

ULRR

Totum officium bene correctum habeatur in domo: uniformity in the Dominican liturgy

Item Type	Book chapter
Authors	Giraud, Eleanor J.
Citation	Making and Breaking the Rules: Discussions, Implementation and Consequences of Dominican Legislation, Cornelia Linde (ed); pp. 153-172
Publisher	Oxford University Press
Download date	2026-06-13 09:29:42
Item License	https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/1.0/
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/10344/9798

ELEANOR GIRAUD

A key concern for the Dominican Order in the thirteenth century was the uniformity of its liturgy. In the middle of the century, the general chapter sought to consolidate the order's liturgical practices, issuing a definitive version of the liturgy in 1256. Uniformity between houses within the Dominican Order was vital both for practical reasons and for theological ideals, and therefore a concerted effort was made to ensure that new liturgical books produced after 1256 were carefully copied and checked to ensure that they did not deviate from the official liturgy. Nevertheless, a small number of differences can be found between chants in Dominican manuscripts. What do these tell us about the Dominican perspective on uniformity in chants? What differences were seen as allowable, even normal, whilst still adhering to the principle that it was unacceptable to make changes to the chants? Six Dominican Mass books will be examined here, all dating from shortly after the reform, so one might expect them to conform closely with the officially sanctioned version of the liturgy; Hrvoje Beban's essay in this volume looks at later Dalmatian manuscripts, providing an interesting point of comparison that demonstrates the longevity of the Dominican concern for uniformity.

* I would like to thank various colleagues for their support and advice, especially Hrvoje Beban, Catherine Bradley, Margot Fassler, Lori Kruckenburg, Christian Leitmeir, Cornelia Linde, and Susan Rankin.

The Need for Liturgical Uniformity

On 15 August 1217, following papal confirmation of the establishment of the Dominican Order in the previous year, Dominic and his sixteen followers set out for Prouille, Paris, Rome, and Spain, with two of the brothers remaining in Toulouse where the order had been founded. They quickly grew in number and by 1221 twenty-four houses had been established.¹ The early Dominicans appear to have adopted local practices for their liturgical celebrations, perhaps in order to facilitate their integration with local society. This is reflected in some of the few liturgical books that survive from this early period: the missal MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 8884, was probably made for the convent of St-Jacques in Paris, and its contents reflect liturgical practices found in Paris;² similarly, MS Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibliothek, Ny Kongeling Samling 632 8^o is a Dominican liturgical miscellany made for the convent of San Nicolò in Bologna, and it contains two versions of the Office for St Nicholas, one ‘according to the Dominican Use’,³ and the other presumably reflecting local practices. Given the highly mobile nature of the Friars Preachers, with brothers regularly moving between convents for education, preaching, and administrative duties, a situation whereby convents followed different traditions would have been impractical: the diversity of lectionaries would have been problematic for preaching purposes, as it may have been difficult to know in advance which Gospel and Epistle passages would be read at each church.⁴ Similarly, the necessity for a brother to adopt and learn a new set of liturgical practices each time he moved to a new convent would have been

¹ William A. Hinnebusch, *The History of the Dominican Order*, 2 vols. (New York, 1966-1973), i, 92.

² Bonniwell, *Dominican Liturgy*, 29-35; Philip Gleeson, ‘Dominican Liturgical Manuscripts from before 1254’, *AFP*, 42 (1972), 81-135, at 99-102.

³ Fo. 48v, ‘Hic incipit secundum usum fratrum predicatorum usque in fine libri’.

⁴ I thank Father Innocent Smith for putting forward this suggestion.

inconvenient, and the differences between liturgical traditions would have been very evident when brothers worshiped communally at annual provincial and general chapters. Presumably in response to such inconveniences (no contemporary documents explain the reasoning), attempts were soon made to unify the Dominican liturgy.

Some moves towards a unified liturgy may have been made in the early years of the order's existence, but the extent to which uniformity was achieved is unclear.⁵ In any case, the results cannot have been satisfactory, for an official process of revision and unification was begun in 1244. Each province was requested to send a copy of their missal and breviary to the following General Chapter, in order for the books to be brought into line with one another, *pro concordando officio*.⁶ In 1245 four brothers were assigned the task of collating and unifying the breviary. The process was not a simple one, and two separate revisions by the four brothers both appear to have been rejected by the order at large. The first, which had been ratified as part of the Dominican constitutions in 1246–8, was met with such strong disapproval across the provinces that the four brothers were recalled in 1250 to correct the Office again.⁷ Their second attempt, seemingly completed by 1251,⁸ appears to have met the same fate, as it was never fully ratified as part of the constitutions.⁹ Upon his appointment as master general of the order in 1254, Humbert of Romans was assigned the task of undertaking what would become the final revision of the Dominican liturgy. This was completed and confirmed as part of the constitutions in 1256.¹⁰ Perhaps foreseeing the potential for more discontent, Humbert wrote a letter to the order in that year, describing his liturgical reform and asking that brothers accept his revision for the sake of 'liturgical unity',

⁵ See Bonniwell, *Dominican Liturgy*, 61-70; Humbert of Romans, *Leg.*, 1-7.

⁶ *ACG*, i, 29.

⁷ *Ibid.* 33, 35-6, 39, 41, 53-4.

⁸ *Ibid.* 60.

