

Franciscan Liturgy and Identities

**The Codex Sancti Paschalis
and Networks of Manuscript Production
in Umbria, 1280–1350**

by

Anna Elizabeth Welch

A thesis submitted

in fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Melbourne College of Divinity

2011

Abstract

This dissertation analyses manuscript production networks operating in late-thirteenth- and early-fourteenth-century Umbria. It focuses on liturgical Franciscan manuscripts decorated by the ateliers of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno (active c. 1280) and Maestro Venturella di Pietro (active c. 1317), including the Codex Sancti Paschalis. This micro-history of Franciscan liturgical activity reassesses methodologies pertinent to manuscript production networks and aims to stimulate reflection on both the construction of communal identity through ritual activity and historiographic trends regarding this process.

Declaration of Originality

I hereby certify that this dissertation contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other institution, and affirm that to the best of my knowledge the dissertation contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text of the dissertation.

Acknowledgements

It is with gratitude and affection that I acknowledge the many people who have enabled me to complete this dissertation.

My principal supervisors, Dr Claire Renkin and Professor Constant Mews, have been a consistent source of guidance, knowledge and kindness. I also gratefully acknowledge and thank Rev. Dr Paul Chandler O.Carm, Dr Barry Collett, Professor William M. Johnston and Professor emeritus Margaret Manion, who supported and guided the project in its earlier stages. I am privileged and thankful to have been mentored by all these scholars.

The Province of the Holy Spirit of the Order of Friars Minor has supported me both financially and personally since the beginning of this research in 2005. I especially thank Fr Stephen Bliss OFM, Fr Paul Smith OFM (current Provincial Vicar), Fr Campion Murray OFM and Fr Angelo O'Hagan OFM for their friendship and belief in this project.

I thank the Melbourne College of Divinity for its support of my studies and for the provision of an Australian Postgraduate Award to fund this research. I particularly thank Dr Mark Lindsay and Rev. Dr Michael Kelly CSsR. My thanks also go to the Australian European University Institute Fellowship Association, which, by awarding me a postgraduate fellowship at the European University Institute in 2007, facilitated the bulk of my research in Italian manuscript collections. I thank Federica Parretti and everyone at the Villa Palmerino for their hospitality and friendship during my time in Firenze. I also thank the ARC-funded Network for Early European Research (NEER), which has provided me with many opportunities for training and for the exchange of ideas with my fellow Australian postgraduates and with established researchers.

I thank the wonderful librarians, archivists, conservators and museum staff who have so generously facilitated my research, especially those at the following institutions: St Paschal Library (Order of Friars Minor, Box Hill, Melbourne), the

State Library of Victoria (Melbourne), the Academic Centre Library (Newman and St Mary's Colleges, the University of Melbourne), the Museo Capitolare (Perugia), the Biblioteca Augusta (Perugia), the Sacro Convento (Assisi), the Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca (Cortona) and the Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana (Firenze). My special thanks to Katrina Ben (State Library of Victoria), who generously allowed me to witness and learn from the conservation and rebinding of the Codex Sancti Paschalis.

I thank my family and friends for their unconditional support throughout this research. I dedicate this work to you all. My special thanks to Miranda Fyfield, Martin Welch, Julian Welch, Andrew Ritchie, Elisa Webb and Gene Flenady for graphic design, editorial work, the location of obscure reference material, and late-night discussions of medieval Franciscan liturgy over comforting pots of tea.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Declaration of Originality	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vii
List of Figures	xi
Introduction	1
Limitations	3
Terms and Definitions.....	4
The Provenance of the Codex Sancti Paschalis	6
Previous Studies of the Codex Sancti Paschalis	11
This Dissertation’s Approach: Chapter Outlines	16
Chapter One: The Silent Parchment? A New Methodology for the Study of Missals	16
Chapter Two: Quarrelling Brothers – Liturgy and Identity, 1209–1274	17
Chapter Three: The Order of Friars Minor and the Book	18
Chapter Four: Calendars – Comparing the Evidence.....	20
Chapter Five: Celebrating Saints – Articulating Communal Identity through Liturgy.....	20
Chapter One The Silent Parchment? A New Methodology for the Study of Missals	23
1.1 The Historiography of Illuminated Liturgical Manuscripts.....	23
1.2 Art History and the Codex Sancti Paschalis	26
1.3 Selection Rationale for the Missals Under Study	38
1.3 Towards a New Model for Manuscript Studies: Liturgical History meets Ritual and Performance Theory	42
Chapter Two Quarrelling Brothers – Liturgy and Identity, 1209–1274	49
2.1 The Accepted Narrative of Franciscan Liturgical History.....	49
2.2 Franciscan Liturgy: the Regula Editions?	53

