin*.

[6] The earliest female religious in the Dominican order were nuns (*moniales*), who lived an enclosed, contemplative life in houses which the Dominicans called 'monasteries' (*monasteria*). Groups of apostolic Dominican sisters, living in 'convents', emerged much later in the order's history, in the nineteenth century.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009712217.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

From Toulouse, Dominic and his seventeen followers dispersed across Europe: on 15 August 1217, Dominic went with one friar to Rome; three friars stayed in Toulouse; two oversaw the Dominican nuns in Prouille; four went to Spain; and seven went to Paris.[7] The order was firmly established by the time of Dominic's death in 1221, and consisted of eight geographical provinces: Spain, Provence, France, Lombardy, Rome, Hungary, Germany, and England;[8] in 1228 a further four provinces were established: Poland, Scandinavia (*Dacia*), Greece, and the Holy Land.[9] Unlike other orders, the Dominicans did not have a single geographical centre or motherhouse: Toulouse was the founding location of the order rather than its focal point. Dominican general chapters initially alternated between Paris and Bologna, but from 1245 they circulated across the various provinces. Rome, Paris, Bologna, Oxford, and Cologne were all important early priories, but none was more important than any other.

It is unclear what the precise form of the liturgy the earliest Dominicans would have practised, for no manuscripts survive; it is possible that they used the local norms wherever they settled. However, many new orders felt the need to create their own liturgical practices, and by the 1230s, if not earlier, a recognisably Dominican liturgy emerged. This stemmed from the broader family of the Roman rite, and with this came Gregorian chant. The divine office followed the secular *cursus*, a structure of the office liturgy used in cathedrals. Like the order's lack of motherhouse, the Dominicans did not favour a single liturgical tradition or adopt one liturgical practice wholesale; rather, they developed a liturgical repertoire that borrowed from a number of existing traditions. Elements of their mass liturgy were taken from the Cistercians,[10] their constitutions were modelled on those of the Premonstratensians,[11] and their office lectionary drew on secular books from a variety of dioceses, bearing no clear relation to the lectionary of the Cistercians or the Papal curia, or by extension the Franciscans.[12] The resulting patchwork suggests that careful consideration was given to the best source for any given part of the liturgy. This prompts questions regarding the priorities that led to the selection and adaptation of certain existing liturgical repertoires.

[7] Hinnebusch, *History of the Dominican Order*, 1:52.
[8] Reichert, ed., *ACG*, 1:2.
[9] After 1228, it was not until 1296 that further provinces were added. Reichert, ed., *ACG*, 1:3, 278–279. On the early Dominican provinces, see Tugwell, 'The First Dominican Provinces'.
[10] Delalande, *Le graduel des Prêcheurs*, 24.
[11] Creytens, 'L'ordinaire des Frères Prêcheurs', 119–120; Thomas, *De oudste constituties*, 129–158.
[12] Urfels-Capot, *Le sanctoral du lectionnaire*, 543.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009712217.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

While it is unclear how this early Dominican liturgy was devised or disseminated, a shared practice emerges across the handful of manuscripts surviving from this period, listed in Appendix 1A. Among these are three books that were probably used by nuns, although it is often difficult to distinguish between nuns' and friars' liturgical books. The presence of text in the vernacular is often used to determine that a book was used by nuns; however, not all nuns' liturgical books contained vernacular language texts, and the use of the vernacular (and/or absence of textual composition in Latin) does not necessarily indicate a lack of comprehension of the Latin liturgy.[13] Two early Dominican books containing vernacular annotations are the diurnal Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek, Codex 104, which probably dates from around 1235–40 and may have been used at the monastery of Oetenbach in Zurich,[14] and the liturgical miscellany London, British Library, Add. 41507, a compilation of offices and sequences dating from the 1240s, which probably originated as separate sections or quires that have now been collected into one volume. The gradual Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 10773 dates from before 1246 and was among books that came from St Catherine's, Diessenhofen, which began as a house of beguines and was officially incorporated into the Dominican order in 1245 (it contains no vernacular annotations, which demonstrates the limitations of this means of identification).[15] Clearly, by the time that an identifiably Dominican liturgy was in existence, it was practised in houses of nuns as well as friars.

Many new religious orders revised their liturgical practices in the decades following their foundation, and the Dominicans were no exception. In 1245, a commission of four friars was appointed to this task by the general chapter, and the liturgical revision was eventually completed in 1256 by Humbert of Romans, the master of the order. The process was recorded in Dominican legislation – the acts of their general chapters – various copies of which survive today.[16] The resulting Dominican liturgy is recognised for its remarkable uniformity and longevity: notwithstanding certain modifications, the Dominican rite remained in use until the order formally adopted the Roman rite in 1968, following changes resulting from the Second Vatican Council (1962–65).[17] It was also sung with little

[13] Jones, *Fixing the Liturgy*, 11–20.