⁹ Only the *inchoatio*, the first stage in the threefold ratification, was recorded in the Acts in 1252; *ibid.* 63.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 68, 78.

uniformitas officii, even if they found aspects of it ‘displeasing’, *minus gratum*.¹¹

Having finally established an acceptable revision of the liturgy, it was then necessary for convents across the Order to adopt it in order for uniformity to be achieved. To facilitate dissemination of the liturgical revision, several exemplars were made, from which new books were to be copied and carefully checked. Each exemplar was a compendium of fourteen individual liturgical books, which between them left little room for doubt as to what should be done at any point of a given service. In the years following the revision, *admonitiones* were issued at general and provincial chapters demanding that books should be obtained that conformed to the new revision as given in the exemplars, thus indicating the importance placed on the universal adoption of the same liturgy, and perhaps also that the uptake was not immediate. The *admonitiones* read as follows:¹²

1258, General Chapter: ‘Brothers should take care that books of the Office which are newly written are corrected diligently from the first exemplars.’¹³

1259, General Chapter: ‘Priors should make sure that they possess the new correction of the liturgy, and well corrected books of it.’¹⁴

1265, General Chapter: ‘Priors [are reminded] to obtain books of the liturgy according to the new correction.’¹⁵

1267, Provincial Chapter of Teutonia: ‘Similarly, [we instruct] that the Priors should strive so that books of the new correction are obtained, and that the brothers sing according to

¹¹ *Litt. Enc.*, 42.

¹² All translations are my own.

¹³ ‘Apponant fratres curam. quod libri de officio qui de novo scribuntur. corrigantur diligenter ad exemplaria prima.’ *ACG*, i. 92. All translations are my own.

¹⁴ ‘Procurent priores. quod habeant novam correctionem de officio ecclesiastico. et libros de ea bene correctos.’ *Ibid.* 98-9.

¹⁵ ‘Priores. Ad habendum libros ecclesiastici officii. secundum novam correctionem.’ *Ibid.* 130.

them.’¹⁶

1270, Provincial Chapter of Roman Province: ‘We require and command that Priors and brothers strive to have books of the new correction.’¹⁷

Pope Clement IV granted papal approval for the new liturgy on 7 July 1267,¹⁸ thus recognizing Humbert’s revision as the official version of the Dominican liturgy, and also prohibiting any further changes from being made to it. One reason for seeking papal approval may have been to bolster support for the new liturgical revision, and thus aid its acceptance across the order.

The importance of obtaining correct and updated liturgical books is stressed in Humbert of Romans’s descriptions of the duties pertaining to offices in the order, *Instructiones de officiis ordinis*. The first duty assigned to the cantor, under the heading of ‘books and written items’, is the responsibility to ensure that the convent’s books were up-to-date:

‘The duty of the cantor is to solicit the prior so that a well corrected version of the entire liturgy is held in the convent; and if [the prior] is negligent in this

¹⁶ ‘Item [ammonemus] studeant priores, ut libri de nova correccione habeantur et fratres cantent secundum illos.’ Fritz Bünger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Provinzialkapitel und Provinziale des Dominikanerordens*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Dominikanerordens in Deutschland 14 (Leipzig, 1919), 11. The chapter acts in which this *admonitio* appears are fragmentary and lack a date; it has been argued by Bünger that they date from 1267.

¹⁷ ‘Volumus et mandamus quod priores et fratres studeant habere libros de nova correccione.’ *ACP Pr. Rom.*, 36.

¹⁸ Archivio Segreto Vaticano, Fondo Domenicano, I. 98: Leonard E. Boyle, ‘A Material Consideration of Santa Sabina MS XIV L 1’, in Leonard E. Boyle and Pierre-Marie Gy (eds.) *Aux origines de la liturgie dominicaine : le manuscrit Santa Sabina XIV L 1* (Rome, Paris, 2004), 19-42, at 40-42.

regard, [the cantor] should report him to his seniors, and he should work anxiously so that [the prior] has it [the liturgy] corrected.’¹⁹

A concern for correctness is similarly found in the instructions regarding the copying of chant books that were included in the exemplars, at the start of the antiphoner, and were subsequently copied into many later antiphoners.²⁰ These rules were aimed at the copyists of new liturgical books, in order to ensure that no changes were made to the liturgy. The rules make it clear that the intention was for all Dominican convents to have identical copies of the newly revised liturgy: identical in words, notes, marks of pauses, and standards of presentation (namely four-line staves and square notation, typical of thirteenth-century Parisian chant books),²¹ with careful checking to ensure no errors were accidentally introduced.²²

‘In antiphoners and graduals and other books of chant, let there be square notes, with four lines separated in the necessary manner lest the note be compressed by them from above and below. Let no one knowingly alter a letter or note, but let

¹⁹ ‘Officium cantoris est sollicitare priorem ut totum officium bene correctum habeatur in domo; et si negligens fuerit circa hoc, erga majores eum debet accusare, et laborare sollicite quod hoc faciat emendari.’ Humbert of Romans, *Instr.*, 238.

²⁰ These rules can be found on fo. 250r of MS London, British Library, Additional 23935; on fo. 1v of MS Salamanca, San Esteban, SAL.-CL.01; and were presumably copied onto the now lost opening page of the antiphoner in MS Rome, Santa Sabina, XIV L 1; they are re-copied in other thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Dominican sources, which are listed by van Dijk and supplemented by Huglo and Beban: see S. J. P. van Dijk, *Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy: the Ordinals by Haymo of Faversham and Related Documents (1243-1307)*, 2 vols., *Studia et Documenta Franciscana* (Leiden, 1963), 118 n. 2; Michel Huglo, ‘Règlements du XIII^e siècle pour la transcription des livres notés’, in Martin Ruhnke (ed.), *Festschrift Bruno Stäblein zum 70. Geburtstag* (Kassel, 1967), 121-133, at 124, n. 15; Huglo, ‘Dominican and Franciscan books’, 196, n. 10 (the latter is an English version of his French article of 1967); and Hrvoje Beban’s contribution in this volume.