2.2.1 The Regula Missal	54
2.2.2 The Regula Breviary	61
2.3 Elias of Cortona to Haymo of Faversham: the Concept of a Second Founder .	65
2.3.1 Haymo’s Ordinal.....	70
2.3.2 The Question of Liturgical Unity.....	72
2.4 John of Parma to Bonaventure: the Difficulties of Achieving Liturgical Unity	73
2.5 The Friars Minor, Liturgy and Identity in the Thirteenth Century	76
Chapter Three The Order of Friars Minor and the Book	83
3.1 The Scribes.....	84
3.2 The Miniaturists	90
3.2.1 Friar-miniaturists in a scriptorium in Assisi?.....	92
3.2.2 Scholarly conceptualisation of a simplistic Franciscan decorative style and its meaning	96
3.3 ‘ <i>Pauperistico</i> ’? Franciscan spirituality in Perugian miniatures.....	113
3.3.1 Crucifixion miniatures from the selected missals	114
3.4 Conclusions.....	131
Chapter Four Calendars – Comparing the Evidence	133
4.1 The Historiography and Methodology of Studying Sainthood, Liturgical Calendars and the Commemoration of Saints.....	134
4.2 Short Catalogue Entries for CSP and B–E: Codicology and Provenance.....	138
4.4 The Calendars Compared.....	149
4.5 Conclusions	177
Chapter Five Celebrating Saints – Articulating Communal Identity through Liturgy.....	179
5.1 Selection of Feasts for Analysis; Methodology	179
5.2 The Feasts in CSP and B–E	183
5.2.1 Feasts of St Francis	183
5.2.2 Feasts of St Anthony of Padua.....	185
5.2.3 Feasts of St Clare	187
5.2.4 Feast of Elisabeth of Hungary.....	189
5.2.5 Feast of St Louis of Toulouse	190
5.2.6 Feast of St Louis IX, King of France	190
5.2.7 Feasts of St Herculanus, bishop of Perugia.....	191
5.2.8 Feast of Ubaldo, patron saint of Gubbio	192
5.2.9 Feast of St Dominic.....	192
5.2.10 Feast of St Peter Martyr (of Verona)	193
5.2.11 Feast of Augustine of Hippo	193

5.2.12 Feast of St Bernard of Clairvaux.....	194
5.2.13 Feasts of the Virgin.....	194
5.3. Categories of Interpretation.....	198
5.3.1 Rubrication.....	198
5.3.2 Wording of the entries.....	199
5.3.3 Inclusion/exclusion of localised feasts in a) calendar and b) Proper of the Saints.....	200
5.3.4 Inclusion/exclusion of feasts from other orders (i.e. Dominicans and Cistercians).....	201
5.3.5 Relationship to Roman Curia's calendar.....	202
5.3.6 Additions and absences.....	203
5.3.7 Adherence to Haymo's Ordinal.....	205
Conclusions and Directions for Future Research The Codex Sancti Paschalis from the Thirteenth to the Twenty-first Centuries.....	207
Reflections on the Liturgy's Role in the Construction of Communal Identity amongst the Medieval Order of Friars Minor.....	207
The Codex Sancti Paschalis as a Site of Communal Memory.....	217
Bibliography.....	221
1. Primary.....	221
1.1 Manuscripts consulted.....	222
2. Secondary.....	224
Appendix.....	243
Liturgical Contents of the Codex Sancti Paschalis.....	243
Calendar.....	243
Advent and Christmastide.....	243
Lent and Eastertide.....	246
Ordinary of the Mass.....	250
Eastertide.....	252
Season after Pentecost.....	254
Inserted Addition.....	256
Sanctoral – Proper of the Saints.....	256
Common of the Saints.....	263
Votive Masses.....	264
Sacraments.....	269
Additions.....	269

List of Figures

Figure 1 – CSP, incipit page, f. 7r.....	101
Figure 2 – B, decorated initial, f. 148r.	103
Figure 3 – C, decorated initial, f. 102v..	105
Figure 4 – D, historiated initial of St Francis receiving the stigmata, f. 255v.	107
Figure 5 – E, decorated initial, f. 6v.....	109
Figure 6 – E, decorated initial of St Dominic, f. 253r.....	111
Figure 7 – CSP, Crucifixion miniature, f. 182r.....	127
Figure 8 – B, Crucifixion miniature, f. 148v.	129
Figure 9 – January.....	152
Figure 10 – February.....	154
Figure 11 – March.....	156
Figure 12 – April.....	158
Figure 13 – May.....	160
Figure 14 – June.....	162
Figure 15 – July.....	164
Figure 16 – August.....	166
Figure 17 – September.....	168
Figure 18 – October.....	170
Figure 19 – November.....	172
Figure 20 – December.....	174

Introduction

That the question has ever been not only asked but seriously debated, whether History was an art, is certainly one of the curiosities of human ineptitude. What else can it possibly be? It is obvious that History is not a science: it is obvious that History is not the accumulation of facts, but the relation of them. Only the pedantry of incomplete academic persons could have given birth to such a monstrous supposition. Facts relating to the past, when they are collected without art, are compilations; and compilations, no doubt, may be useful; but they are no more History than butter, eggs, salt and herbs are an omlette.¹