[14] Gleeson, 'Dominican Liturgical Manuscripts from before 1254', 105.

[15] Dirks, 'De tribus libris', 9.

[16] On which, see Chapter 1, n. 55.

[17] After the implementation of liturgical reforms to the Roman liturgy following the Council of Trent (1545–63), the Dominican order made major revisions to the temporal cycle of Humbert's liturgy in the early seventeenth century, but maintained Humbert's *ordo missae* and

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009712217.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

regional variation,[18] although this is not to claim that there was never any deviation from the authorised liturgy.[19] Its reach extended beyond the Dominican order: the Teutonic Knights,[20] the Crosiers,[21] many Scandinavian dioceses,[22] and various other groups adopted (and adapted) the Dominican liturgy.[23] Given the importance of Dominicans in medieval universities, and their role as confessors to the ruling elite, their liturgy had a wide impact.[24]

Key to the dissemination of Humbert's revised liturgy across the Dominican order was the production of several exemplars, of which three survive today. As stated on the title page of the first exemplar (see Figure 2.1, p. 40), these manuscripts recorded the authoritative version of the Dominican liturgy. Each exemplar was a compendium of the books considered necessary for liturgical celebration, which together encapsulated the Dominican liturgy. This concept of a liturgical exemplar was borrowed from the Cistercians: the medieval Dominicans were adept at cultivating innovative written tools to facilitate their mission.[25] Several exemplars were made in Paris, the site of a flourishing professional book trade as well as the prominent Dominican convent of St-Jacques, which hosted a *studium generale* for the order's brightest students. The oldest and most complete surviving witness is the manuscript Rome, Santa Sabina, XIV L 1, now missing just one folio. It has various signs of correction made during the initial book production, as seen above in *Alleluia V. Pie pater dominice*, but relatively few updates after the 1270s. This manuscript has been thoroughly studied in terms of both its production and the contents of its fourteen

many other elements with minor changes; see Bonniwell, *A History of the Dominican Liturgy*, 311–325; Smith, 'Liturgical Preaching and the *Summa Theologiae*', 474.

[18] King, *Liturgies of the Religious Orders*, 337.

[19] The extent of liturgical uniformity is a subject for other studies. See, for example, regarding Dominican chant, Beban, '*Nullus scienter litteram aut notam mutet*'; Giraud, '*Totum officium bene correctum*'. Regarding the lectionary: Tugwell, ed., *Legendae Sancti Dominici*, 27–30.

[20] Strehlke, ed., *Tabulae ordinis theutonici*, 357 (no. 471), 378–379 (no. 536); Fehér, 'The Hymnal of the Dominicans and the Teutonic Knights'; Gancarczyk, 'Musical Culture of the Teutonic Order'.

[21] Hentges, 'The Liturgical Sources of the Crosiers'; van Rooijen and Hentges, 'The Liturgy of the Crosiers'.

[22] Ottosen, *Responsories and Versicles*, 242.

[23] King, *Liturgies of the Religious Orders*, 341–346; Ottosen, *A Short History of the Churches of Scandinavia*, 19.

[24] See for example Röhrkasten, 'Dominicans in England'.

[25] Other examples of this include the development of a system for referencing passages in the bible before verses were numbered, innovative ways of linking new biblical divisions and the liturgy, and the adoption of a *pecia* system enabling mass production of key university texts. See Rouse and Rouse, 'The Impact of the Dominicans'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009712217.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

liturgical books.[26] A second extant exemplar, Salamanca, San Esteban, SAL.–CL.01, was originally similar in size and presentation to Santa Sabina XIV L 1. This exemplar shows signs of considerable use over several centuries, and ten of its books have now been lost; the four that remain were all for use by a cantor. The third exemplar, London, British Library, Add. 23935, was a smaller, more portable copy, made for the master of the order to take with him on his travels. These last two exemplars have not been subject to the same degree of scholarly scrutiny as Santa Sabina XIV L 1.

Our understanding of the Dominican liturgy is indebted to studies undertaken by members of the Dominican order. In particular, the standard reference text on the Dominican liturgy remains William Bonniwell OP's pioneering 1945 study, *A History of the Dominican Liturgy: 1215–1945*. Bonniwell's detailed survey was written from the position of proving the 'genuinely Gregorian' authenticity of his own liturgical heritage, and his monograph is shaped by these ideologies. Examples of this stance include his reference to the Dominican calendar and Dominican chant as being 'genuinely Gregorian'; his attempt to prove that the Dominican liturgy was a version of 'the genuine Roman rite' and that 'the [Dominican] Order preserved the plain-chant far better than did the Church at large'; and his description of Humbert's revision as 'more Roman than Rome herself', 'a work of the highest liturgical excellence', 'a masterpiece surpassed by no other rite in the Latin Church'.[27] A similar stance is taken in the illuminating but less often cited 1949 study by Dominique Delalande OP, *Le graduel des Prêcheurs*. Delalande devoted more than half the book to proving the 'value' of the Dominican gradual for the restoration of an 'authentic' Gregorian gradual.[28] The early Dominican liturgy requires reconsideration from a fresh perspective, not least because of the wealth of early Dominican chant books that have come to light since these historical overviews were published.