²¹ On the emergence of square chant notation, see John Haines, ‘From Point to Square: Graphic Changes in Medieval Music Script’, *Textual Cultures: Texts, Contexts, Interpretation*, 3/2 (2008), 30-53.

²² For a further discussion of these rules in relation to a fifteenth-century antiphoner from Dalmatia, see Hrvoje Beban’s contribution to this volume.

the letter[s] and notes and lines of pauses be observed. Also, the guiding *puncta*, which are placed at the end of lines to indicate where the first note of the following line ought to begin, should be diligently observed by the notators. In any book which is to be newly written from now on, before it is read or sung [from], let the book first be corrected twice from a corrected exemplar [i.e. an exemplar of Humbert's revision].²³

Uniformity in Dominican Chant

How far did the newly copied manuscripts follow these rules? To what extent were the Dominicans successful in producing uniform books of chant? These questions will be explored through an examination of the chant in six liturgical books produced in Paris shortly after 1256. The comparison is based on the chants for Mass from Monday to Friday of Holy Week, with the expectation that the copying of chant for these five days is representative of the books at large. Twenty-three fully notated chants are provided across the five days, namely three introits, four graduals, three tracts, three offertories, four communions, four antiphons, one hymn, and the Agios and Sanctus of the Improperia sung on Good Friday. In addition, the three verses of the Improperia are notated in full in one of the books, MS

²³ 'In antiphonariis et gradualibus. et aliis libris cantus; fiant note quadrate cum quatuor lineis debito modo distantibus. ne nota hinc inde comprimatur ab eis. Nullus scienter litteram aut notam mutet. sed teneantur littere [MS: littera] et note et uirgule pausarum. Puncta etiam directiua posita in fine linearum. ad innuendum ubi prima nota sequentis lineae debeat inchoari: diligenter a notatoribus obseruentur. Antequam legatur uel cantetur de cetero in quocumque libro de nouo scribendo: prius liber bis ad correctia exemplaria corrigatur.' Transcribed from MS London, British Library, Additional 23935, fo. 250r; and MS Salamanca, San Esteban SAL.-CL.01, fo. 1v. Transcriptions are also given in van Dijk, *Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy*, 118; Huglo, 'Règlements du XIII^e siècle', 124-5. The orthography has been modernized in Huglo's transcription and both authors mistakenly give 'inueniendum' for 'innuendum'. Huglo's article compares the Dominican rules governing the copying of notation with the more extensive rules of the Franciscans.

Philadelphia, Free Library, Lewis E 158 (hereafter Lewis 158), but only the incipit is notated in the other five manuscripts. These twenty-three chants and three incipits will be compared in order to gauge the extent of uniformity, or conversely ‘rule breaking’, in Parisian books made shortly after the liturgical reform.

In comparing the manuscripts, each instance of difference between any two manuscripts has been noted; a so-called ‘variant’ may be unique to one manuscript or may occur in two or more manuscripts. Two of the manuscripts were only available for study on grainy microfilms,²⁴ where fine vertical lines in particular were often difficult to see; in cases where it was unclear whether a manuscript had a variant or not, I erred on the side of caution and assumed that no variant was present. Similarly, where later corrections have been made and the earlier form of the notation may have been the same as the other manuscripts, no variant has been noted.

The main sources of Humbert’s liturgy are the three extant exemplars that served as models from which new books could be copied and verified. The chants for Mass are found in the gradual, one of the four main chant books contained within the exemplar, the others being the antiphoner (with chants for the Office), processional, and *pulpitarium* (a book particular to the Dominican Order with sections of chant sung by soloists).²⁵ The oldest and most complete of the three exemplars is MS Rome, Santa Sabina, XIV L 1 (hereafter Sabina L1). Once thought to be Humbert’s original prototype of the revised Dominican liturgy, it is now accepted that the manuscript was copied between 1256 and 1259, immediately following the reform.²⁶ The manuscript was made in Paris and remained at the Parisian convent of St-

²⁴ MS Philadelphia, Free Library, Lewis E 158 and MS Lawrence, Kansas, Kenneth Spencer Research Library, J4:2.

²⁵ On the *pulpitarium*, see Christian Meyer, ‘Le *pulpitarium* des Frères Prêcheurs’, *AFP*, 75 (2005), 5-28.

²⁶ Boyle, ‘A Material Consideration’, 39.

Jacques until the French revolution.²⁷ An exemplar made for the Province of Spain, MS Salamanca, San Esteban, SAL.–CL.01 (hereafter Esteban 01), was also copied in Paris, probably before 1264, as the text has been altered to match a change that was made constitutional between 1262 and 1264.²⁸ Esteban 01 would have originally been similar in size to Sabina L1, but today only four of its books survive, including the gradual. A smaller, more portable copy of the exemplar was made in Paris for the Master General of the Dominican Order and is today held in the British Library: MS London, British Library, Additional 23935 (hereafter BL Additional 23935).²⁹ This manuscript may have been copied in the early years of the 1260s, perhaps before 1262, given that readings for the feast of St Anthony, which was made constitutional between 1260 and 1262,³⁰ have been added by a different hand to the margin of the Lectionary (fo. 212r).³¹

In addition to the graduals of the three exemplars, this analysis includes three further notated books for Mass known to have been copied in Paris shortly after the reform: one, Lewis 158, is a notated missal, probably copied in the 1260s,³² certainly before 1285, the date

²⁷ Ibid. 20.

²⁸ Bernardo Fueyo Suárez, 'El *exemplar* de la liturgia dominicana de Salamanca (manuscrito *San Esteban* SAL.–CL.01)', *Archivo Dominicano*, 28 (2007), 81-118, at 108-110.