Its notable charm aside, the eminent Edwardian Lytton Strachey's description of history has (perhaps unexpected) relevance to this dissertation's conceptual approach to the study of the Order of Friars Minor. Liturgical history is all too often perceived as a dry and 'scientific' discipline, wherein the highly detailed comparison of similarities and dissimilarities amongst the manuscript traditions of particular liturgies usually results in exactly the kind of 'useful compilations' that Strachey derides. In its investigation of the role of liturgy within the Order of Friars Minor, this dissertation explores an area seldom researched since Stephen J.P. van Dijk OFM's pioneering work from the 1940s to the 1970s, and has done so through the analysis of manuscripts which themselves have been studied infrequently outside the discipline of art history.

The underlying aim of this dissertation's methodological approach is to enliven the study of liturgical manuscripts – to highlight that such manuscripts are not only the source of information about textual liturgical changes, but also significant sites of cultural memory for individual communities. Through the analysis of five particular missals, this dissertation will investigate to what extent liturgy was used in the construction and maintenance of communal spiritual identity by Umbrian houses of friars, and will offer some alternative readings of the methods used by the friars to

¹ Lytton Strachey, "Gibbon", in *Portraits in Miniature and Other Essays* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1962), 158.

forge their Franciscan identities. It is a micro-history of Franciscan liturgical practice in Umbria, and raises issues relevant to the methodologies of liturgical history and manuscript studies more broadly.

The five missals studied in depth by this dissertation are:

CSP: Melbourne, State Library of Victoria, Rare Books Collection, Codex Sancti Paschalis. A late thirteenth-century Umbrian Franciscan missal (post-1297).

B: Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Ms. Gaddi 7. Late-thirteenth-century Umbrian Franciscan missal.

C: Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 13. Late-thirteenth-century missal (possibly Franciscan), made for use in Gubbio.

D: Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 14. Early-fourteenth-century missal (possibly made for use in San Francesco, Cortona).

E: Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 267. Early-fourteenth-century Augustinian missal.

These missals were created for and used by communities in central Italy (Perugia, Cortona, Gubbio and possibly Assisi) in the late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries. Art historians have identified their decorative programmes as the work of the Perugian ateliers of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno (active c. 1270–1280) and Venturella di Pietro (active c. 1317). The manuscripts decorated by these ateliers (some 36 have been identified so far) are neither exclusively Franciscan nor exclusively liturgical (the non-liturgical manuscripts associated with the group are theological texts); both workshops were active in decorating a wide variety of books for Franciscan, Augustinian and secular clerical clients. Though this grouping has been discussed extensively by Italian art historians, it has not been assigned a name. This dissertation proposes (and will use) the name 'Perugian Liturgical Group' for the grouping, although it is acknowledged that not all the manuscripts included in the grouping are, strictly speaking, liturgical books, and that in some cases it is not possible to definitively prove Perugian origin.

The relationships between specific communities of friars and commercial miniaturists remain obscure: there has yet to be a systematic study of these particular manuscript production networks. This dissertation, particularly Chapter Three (The Order of Friars Minor and the Book), goes some way towards opening the discussion. While records from within the Order regarding the production of books are scarce,

some conclusions can still be drawn about the Order's attitude to liturgical books, in particular by analysing the surviving manuscripts and considering previous methodological approaches to the subject. In this way, I shall explore the impact of manuscript production networks on the content of such manuscripts, and thus on the ritual communal liturgical activity of houses of friars.

Limitations

The limitations of this project must be clearly stated from the outset, as the manuscripts discussed here suggest a great many areas of potential interest that cannot all be included in one study. In the last hundred years, there has been a proliferation of scholarship about Francis of Assisi, his order and his cult.² While this study discusses the ritual commemoration of Francis and other saints of importance to the Order of Friars Minor, and thus in some sense discusses the cults of these saints, it does so with specific reference to the selected manuscripts and to the field of liturgical history. For this reason, scholarship that addresses the issue of Francis's cult (and those of other major Franciscan saints) from other methodological approaches is not regularly cited, though it of course informs the context that underpins this study. Similarly, while this study discusses the communities of friars who used the selected missals, it does so without seeking to name these communities, in part because such clarity is not possible from the known provenance of the missals. Thus, no specific discussion of Franciscan houses in Umbria is undertaken.³