When questions of authenticity are set aside, it is possible to consider choices made in assembling and then revising the Dominican liturgy as reflections of the concerns and values of early Dominicans as they shaped their liturgical identity. *The Making of the Dominican Liturgy and Its Chant* uses the exemplars as a lens through which to better understand the

[26] See, in particular, the proceedings from a 1995 conference devoted to the manuscript: Boyle and Gy, eds., *Aux origines de la liturgie dominicaine*.

[27] Bonniwell, *A History of the Dominican Liturgy*, 112, 189, 173, 356, 190, 192, 193.

[28] Delalande, *Le graduel des Prêcheurs*, 78–241.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009712217.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

creation of what became the core Dominican liturgy for several centuries. In this study, rather than tracing regional practices and subsequent developments, I focus on the three extant exemplars that were created to transmit the definitive form of the liturgy. I limit myself primarily to chant; other elements of the liturgy, such as prayers and lections, are the subject of existing studies and will be referenced in passing.[29] I consider the making of the liturgy from two perspectives: making as a formulation of the liturgical contents, whereby I survey the sources and the patterns of change, and consider what these reveal about ideas of difference, identity, and the concerns of those revising the liturgy; and making as material production, in which I identify the hands involved in copying the exemplars, drawing wider conclusions about Dominican and Parisian book production.

The three exemplars make a particularly fruitful group for study with respect to musical and liturgical book production. Their supposed uniformity allows for direct comparison between manuscripts, and makes any differences in content, presentation, and production more evident. In addition, their complexity would have required much forethought, careful planning, and collaboration between copyists, and thus traces of such interactions are generally more visible here than in simpler antiphoners and graduals. As all three exemplars were made in Paris within a few years of each other, this group offers an insight into standard practices around the mid thirteenth century. Paris, famous for its substantial book trade, was the site of production of numerous books of chant and even polyphony in this period. Yet relatively little is known about how music book production intersected with the wider Parisian book trade.[30] This study employs palaeographical, codicological, and contextual approaches in order to establish new information about the availability and working habits of professional notators in Paris, and about Dominican liturgical book production more generally.

The four friars and Humbert did not leave detailed records concerning their revision process. The surviving exemplars are therefore the most important testimony in this regard, as can be revealed through close analysis. Scribal anomalies, as seen in *Alleluia V. Pie pater*, may flag where

[29] On Dominican mass orations, see Smith, 'The Orations of the Medieval Dominican Liturgy'. On the office and mass lectionaries, see Urfels-Capot, *Le sanctoral du lectionnaire*; O'Carroll, 'Lectionary for the Proper of the Year'; Jurczak, *Vangelo e liturgia domenicana*. On the Dominican *ordo missae*, see Smith, *Bible Missals*, 152–187.

[30] For example, in their magisterial study of book production in Paris, the Rouses did not discuss the making of chant books in any detail. Rouse and Rouse, *Manuscripts and Their Makers*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009712217.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the original planning and production of the exemplars was interrupted, corrected, or reworked. Notably, across the whole of Santa Sabina XIV L 1, the text and chant were frequently corrected, with omissions supplied as marginal additions or inserted over erasures. Through palaeographical analysis, I peel back the layers behind this first exemplar, seeking to understand the model used for its copying and thus shed light on processes of revision. Liturgical books from the pre-Humbertian period may also help to fill in some gaps in the narrative.[31] Through a detailed study of their contents, I examine whether it is possible to identify different stages of revision. If so, what relation does Humbert's work bear to previous attempts at revision? What types of changes were made, and what kinds of agendas, aesthetic and/or political, might they suggest? Most broadly, what existing liturgical practices did the early Dominican liturgy draw on, and how was this adjusted in light of the revision?

The Making of the Dominican Liturgy and Its Chant consists of three parts: I: Historical Contexts and Manuscripts; II: Making Dominican Liturgical Books; and III: Making Dominican Chant and Liturgy. While the liturgy was of course first conceptualised before it could be copied into books, in this study I first present the production of the exemplars in Part II, which lays the groundwork for my subsequent analysis of their liturgical contents in Part III.