²⁹ On the Master General's exemplar, see Galbraith, *Const.*, 193-202; Michel Huglo, 'Comparaison du "prototyp" du couvent Saint-Jacques de Paris avec l'exemplaire personnel du maître de l'ordre des prêcheurs (Londres, British Library, Add. MS 23935)', in Boyle and Gy (eds.) *Aux origines de la liturgie dominicaine*, 197-214.

³⁰ *ACG*, i. 104, 107-108, 113.

³¹ On the copying of the Dominican exemplars, see Eleanor Giraud, 'The Dominican Scriptorium at St-Jacques, and its Production of Liturgical Exemplars' in Andreas Nievergelt *et al.* (eds.), *Scriptorium, Wesen, Funktion, Eigenheiten* (Munich, 2015), 247-58.

³² Pierre-Marie Gy dated the manuscript to 1265–70, whereas the art historian Robert Branner placed it between 1262–5; Pierre-Marie Gy, 'Documentation concernant le MS. Santa Sabina XIV L 1', in Boyle and Gy (eds.) *Aux origines de la liturgie dominicaine*, 5-17, at 12 n. 33; Robert Branner, *Manuscript Painting in Paris during the Reign of Saint Louis: A Study of Styles*, California Studies in the History of Art, 18 (Berkeley, 1977), 82, 223.

of the death of Charles I, King of Sicily, for whom a prayer was entered onto fos. 183r, 184r.³³ This prayer, along with other Italian marginalia, suggests that the Parisian-made manuscript was taken to Italy for use shortly after its production. A similar journey was made by another of the manuscripts examined here, the gradual MS Lawrence, Kansas, Kenneth Spencer Research Library J4:2, previously owned by Milton Steinhardt (hereafter Kansas J4:2).³⁴ This manuscript was copied in Paris, but has marginalia in Italian suggesting that it was later used in Italy. Owing to the absence of the feast of St Anthony of Padua, Steinhardt dated his gradual to shortly after the reform: 1256–60. However, the absence of a feast cannot provide a certain *terminus ante quem*, especially as the later missal Lewis 158 does not include this feast in its Sanctorale (it would have been on fo. 34v), but only in its calendar. The third manuscript examined here is another gradual: MS Oxford, Blackfriars, 1 (hereafter Blackfriars 1).³⁵ The manuscript travelled from Paris to Spain where a quire with the feast of Corpus Christi was added shortly after 1270, thus placing the initial production of the gradual in the first decade and a half after 1256.

Given that the three exemplars were created as models for copying new uniform liturgical books, one would not expect to find significant differences between them. As the three other Mass books were also copied in Paris, within two decades of the revision in 1256, it might be expected that they too would have conformed closely to the official version of the liturgy—especially if they followed the stringent copying instructions found at the start of the antiphoner. As a result, at least some of the differences between these six manuscripts may reflect ways in which chants could vary without contradicting the ideal of uniformity.

³³ Edwin Wolf, *A Descriptive Catalogue of the John Frederick Lewis Collection of European Manuscripts in the Free Library of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1937), 170-3.

³⁴ Milton Steinhardt, 'A Recently Discovered Dominican Gradual of Humbert's Time', *AFP*, 63 (1993), 43-50.

³⁵ Walter Gumbley, 'The Blackfriars Codex', *Blackfriars*, 17/197 (1936), 611-613.

The most obvious difference between these six manuscripts is their visual aspect: although they all use the square notes on four-line staves stipulated in the rules, they display different ways of grouping series of notes into ligatures—a ligature being a shape which represents a group of two or more notes in one graph.³⁶ Series of notes tend to have been divided into several small ligatures of two or three notes in the graduals of Sabina L1 and BL Additional 23935, and in Lewis 158, whereas Esteban 01’s gradual, Kansas J4:2, and Blackfriars 1 show a preference for longer ligatures. Naturally, differences in note groupings are most common in the more melismatic chants, such as alleluias and graduals.³⁷ There can also be differences in the ligature shape chosen for the same group of notes, for example, two notes descending within a ligature may be represented by a single oblique stroke or by two conjoined square forms. Thus, while each of the manuscripts displays the same fundamental melodic patterns, there can be significant variety in how the individual pitches are displayed graphically. There does not seem to be any significance in the different groupings and shapes of ligatures; rather, it appears that this was a matter of scribal preference, with some scribes having a tendency to draw ligatures in a particular manner. It may be telling that whereas the twelfth-century Cistercian rules regarding notation stipulated that ligature shapes should not be altered,³⁸ no such demand was included in the Dominican regulations. This omission perhaps reflects a Dominican acceptance of changeable note groupings.

³⁶ In its strictest definition, the term ‘ligature’ refers to a group of graphically joined notes in polyphonic notation, where the shape of the ligature has a rhythmic signification. However, ‘ligature’ has also come to be used in square chant notation, where the same note forms are used without implying any rhythm. The alternative term, ‘neume’, is primarily used in relation to the earlier, more cursive chant notations.

³⁷ The term ‘gradual’ refers both to the chant sung from a step—*gradus*—in the ambo after the Epistle reading in Mass, and to the book of Mass chants, which derives its name from the former.

³⁸ ‘Premunitos autem esse uolumus eos maxime qui libros notaturi sunt ne notulas uel coniunctas disi<un>gant. uel coniungant disiuncta<s.> quia per huiusmodi uariationem grauis cantuum oriri potest dissimilitudo;’ (We wish those particularly who will notate books to be forewarned that they should neither separate conjoint notes, nor join together separate notes, because by variation of this sort, a serious difference of chants can arise.)