² Some major studies are: Paul Sabatier, *The Life of St Francis of Assisi*, trans. L. Seymour Houghton (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1894); John R.H. Moorman, *Richest of Poor Men: The Spirituality of St Francis of Assisi* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1982); Margaret Carney (OSF), *The First Franciscan Woman: Clare of Assisi & Her Form of Life* (Quincy, Illinois: Franciscan Press, 1993); Jeryldene Wood, *Women, Art and Spirituality: The Poor Clares of Early Modern Italy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); Michael Robson (OFM Conv.), *St Francis of Assisi: The Legend and the Life* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1997); Chiara Frugoni, *Francis of Assisi: A Life* (London: SCM Press, 1998); David Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans: From Protest to Persecution in the Century after Saint Francis* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State Press, 2001); Jacques Dalarun, *The Misadventure of Francis of Assisi: Toward a Historical Use of the Legends*, trans. E. Hagman (OFM Cap.) (New York: The Franciscan Institute, St Bonaventure University, 2002); Jacques Dalarun, *Francis of Assisi and the Feminine* (St Bonaventure, New York: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2006); Michael Robson, *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006); Jacques Dalarun, *Uno sguardo oltre: donne, letterate e sante nel movimento dell'Osservanza francescana: atti della I Giornata di studio sull'Osservanza francescana e femminile*, 11 novembre 2006, Monastero Clarisse S. Lucia, Foligno (Assisi: Porziuncola, 2007); Lezlie Knox, *Creating Clare of Assisi: Female Franciscan Identities in Late Medieval Italy* (Leiden: Brill, 2008); William J. Short OFM, "The Changing Face of Christian Spirituality: the Franciscan Tradition", *Spiritus: A Journal of Christian Spirituality* 8:2 (2008): 128–134; Cynthia Ho, Beth A. Mulvaney and John K. Downey, *Finding St Francis in Literature and Art* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009).

³ Studies which discuss particularities of Franciscan houses in Perugia include: John. R.H. Moorman,

Although all five missals are noted, the musical content of these manuscripts will not be discussed. This is a practical limitation; extensive musicological knowledge is necessary to discuss such aspects adequately. While reference is made to musical notation where necessary – primarily in the context of previous scholarship – it is left to future studies to explore this aspect of the selected missals more fully.

As this study concentrates on the liturgical calendars of the selected missals, discussion of the offices included in the sanctoral cycles of these missals is necessarily limited. Chapter Four (which presents the liturgical evidence from the selected missals) discusses this decision in greater depth, while the analysis of this evidence (in Chapter Five) suggests the complexity of studying the relationship between calendars and sanctoral cycles. The discussion generated in this study will suggest fruitful ways in which future scholarship might approach this complicated relationship.

Terms and Definitions

Before introducing the main questions and themes of what follows, it is necessary to identify certain terms and conventions that are frequently employed. The first is my use of the term ‘Franciscan’. While this term was not introduced until the sixteenth century, it has been widely adopted by many scholars to discuss the pre-sixteenth-century history of the Order of Friars Minor, as it is both convenient and simple. For this reason, and with an awareness of the term’s historical usage, I have used it here to refer to members of the Order. Similarly, the term ‘friar’ refers to male members of the Order of Friars Minor, unless otherwise specified.

The term ‘miniaturist’ is employed throughout to refer to those artists who specialised in painting miniatures in manuscripts. Although documents from the period do refer to Perugian miniaturists as ‘painters’ (as discussed in Chapters One and Three), it would appear that this convention is specific to Perugia: though a miniaturist may also have painted monumental pieces, outside Perugia artists were

Medieval Franciscan Houses (New York: The Franciscan Institute, St Bonaventure University, 1983) and Anna Imelde Galletti, “Insediamento e primo sviluppo dei frati minori a Perugia”, in *Francescanesimo e società cittadina*, ed. Ugolino Nicolini (Perugia: Centro per il Collegamento degli Studi Medievali e Umanistici nell’Università di Perugia, 1979), 21–23. For a discussion of the relationships between friars and cities in general, see: Antonio Rigon, “Fratelli minori e società locali”, in *Francesco d’Assisi e il primo secolo di storia francescana*, ed. Maria Pia Alberzoni et al. (Turin: Einaudi, 1997), 259–281. For discussion of medieval Perugia’s social history, see: Sarah Rubin Blanshei, “Perugia, 1260–1340: Conflict and Change in a Medieval Italian Urban Society”, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, New Series 66:2 (1976): 1–128.

usually distinguished by their main artistic discipline, and known as a painter, miniaturist, sculptor, etc. Given that this study deals exclusively with miniatures, it seems appropriate to maintain the distinction between ‘painter’ and ‘miniaturist’ within the context of this research.

The name ‘Maestro di Deruta-Salerno’ is used in its Italian form. It was coined by Italian art historians and has not been widely used by non-Italian scholars, as the miniaturist in question has not been studied outside Italy. Similarly, proper names such as ‘Venturella di Pietro’ and the names of relevant Italian cities are given in their Italian form, as there is nothing gained from their translation. The one exception to this usage is the city of Rome, which is consistently given in its English, to avoid confusion over its use in the phrase ‘Use of Rome’. As is standard in many scholarly texts, words in languages other than English are italicised, with the exception of proper names. English translations of longer textual passages in languages other than English are given in the footnotes. Words such as ‘mass’ and ‘octave’ are capitalised when used in reference to a specific feast, and left in lower case where used in a general sense. Capitalisation of the titles of articles and books written in languages other than English follows that used in the original publication.