Part I sets out the context of the thirteenth-century revision of the Dominican liturgy. Chapter 1 opens with a discussion of the scope and challenges of the corpus of pre-Humbertian liturgical books. Using early legislation and other Dominican writings, this first chapter then traces the sequence of events leading up to the creation of the liturgical exemplars, and their reception by the order. A narrative emerges of a search for liturgical uniformity that took several years to achieve. The three exemplars are the subject of Chapter 2. Humbert's team undoubtedly drew inspiration from the Cistercian exemplar (now Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, 114), while adapting this concept to their own needs. The three surviving Dominican exemplars are introduced in more detail, outlining the dating, known provenance, and current state of each manuscript.

[31] My discussion of the pre-Humbertian Dominican liturgy is indebted to previous studies such as Bonniwell, *A History of the Dominican Liturgy*; Dirks, 'De evolutione liturgiae dominicanae' (1980); Delalande, *Le graduel des Prêcheurs*; Gleeson, 'Early Dominican Liturgical Manuscripts'; Gleeson, 'Dominican Liturgical Manuscripts from before 1254'; Haller, 'Early Dominican Mass Chants'; Smith, *Bible Missals*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009712217.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Part II considers various aspects of Dominican liturgical book production, through the context of the exemplars. Chapter 3 focusses on textual palaeography, first reviewing contemporary Dominican documentation concerning the copying of Dominican books, before identifying the text scribes involved in copying each exemplar. Given the high production quality, I argue that the exemplars were largely the work of professional scribes, who would have been working under the supervision of a Dominican friar. Music scribes, whom I term 'notators', are the subject of Chapter 4. Their work is first contextualised through a discussion of Humbert's regulations concerning notation. Numerous notators are then identified across the three exemplars, only one of which, potentially a Dominican cantor, copied notation in more than one exemplar. Beyond the Dominican sphere, this has implications for understanding professional medieval music book production in the milieu in which books of Notre Dame polyphony were made, not to mention numerous other chant books. Chapter 5 situates the context in which Dominican books, and specifically the exemplars, were produced. It examines the intersection between the Dominicans and the blossoming Parisian book trade, the *pecia* system of book production, and the relationship between the Dominicans and their neighbouring book-maker, Guillaume de Sens. Close palaeographical and codicological study of the exemplars reveals certain guiding principles, within which individual copyists and artists had the freedom to execute and manipulate the contents. To conclude, Chapter 5 considers the interaction of the various scribes and artists within the exemplars.

Part III considers the creation of the liturgy contained within the exemplars. Each chapter traces the sources that informed the Dominican liturgy, the trends of revision across the pre-Humbertian books, the identifying characteristics of Humbert's liturgy, and the palaeographical anomalies in the first exemplar, Santa Sabina XIV L 1. Chapter 6 uses the sanctoral cycles of pre-Humbertian mass and office books to identify revisions made to the Dominican calendar. My study of Dominican mass chants in Chapter 7 confirms a heavy reliance on the Cistercian gradual from the early years of the Dominican order. Chapter 8, on chants of the divine office, draws on Hesbert's magisterial survey of office responsories in advent and Dirk's extensive comparisons between Dominican and other liturgical traditions.[32] This chapter notes similarities between the Dominican office and the liturgy of cathedrals in Britain and Ireland,

[32] Hesbert, *Corpus antiphonalium officii*; Dirks, 'De evolutione liturgiae dominicanae' (1980).

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009712217.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press

probably pointing to a common source for the two. Chapter 9 considers the musical qualities of Dominican chant. For the mass, Cistercian chants clearly inspired the early Dominicans, and while Dominican reformers maintained certain Cistercian traits, they reversed others.

Finally, Chapter 10 brings together the trends in material production and liturgical revision presented across Chapters 2–9, discussing how analysis of such trends contributes to our understanding of the liturgical priorities of those behind the Dominican revision, the status of the first exemplar as both presentation copy and work-in-progress document, and the working practices of those involved in revising and copying the liturgy.

This research depends on a body of data, much of which is presented in the appendices. In addition to substantiating my analyses, this material may also act as an entry point for further research into Dominican chant and chant books in the Middle Ages. A handlist of known thirteenth-century Dominican chant books is supplied as Appendix 1, and Appendix 2 provides a handlist of medieval Dominican books (primarily antiphoners) which contain the Dominican tonary that opens *Omnis cantus ecclesiasticus* and contains rules for notators. Appendix 3 supplies a foliated inventory of the three exemplars, facilitating navigation of these manuscripts, and Appendix 4 provides codicological tables of their quire collation and page layout. Appendix 5 presents a full Dominican calendar of saints' feasts, and includes (where known) the year of any relevant legislation, thus facilitating the identification and dating of other Dominican liturgical books. The Dominican litany of Humbert's exemplars is given in Appendix 6, and chants that are distinctive to the Dominican mass and office are listed in Appendix 7 and Appendix 8, respectively.

https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009712217.002 Published online by Cambridge University Press