Similarly, the choice and placement of the clef—the symbol used to indicate the pitches of the stave lines—can vary from manuscript to manuscript without affecting the pitch content of the chant. The employment and positioning of the *fa* and *mi* signs (to indicate whether the pitch *B* should be flat or natural) are also variable: there is some consensus as to when these signs need to be employed, but not all signs are placed at the same point before the note(s) affected; in some cases the *fa/mi* sign is omitted entirely. It is highly unlikely that the omission of a *fa* or *mi* sign would entail a different pitch being sung; instead it is probable that the copyist and/or readers knew or could infer what note should be sung at that point and did not need a sign on the page to remind them.

Overall, it would seem that the Dominicans placed little or no importance on maintaining an identical visual appearance of notation with regards to ligatures, clefs, and *fa* and *mi* signs, which is unsurprising as this made no difference to the performance or legibility of the chant.³⁹ In addition, the fact that the copyists were able to manipulate the appearance of notation without changing its contents is an indication that the copyists were musically literate and that they could understand the meaning of the shapes they were copying.

Another frequent place for variation between manuscripts was the use of vertical lines which separate phrases, or ‘lines of pauses’ (*virgule pausarum*). The rules which open the Dominican antiphoner (quoted above) stated ‘let [...] the lines of pauses be observed’, but in these six manuscripts, and particularly in Kansas J4:2, this rule was not always obeyed. There are four main differences in these Dominican manuscripts. Firstly, a vertical line may be

Transcribed from MS Mount Melleray Abbey, [unnumbered], fo. 1v: a twelfth-century Cistercian antiphoner from Hauterive, Switzerland. The most recent edition and translation of the preface in which these rules are found is Francis J. Guentner (ed.), *Epistola S. Bernardi De revisione cantus cisterciensis et tractatus scriptus ab auctore incerto Cisterciense Cantum quem cisterciensis ordinis ecclesiae cantare consueverant*, *Corpus scriptorum de musica* 24 (Rome, 1974). An earlier edition is given in *Super Antiphonarium Cisterciensis Ordinis*, in *PL* 182, col. 1123.

³⁹ Beban’s findings in this volume support this conclusion.

present in most manuscripts at a given point but missing in one or more manuscripts, and secondly, an extra line may have been drawn where it was not present in most manuscripts. In some cases it seems that a line could be omitted at the end of a stave: it may be that the break of a stave was enough of a juncture to not require a line as well. Thirdly, a double line was occasionally replaced by a single line: a double line was used to demarcate the sections of chant to be sung by the cantor or designated soloist(s).⁴⁰ Fourthly, and more rarely, a double line could be drawn in one manuscript where only a single line was given in the others. Table 1 tallies the instances of these four cases. Compared to the differences between ligature groupings discussed above, which were too numerous to tally,⁴¹ there are far fewer cases of variation involving vertical lines: there are 724 vertical lines in Sabina L1 over Monday to Friday of Holy Week, so the fact that the number of extra or missing lines is mainly in single figures shows that, on the whole, copyists were careful to ensure that the rule regarding *virgule pausarum* was respected. The notable exception is Kansas J4:2, where the chants are inexplicably peppered with numerous extra or missing lines. It could be that the notator copying Kansas J4:2 was less well informed regarding the Dominican norms and rules, or that this manuscript represents a local performing tradition, involving different phrasing (indicated by vertical lines) to the practice laid out in Humbert of Romans's liturgy as found in the three exemplars. It is also possible that the use of vertical lines may have been a visual aspect in the copying of Dominican chant without necessarily requiring a pause or breath at

⁴⁰ This practice is described in the Ordinal MS London, British Library, Additional 23935, fo. 24v: 'De principio autem antiphone inchoari tantum debet usque ad primas duas virgulas simul iunctas' (Regarding the beginning of the antiphon, it should only be begun as far as the first two lines joined together).

⁴¹ In one chant alone, the gradual *Exsurge Domine* for Monday of Holy Week, there are eighteen places at which the notes as presented in Sabina L1 are grouped differently in at least one of the five other sources. As such differences were down to scribal preference, enumerating the numerous instances across the five days would not have been a meaningful activity.

that point, that is to say, that the performance of chant from Kansas J4:2 may not have differed substantially in this respect from the other manuscripts.

Table 1: *Variations in the Placement of Vertical Lines*

	Sabina L1	BL Add. 23935	Esteban 01	Blackfriars 1	Lewis 158	Kansas J4:2
Extra line	3	5		4	8	76
Missing line of which at stave end	3 1	5 1	3	3	8 4	64 7
Single not double line		1		1	1	3
Double not single line		1		1		

After vertical lines, the liquescent plica is the next most common source of differences between the manuscripts. A plica, as it came to be known in thirteenth-century modal theory, is a group of two notes of which the second was probably semi-vocalized to provide a passing note before the next note, an aspect of performance also known as liquescence. It is most commonly found on liquid and nasal consonants, diphthongs, and the

word *et*;⁴² for example, it is not unusual for the word *alleluia* to have a plica at the end of the first and/or third syllables. The pitch of the second, liquescent note is usually one note away from the main note, although sometimes a distance of a third or more is indicated.⁴³ The plica appears to be a particularly ripe source for variation: a single note (on its own or at the end of a ligature) can be transformed into a plica (for example, a single *G* might become *GF* with the *F* being liquescent), or a plica may be stripped down to a single note. In addition, where one manuscript may show a plica (that is, a full note and a liquescent note), another manuscript may show a two-note ligature (that is, two full notes). More rarely, the pitch of the liquescent note may differ from those of the other manuscripts; this only occurs once across the Mass chants sung in Holy Week. All variations involving plicas are tallied in Table 2. Variable treatment of plicas is not particular to the Dominicans: it is not unusual to find variations involving plicas in other chant repertories.⁴⁴ It seems that the presence of a plica was not immutable in Dominican books; it could be expanded into two full notes, removed entirely, or imposed on notes which were not previously liquescent. Nevertheless, the total number of incidences of changes involving plicas is far less prevalent than those involving vertical lines.