In the tables of data from the liturgical calendars of the five missals studied (Chapter Four) and in the ensuing discussion (Chapter Five), these missals are referred to by the sigla assigned above to maintain clarity and brevity. These letters do not follow a previous convention for discussion of the manuscripts, simply because no previous study exists. It is not anticipated that these assignments will necessarily be maintained in future scholarly works: here, they are used for clarity.

On a similar note, for brevity’s sake the Codex Sancti Paschalis is frequently referred to in this study as ‘CSP’. Initially, this manuscript was known only as ‘Messale’ or ‘Codex Missalis’; it was given its current name by Celsus Kelly OFM when bought in 1949 for the friars of St Paschal College, Box Hill, Melbourne (discussed below). As with the alphabetical assignments discussed above, the abbreviation ‘CSP’ is not a standardised norm; the missal has not been the subject of enough scholarship to have generated a standard form of reference. The scholarship that has studied it has not sought or used a standard name: Italian scholars still frequently refer to the missal as a ‘*messale francescano*’ kept in Australia, indicating that one of its most distinguishing features to European scholars is its current location in the Antipodes.

The Provenance of the Codex Sancti Paschalis

Every research project begins with a point of departure, from which the study launches into new intellectual territory; in the present case, that point was the CSP. A thirteenth-century illuminated manuscript in an Australian collection is a relatively rare object; while Australia's libraries hold an impressive array of medieval and renaissance manuscripts, the CSP lays claim to being one of the earliest Western Christian illuminated liturgical books in this country. Despite this, it has attracted relatively little detailed study; only two comprehensive studies of the missal have been written (those of Celsus Kelly OFM and Margaret Manion, discussed below). The absence of scholarly discussion of the CSP is, no doubt, due to the peculiarities of its provenance and acquisition history, which are discussed below. It is anticipated that most readers of this dissertation will not be familiar with the CSP. Since it forms the backbone of this dissertation's investigation into Franciscan liturgical identity, it is necessary, then, to summarise here the manuscript's known history and its journey to Australia. A more detailed codicological description of the missal is reserved for Chapter Four, which introduces the liturgical evidence from the CSP and its four related missals.

While the original community that used the CSP may never be identified, scholars are agreed that it is of Umbrian provenance, and that it was very likely decorated by Perugian miniaturists. Whether or not the CSP was in constant use during its first three hundred years is not definitively known; it seems likely that it fell into disuse at some point (or was improperly cared for wherever it was stored), as the water-damaged condition of some of its folios (particularly in the first and last quires) indicates time spent in a damp environment without a cover. Given the many glosses in later hands that appear in the CSP, it seems likely that the missal was in daily use for at least some of these early centuries. Further analysis of these glosses is required to investigate the impact of the Tridentine reforms on the use (or disuse) of the CSP.

There is no mention of the CSP in documentary records until 1848, when it was purchased by Sir Thomas Phillipps (the famous English bibliophile) through the English booksellers Payne & Foss.⁴ The evidence attesting to Phillipps's ownership of the CSP is firm – until its recent rebinding by the State Library of Victoria, the

⁴ *The Phillipps Manuscripts. Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum in Bibliotheca D. Thomae Phillipps, BT. Impressum Tupis medio-montanis 1837–1871*, with an introduction by A.N.L. Munby (London: The Holland Press, 1968), 216.

binding bore Phillipps's distinctive small green seal of the lion rampant device, with the note '12289 Ph' (the CSP's catalogue number in Phillipps collection). Also present was the binder's label, reading 'Bretherton ligavit 1848'. (George Bretherton was the binder employed by Phillipps at Middle Hill.⁵)

There is some confusion regarding the CSP's provenance in Italy prior to Phillipps's ownership.⁶ The eminent Franciscan scholar A.G. Little wrote a detailed description of Ms. 12290 of the Phillipps collection, which he purchased in 1910.⁷ In a footnote to his detailed work on Ms. 12290, Little observed that both it and the CSP (Ms. 12289 of the Phillipps collection) were part of a small group of Franciscan manuscripts listed as part of the codices that Phillipps had purchased from the abbey of Fossanova, as cited in the printed catalogue of Phillipps's collection.⁸ However, whether all of these manuscripts actually came from the Cistercian abbey of St Stefano, Fossanova, is uncertain.⁹ That some of the manuscripts listed in the Phillipps catalogue as coming from Fossanova actually came from the ancient Benedictine abbey of Nonantola, near Modena, after being taken to the Cistercian Bibliotheca Sessoriana of the church of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, in Rome, was established

⁵ Keith Val Sinclair, *Descriptive Catalogue of Medieval and Renaissance Western Manuscripts in Australia* (Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1969), 297.

⁶ I am very grateful to Prof. Constant Mews for his interest in and research into the CSP's provenance, which has contributed most significantly to the following discussion.

⁷ This manuscript contained the Rules of Francis and of the brothers with associated commentaries, an important Latin version of the *Fioretti di San Francesco* (accounts of the Life of Francis with a strongly Spiritual Franciscan flavour), chapters from the *Speculum Perfectionis* and various other writings, including those of Peter Auriol, Bonaventure, the Five Masters and Peter John Olivi. The manuscript, copied in the early fifteenth century, carries a note affirming that it was written on the order of friar Laurent de Rieti, minister of the province of St Anthony (i.e. of Venice). Upon his death, A.G. Little bequeathed the manuscript to the Bodleian Library, Oxford, where it is now has the shelfmark lat. th. d. 31.

⁸ A.G. Little, "Description of a Franciscan Manuscript formerly in the Phillipps Library now in the Possession of A.G. Little", *Publications of the British Society of Franciscan Studies* V (1914): 9–14. As well as 12290, the group included the following manuscripts of Franciscan provenance: 12887, a *Breviarium* (sold in 1903); 12888, a *Breviarium* from the Franciscans in Siena (now Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, McClean 60); 12289 (CSP, the Franciscan missal); and 12302 *Li Fioretti, Leg. De S. Clara* ("olim pauperarum [sic] sorarum [sic] de Fabriano", now in the Rylands library). In the Phillipps catalogue, the CSP is listed as part of a collection of 56 codices (originally 55 codices, but the final item was divided into two) under the heading "Payne & Foss. 1848, Ex. Abb. S. Stephani, de Nova Fossa". See: *The Phillipps Manuscripts. Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum in Bibliotheca D. Thomae Phillipps, BT. Impressum Tupis medio-montanis 1837–1871*, with an introduction by A.N.L. Munby (London: The Holland Press, 1968), 216. (For the list of the 55 Italian codices, Ph 12260–12313, see 215–217).

⁹ St Stefano was originally a Cistercian abbey, built in the late twelfth century and famous for being the location of Thomas Aquinas's death in 1274, en route from Napoli to the Council of Lyons. The abbey was secularised by Napoleon in 1810, but in 1821 went back under the control of the Church, first under the Carthusians of Trisulti and then transferred to the Friars Minor Conventual in 1936. M.-A. Dimier, "*FOSSANOVA, ancien abbaye cistercienne d'Italie*", in *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques*, ed. R. Aubert (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1971) vol. XVII, columns 1208–1211.

by Giuseppe Gullotta in his detailed study of the ancient library catalogues of Nonantola (from 1166, 131, 1464 and 1464–1490).¹⁰ The first five of the ‘Fossanova’ manuscripts from Phillipps’s collection (from the eighth century and written in the Lombard script) may well have come from Nonantola, as did a twelfth-century manuscript (of the sermons of St Maximus), which passed into the collection of Major J.R. Abbey and was described by A.C. de la Mare and J.J.G. Alexander.¹¹ The abbé José Ruyschaert made an important contribution regarding the current locations of the Nonantola manuscripts, observing that a number of them surfaced in the collection of the book-dealer Gianbattista Petrucci between 1798 and 1813, and that they had then been acquired by Payne & Foss for Thomas Phillipps.¹² A.N.L. Munby picked up on Ruyschaert’s reference to the provenance of the Nonantola manuscripts, but erred in suggesting at one point in his work that *all* the Italian manuscripts listed as having been acquired by Payne & Foss for Phillipps – including the Franciscan manuscripts in the group, such as the CSP – came from Nonantola.¹³ Munby cited Ruyschaert as his source for this information, but in fact Ruyschaert never mentioned the shelfmarks of the Franciscan manuscripts as being part of the Nonantola collection that passed into Phillipps’s library.¹⁴

While there is no evidence the CSP came to Payne & Foss via Nonantola, it did not necessarily come from Fossanova either. It and the other ‘Fossanova’ manuscripts bought by Payne & Foss appear to have come from many different locations. Munby’s annotations to the xerox of the Phillipps catalogue in Cambridge University Library indicate, for instance, that Ph 12288 came from the Franciscans in

¹⁰ Giuseppe Gullotta, *Gli antichi cataloghi e i codici della Abbazia di Nonantola*, Studi e Testi 182 (Città del Vaticano, 1955), 146–149.

¹¹ A.C. de la Mare and J.J.G. Alexander, *Italian Manuscripts in the Library of Major J. R. Abbey* (London: Faber, 1969), 6.