Table 2: *Variations Involving Plicas*

⁴² David Hiley, 'Plica', in *Grove Music Online*, ed. L. Macy, <<http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com>>, accessed 18 Dec. 2012. See also: David Hiley, 'The Plica and Liquescence', *Gordon Athol Anderson (1929-1981): in memoriam von seinen Studenten, Freunden und Kollegen*, 2 vols., Musicological Studies 39 (Henryville, 1984), ii, 379-391.

⁴³ Not all music copyists indicated the pitch of the plica's liquescent note when it was greater than a step; in Lewis 158 and the gradual of Esteban 01 the two melodic versions of plica are graphically indistinguishable.

⁴⁴ See e.g. the discussion of changes to plicas in English chant manuscripts in Diane Droste, 'The Musical Notation and Transmission of the Music of the Sarum Use, 1225-1500' (unpubl. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1983), 281-92.

	Sabina L1	BL Add. 23935	Esteban 01	Blackfriars 1	Lewis 158	Kansas J4:2
Single note to plica	1	1		1		2
Plica to single note		1	1		1	2
Full notes to plica	1	1		1		1
Plica to full notes						3
Different liquescent pitch						1

More substantial melodic differences are rare; in their simplest form, the pitch of a single note differed by the interval of a second or sometimes more. Pitches within ligatures were occasionally added, changed or removed, although usually within the melodic contour of the phrase. An example of the latter is found in the gradual *Exsurge Domine*, in which on the first syllable of ‘Dominus’ five of the manuscripts have four notes ascending, *EFGa*, but the *G* has been omitted in Kansas J4:2, leaving *EFa*. As *EFGa* has a different ligature shape from *EFa*, it is clear that the scribe deliberately opted for the latter and that the *G* was not omitted accidentally. Most manuscripts do not have many changes of this kind, except for the gradual Kansas J4:2, which has a greater tendency to alter the chant melody, as seen in Table 3. It may be that differences involving pitches in this way were viewed merely as embellishments or adjustments to the nature of the chant, but such changes were certainly not widespread. It is notable that within the three exemplars, only two instances of this kind of variant occur (a single note has a different pitch in BL Additional 23935; two notes are removed from one ligature in Esteban 01). This may indicate that the copying of the three exemplars was carefully controlled, and thus may also be a sign that such differences were not encouraged.

Table 3: *Variations Involving Addition, Omission, or Changing of Pitches*

	Sabina L1	BL Add. 23935	Esteban 01	Blackfriars 1	Lewis 158	Kansas J4:2
Different pitch (single note)		1				3
Different pitch (within a ligature)				3 (in 2 ligatures ^a)	1	9 (in 8 ligatures)
Added pitch (not on a repeated pitch)				1	2	14 (in 11 ligatures)
Pitch omitted			2 (from 1 ligature)	1		5

^aOne of these ligatures, with two altered pitches (*de* instead of *cd*), is clearly an error: it is found at the start of the second stave of page 162, and the *custos* on the previous stave indicates the correct starting pitch, *c*.

On a few occasions, added or omitted notes occur on repeated pitches, elongating or shortening the length of time spent on a single pitch. Thus a single pitch may be repeated, or one of two notes on the same pitch may be eliminated—or, as is sometimes the case, two repetitions of a pitch may be increased to three, or three decreased to two. One of the principles behind the revised Dominican liturgy was to shorten it, reducing note repetitions

on a single syllable, and curtailing extensive melismas,⁴⁵ thus leaving more time for study.⁴⁶ The occasional inclusion of an extra repeated pitch may be a hangover from previous traditions, whereas the exclusion of repeated pitches may represent the application of this principle. Owing to the fact that it did not alter the melodic contour of the chant, the repetition or omission of such pitches may have been viewed as acceptable ‘changes’ without necessarily disobeying the rules forbidding changes to notes. Nonetheless, such changes were much less frequent than, for example, changes involving plicas, and are only found in two of the six manuscripts examined here (see Table 4).

Table 4: *Variations Involving Repeated Pitches*

	Sabina	BL	Esteban	Blackfriars	Lewis	Kansas
	L1	Add. 23935	01	1	158	J4:2
Added repeated pitch					1	3
Repeated pitch omitted						2

One notable difference is found in Lewis 158, fo. 133v: it omits the notated antiphon incipit and psalm incipit for Maundy Thursday, ‘*A. Calicem Ps. Credidi*’, which is provided in the five other manuscripts. This omission may be owing to the fact that Lewis 158 is a notated missal whereas the other manuscripts under comparison are all graduals, and thus they fulfilled slightly different purposes. Lewis 158 contains the same items and rubrics at

⁴⁵ Dominique Delalande, *Le graduel des Prêcheurs : Recherches sur les sources et la valeur de son texte*, Bibliothèque d’histoire dominicaine 2 (Paris, 1949), 36-44.

⁴⁶ As Humbert wrote as part of his *Expositiones* on the Dominican Constitutions, ‘*Melius est autem breve officium cum studio quam prolixum cum impedimento studii*’ (A short Office with study is better than a long [Office] with study hindered): Humbert of Romans, *Exp.*, 97.

this point as the plenary missal (*Missale minorum altarium*) of the exemplar Sabina L1 (fo. 472r).