¹² José Ruyschaert, *Les manuscrits de l’abbaye de Nonantola*. Studi e Testi bis 182 (Città del Vaticano, 1955), 9: ‘*Une des premières étapes de ces pérégrinations est la librairie romaine de Giambattista Petrucci. C’est-ce dernier qui vend, en 1833 et en 1848, aux agents du collectionneur anglais Phillipps, les séries de mss connus maintenant comme mss anglais Phillipps 6546–6548, 12260–12269 et 12298. Parmi les mss Phillipps les nn 6547–6548, 12265–12668 et 12298 toujours restes a Cheltenham furent rachetés, avec le reste des mss de la collection par la librairie londonienne Robinson, où il se trouvent encore, sauf les deux premiers qui furent acquis récemment par M Martin Bodmer.*’

¹³ A.N.L. Munby, *Phillipps Studies 4: The Formation of the Phillipps Library from 1841 to 1872* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 2: ‘The bookseller bought several important blocks of manuscripts in Italy which passed to Middle Hill, especially Nos. 12260–12313, some of which came from the medieval library of the abbey of Nonantola. Phillipps paid £525 for this group of manuscripts which included five Lombardic books of the eighth century.’ But *ibid*, 180: ‘The abbé Ruyschaert informed me that these MSS came from Nonantola, not from Fossa Nova.’

¹⁴ See note 12, above, for Ruyschaert’s discussion of the Nonantola’s mss.

Siena (as Little suggested) and that Ph 12302 came from the Poor Clares at Fabriano (in the Marche region). These manuscripts were all grouped together under the name 'Fossanova' by the Roman bookseller Gianbattista Petrucci, who gathered them from many sources and sold them to Payne & Foss, Phillipps's agents. While some of Phillipps's Italian manuscripts did come from Nonantola, it seems unlikely that the CSP was one of them, as has been claimed.¹⁵ It is more probable that it came from a Franciscan house and was grouped with others from Fossanova and elsewhere by Petrucci for the sake of convenience.

More research is necessary in order to provide any further information about the CSP's early provenance. Fortunately, detailed records of its movements over the last hundred years exist. When Thomas Phillipps died in 1910, his enormous collection of over 60,000 manuscripts was sold (in portions, across many years). W.H. Robinson Ltd had acted for the State Library of Victoria in negotiating the purchase of the Phillipps' manuscripts from a sale at Sotheby's in 1946.¹⁶ In 1949, these booksellers purchased what remained of the Phillipps library, the rest having been dispersed around the world. A representative of the firm wrote to the chief librarian of the State Library of Victoria, Mr C. McCallum, and proposed a scheme of mutual benefit – the loan of group lots of ten or twelve manuscripts, to be exhibited in the Library, which would hopefully inspire 'some wealthy Australian to make a gift to [the] library'.¹⁷ So it happened that on 28 February 1949 the first such consignment arrived at the State Library in Melbourne, and it was reported in the *Argus* and the *Herald* that a Franciscan missal (the CSP) was amongst the collection.¹⁸

Scholars are in the fortunate position of having a detailed record of the CSP's purchase by the Order of Friars Minor from one who was intimately involved in this process – Fr Celsus Kelly OFM. His article in the *Provincial Chronicle of the Holy Ghost Province of Australia and New Zealand* provides in-depth information about the arrival of the Codex in this country, negotiations about its sale, and its eventual purchase by the Order. He related that the CSP 'caused considerable interest, not to say excitement in the various Melbourne Communities'.¹⁹ One of the many friars to

¹⁵ Margaret Manion, "The Codex Sancti Paschalis", *La Trobe Library Journal* 13:51–52 (1993): 21, n. 1.

¹⁶ Celsus Kelly OFM, "The Codex Sti Paschalis", *The Provincial Chronicle of the Holy Ghost Province, Australia–New Zealand* 3:2 (1949): 89.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 90.

visit the exhibition specifically to view the CSP was Fr Vincent Long OFM, the Guardian of St Paschal's College, Box Hill. Kelly, presumably obtaining his information from Fr Long himself, records some of the Guardian's thoughts:

‘What a wonderful thing it would be if it found its way home again to the Friars – at St Paschal's College! What an inspiration it would be to our present students and the students for generations to come. But there is only one chance in a million of that happening.’²⁰

This ‘one chance in a million’ came to fruition. The State Library of Victoria was also keen to purchase the CSP for its collection, and had even begun raising funds for this purpose.²¹ One of the Library Trustees directing this matter was Fr W.P. Hackett SJ, who was also the director of the Central Catholic Library, another group desirous of purchasing the CSP. Fr Hackett's difficult position, representing conflicting groups, led to his withdrawal from the negotiations.²² With the Central Catholic Library out of the running, the Franciscans (as another viable Catholic group) had the opportunity to channel the funding from Catholic Melbournians previously promised to the CCL. With the support of Fr Hackett, Kelly approached and secured the financial support of Mr Pat Cody.²³ Mr Cody donated £550, and wished to remain anonymous in the public record (a request preserved in some articles on the CSP, but not others!). The State Library was still keen to purchase the missal, however, and further negotiations ensued before the Library agreed to allow the Franciscans to buy the manuscript. There were three conditions:

1) that the Missal should remain in Australia [later changed to Victoria by the Trustees]; 2) that in the event of the library at Box Hill being dispersed the Public Library should have the first option of acquiring the Missal; and 3) that it should be available to the Public Library for exhibition purposes.²⁴

On Tuesday 12 July 1949, the CSP arrived at St Paschal's College in Box Hill, eventually having been bought by the Order of Friars Minor for £507/15/5.²⁵ The missal remained in St Paschal Library for fifty years, for the most part locked in a safe, before being placed on permanent loan to the State Library of Victoria in the early 1990s, for reasons of conservation. In 2008, the CSP was repaired and rebound

²⁰ Fr Vincent Long OFM, quoted in Kelly, “The Codex Sti Paschalis”, 90.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 91.