In none of these contexts is there a trend for changes to be located at a certain point within the chant—at the end of the chant, at the beginnings of phrases, on certain pitches, and so on—or in certain genres of chant as opposed to others. Admittedly, the sample of chant used here, from Monday to Friday of Holy Week, was quite small, and clearer trends may emerge from a wider comparison.⁴⁷ Whilst many of the variants tallied above were unique to one manuscript (particularly those in Kansas J4:2), there were some occasions in which two or more of the manuscripts shared the same difference. In around half of the cases where one of the three exemplars displays a difference involving a vertical line or a plica, the same difference is also seen in at least one other manuscript. Shared ‘variants’ are less common in other contexts: there is only one instance of a variant involving pitches (namely, an added pitch) found in more than one manuscript: in Lewis 158 and Kansas J4:2. These shared differences cannot be arranged into a clear stemma. Instead, they point to a common set of principles behind the performance of Dominican chant, implying that many of these differences were not random or erroneous, but may have represented acceptable or normal ways of performing the liturgy.

The Nature of the ‘Variants’

Within Dominican chant, the ligatures and clefs, the use of vertical lines between phrases, the use of plicas, the repetition of pitches, and changes to notes and ligatures, could all be altered

⁴⁷ Beban’s survey of office chants in this volume found that the insertion of a repeated pitch often occurs in specific phrases in mode 4 and mode 8 responsories. This may reflect a different practice of executing certain stock phrases in Dalmatia.

without necessarily deviating from what was deemed to be the correct version of the chant. Given that these manuscripts were made in such close proximity to one another—both in time and place—it would seem likely that their production was carefully controlled to ensure that they contained the correct copy of the liturgy, and particularly so in the case of the exemplars which were produced specifically to disseminate Humbert’s revised liturgy. As a result, it might be necessary to think of these ‘differences’ not as changes, errors, or rule-breaking per se, but instead at least some of them can be thought of as allowable differences, that is, ‘changes’ that were not considered at the time to be deviations from the uniform liturgy, probably owing to the oral culture within which the liturgy was practised. As posited above, it was precisely because of the oral nature of the liturgy that it had to be revised in the first place: so that once learnt by heart it would be easy to move from convent to convent without having to adjust to different liturgical practices. Although the revised liturgy was issued in the form of written exemplars, and all books were to be updated to match, it is highly unlikely that the daily Dominican liturgy switched from being practised orally to being book-based as a result of the reform.

Among the types of variation, those affecting the presentation of the chant, and possibly also those involving vertical lines, may be thought of as written or graphic variants: variants which appear different on the page but would not have altered how the music was sung. It is perhaps natural that within an oral culture, the visual presentation of ligature groups and lines of pauses could vary from manuscript to manuscript: as long as the notation was legible, it did not matter what the chant looked like, what mattered was how it was sung.⁴⁸ This visual flexibility is likewise found in the practice of text scribes, who could

⁴⁸ Christian Leitmeir’s contribution in this volume discusses the Dominican concern for chant to be sung in an appropriate, manly fashion.

employ different abbreviations for a word or write the word in full, all of which were legitimate ways of presenting the same word.

The variations involving plicas, repeated pitches, and changes to notes or ligatures can be thought of as ‘sonic’ or sung variants, and these were significantly less numerous than the ‘graphic’ variants. In oral cultures, a certain degree of ‘fluidity’ is a feature of the music; early chant comprised memorable and repeatable patterns that would have facilitated its recollection.⁴⁹ By the thirteenth century, although Dominican chant was predominantly ‘fixed’, this still allowed for various small permutations, such as exchanging a plicated pair of notes for either two full notes or a single note. Overall, it would seem that the Dominican perspective on a ‘uniform’ liturgy entailed a chant repertory which allowed for occasional minor ‘sonic’ variation, affecting the quality of the notes or the degree of embellishment, and was much freer with regards to written variations.

The Extent of Uniformity in Dominican Chant Books

Despite the differences enumerated above, the six manuscripts, even Kansas J4:2, are remarkably similar for a time when this was by no means the norm. Other religious orders, such as the Cistercians, had less success in establishing a uniform liturgy.⁵⁰ The Cistercian Order undertook two reforms of their liturgy and chant in the twelfth century, and produced a

⁴⁹ See e.g. the discussion of the Offertory *Factus est dominus* in Leo Treitler, ‘Medieval Improvisation’, *With Voice and Pen: Coming to Know Medieval Song and How it was Made* (Oxford, 2003), 1-38.

⁵⁰ David Chadd, ‘Liturgy and Liturgical Music: the Limits of Uniformity’, in Christopher Norton and David Park (eds.) *Cistercian Art and Architecture in the British Isles* (Cambridge, 1986), 299-314; Alberich Martin Altermatt, “Id quod magis authenticum...”: Die Liturgiereform der ersten Zisterzienser’, in Martin Klöckener and Benedikt Kranemann (eds.) *Liturgiereformen: historische Studien zu einem bleibenden Grundzug des christlichen Gottesdienstes*, 2 vols. (Münster, 2002), i. 304-324.

single exemplar manuscript, now MS Dijon, Bibliothèque municipale, 114.⁵¹ To demonstrate the comparable success of the Dominican reform, I have tallied in Table 5 the number of differences across the same five-day period between two Cistercian graduals: MS Warsaw, Biblioteka narodowa, 12496 IV, possibly copied in Poland in the second half of the thirteenth century; and MS Heidelberg, Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. Sal. 9,67, from Salem in Southern Germany, c.1225.⁵²

Table 5: *Variations Between Two Cistercian Sources, Compared with Kansas J4:2*

	Cistercian sources	Kansas J4:2
Plica/single note	20	4
Plica/full notes	18	4
Different plica pitch	0	1
Different pitch	11	12
Added/omitted pitch (not repeated)	6	19
Repeated pitch added/omitted	19	5
End of melisma curtailed	2	0
Alleluia/Amen omitted	2 ^b	0

⁵¹ Numerous studies of the Cistercian chant reform have been published, including Solutor Rudolphe Marosszéki, *Les origines du chant cistercien : recherches sur les réformes du plain-chant cistercien au XII^e siècle*, *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis* 8, fasc. 1-2 (Rome, 1952); Chrysogonus Waddell, 'The Origin and Early Evolution of the Cistercian Antiphony: Reflections on Two Cistercian Chant Reforms', in M. Basil Pennington (ed.), *The Cistercian Spirit: A Symposium in Memory of Thomas Merton*, *Cistercian Studies* 3 (Shannon, 1970), 190-223.

⁵² As the Gradual in Warsaw contains no vertical lines and those in the Heidelberg Gradual appear to have been added later, no comparison has been made on this basis. The two manuscripts are available to view online at the following addresses respectively: <<http://polona.pl/item/2233461/0/>>, accessed 17 Feb. 2015; <<http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/salIX67>>, accessed 24 Nov. 2014.

Notated incipit omitted	5	0
Full chant in one source, incipit in other	2	0
Verse omitted	2	0
Chant transposed by a fifth	1	0

^bThe omitted alleluia has been added to the margin of fo. 33r by a different hand

Unlike the Dominican manuscripts above, which were all copied in one city and within a couple of decades of one another, the two Cistercian manuscripts were produced in separate contexts, so it is entirely possible that they represent less closely related traditions than the Dominican books. Nevertheless, the number of differences between the two Cistercian graduals is significantly higher than those in Dominican sources, even compared to Kansas J4:2, which was the most ‘deviant’ of the Dominican manuscripts. In particular, there are a striking number of cases in the Cistercian sources where a plica in one manuscript was presented as either a single note or as two full notes in the other, and where an added or omitted note occurs on a repeated pitch. There are also a number of more substantial differences, not seen in Dominican sources, between the two Cistercian graduals: one chant is transposed by a fifth, and in various cases part or all of a chant is absent in one of the manuscripts. Even though the number of Cistercian differences does not always outnumber those in Kansas J4:2, it should be remembered that Kansas J4:2 is not representative of the Dominican sources examined here, which have far fewer instances of such variations. It can thus be seen that, at a time when strict uniformity was unusual, the Dominican Order was by comparison remarkably successful in producing six books which largely conformed to the principle of uniformity.

While the Dominicans strove to maintain a uniform liturgy, some local variation can be seen in the choice of saints venerated liturgically, and the grade of their feasts, thus

affecting the *Sanctorale*—the yearly cycle of saints celebrated in the liturgy. It appears that there was some latitude for the admission of certain saints into a provincial or local calendar even if they were not celebrated across the order. For example, in the fourteenth century, lections for six British saints were added to the thirteenth-century breviary MS British Library, Royal 2 A.xi, alongside lections for various new Dominican feasts.⁵³ This would have enabled the Dominican house, presumably somewhere in England or Wales, to supplement the standard Dominican liturgy with proper lections for saints particular to their region on a small number of days over the year. A similar example of local celebration is found in the fourteenth-century manuscripts from a house of Dominican nuns, Saint-Louis de Poissy, which celebrate the feast of St Louis as *totum duplex* instead of *simplex* as commanded in the acts of the Dominican general chapter.⁵⁴ The addition or elevation of local saints may have gone against the will for uniformity, and certainly if their feasts came to colonise the calendars of individual priories and nunneries, the uniformity of the order's liturgy would have been jeopardized. However, these examples do not present major incursions to the liturgical year and would not have affected the normal pattern of daily uniform worship. Moreover, it is unsurprising that Dominicans, like all other religious communities, continued to venerate saints particular to their church, area or order—for the saints would have been the most likely candidates to support them, protect them and petition on their behalf.

Certain German houses of Dominican nuns composed new sequences to venerate local saints and also to celebrate feasts that were added to or raised in the Dominican

⁵³ Richard William Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History* (Cambridge, 2009), 314-315.

⁵⁴ Joan M. Naughton, 'Books for a Dominican Nuns' Choir: Illustrated Liturgical Manuscripts at Saint-Louis de Poissy, c. 1330-1350', in Margaret M. Manion and Bernard James Muir (eds.) *The Art of the Book: Its Place in Medieval Worship* (Exeter, 1998), 67-110.

calendar.⁵⁵ If all Dominican houses created their own liturgy each time a new feast was instituted then the ideal of uniformity would soon have been put under strain. With no exemplars issued after those in the mid thirteenth century, it is unclear how the liturgy for new feasts was disseminated. The genre of the sequence may have allowed for more creativity than other elements of the liturgy—it does not follow that all chants for new feasts would have been composed locally. Perhaps the composition of sequences in Dominican nunneries was acceptable because, unlike the brothers, nuns were not itinerant and thus were less affected by local differences.

The Dominican endeavour to establish a single uniform liturgy was not without its challenges, let alone resistance from within the Order. Yet the resounding success of the Dominican endeavour to achieve uniformity is borne out by the comparative lack of variance in early manuscripts, even if there were some differences in the veneration of local saints. Close conformity among the exemplars, itself remarkable, is perhaps not wholly unsurprising; that newly copied books are similarly successful is all the more impressive. All six manuscripts examined here are a testament to the Dominicans' thorough approach and their determination for liturgical uniformity.

⁵⁵ I thank Margot Fassler for sharing her work with me prior to publication: Margot Fassler, 'The Late Sequence: An Introduction to its Form and Function in Dominican Practice', in Jeffrey F. Hamburger, Eva Schlotheuber, Susan Marti and Margot Fassler (eds.) *Liturgical Life and Latin Learning at Paradies bei Soest, 1300-1425: Inscription and Illumination in the Choir Books of a North German Dominican Convent* (Münster, 2016), 211-229.