²² *Ibid.*, 92.

²³ *Ibid.*, 93.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 93–94.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 94.

by conservators at the Library in preparation for its inclusion in an exhibition titled *The Medieval Imagination: Medieval and Renaissance Illuminated Manuscripts from Cambridge, Australia and New Zealand* (March–November 2008, SLV). The CSP is still owned by the Order of Friars Minor, and is thus not included in the State Library’s catalogue. This unusual status in part explains the small amount of scholarship to address the CSP – only those scholars engaged in creating comprehensive catalogues of medieval manuscripts in Australian and/or Franciscan collections (for example, Celsus Kelly OFM, Margaret Manion, Keith Sinclair and Maria Grazia Ciardi-Dupré Dal Poggetto) have noted its existence.

Previous Studies of the Codex Sancti Paschalis

As suggested above, the peculiarities of the CSP’s journey from thirteenth-century Perugia to twentieth-century Australia have resulted in relatively few detailed academic studies of this text: the scholarly work has not progressed beyond descriptions of its contents, particularly its art-historical aspects. There has been no study similar to the one undertaken by this dissertation, which adopts a holistic and comparative approach to the missal. What follows is a chronologically ordered literature review of the major scholarship on the CSP, highlighting the important contributions of each scholar. A fuller exposition of the conceptual themes of this scholarship will be undertaken in Chapter One, as discussed in the chapter outlines below.

When Celsus Kelly OFM first became aware of the CSP in 1949, he was engaged in writing the second of a three-part series of articles entitled “Franciscan Scholarship in the Middle Ages” for *The Catholic Review*. As the article had already been submitted, Kelly had no chance to insert a reference to this newly discovered missal, and instead submitted an addendum to his article, printed with the same issue, which listed several Franciscan manuscripts in Australian collections. The first cited was the ‘Codex Assisi’, a temporary title for what he would eventually name the ‘Codex Sancti Paschalis’. Kelly gave a codicological description of the missal and a brief list of its liturgical and artistic contents.²⁶ The rapidity with which Kelly wrote this short description of the CSP attests to his great excitement over its discovery.

²⁶ Celsus Kelly OFM, “Franciscan Scholarship in the Middle Ages”, *The Catholic Review*, 5:3 (1949): 213.

One month later, Kelly published the first academic study of the CSP: ‘The Codex Sti Paschalis’ in *The Provincial Chronicle of the Holy Ghost Province, Australia–New Zealand*. His article was divided into four sections: 1) A scientific description of the Missal as a book; 2) The Calendar in the *Codex*; 3) The story of the Missal during the last two centuries; and 4) The inner story of the negotiations in acquiring the Missal.²⁷ The first section dealt with the codicological details of the missal and an abbreviated index of its liturgical contents. The second section provided a transcription (with an introduction) of the CSP’s calendar, including notes linking feast days to their corresponding masses in the Proper of the Saints. The transcription was deliberately incomplete, leaving out the rubrics of the original. In the third section, Kelly erroneously suggested the past ownership of A.G. Little.²⁸ While these three sections were important contributions to the study of this missal, being the first academic analysis of the CSP, the real value of Kelly’s article lay in its fourth section, which included much ‘inside’ information on the Australian history of the CSP and its purchase by the Franciscans that would otherwise have been unobtainable. The immense amount of information Kelly supplied highlights the intricacies of the acquisition process and the fascinating rivalry between the State Library of Victoria, the Order of Friars Minor in Australia and the Catholic community of Melbourne.

As discussed above, A.N.L. Munby’s comprehensive study and listing of Sir Thomas Phillipps’ manuscript collection did not mention the CSP by name, but contained an entry for numbers 12260–12313 of Phillipps’ collection. The group was described as ‘*Ex Abb. S. Stephani, de Nova Fossa*’.²⁹ The implications and historiography of this proposed provenance have been discussed above in detail. It is unlikely that the CSP actually came to Phillipps via Fossanova, but further research is needed to ascertain more accurate details of its provenance.

The renowned paleographer Keith Val Sinclair was the next to discuss the CSP, in his article “Phillipps Manuscripts in Australia” for *The Book Collector*. Sinclair listed the CSP by its catalogue number from Phillipps’ collection (12289) and titled it ‘*Messale*’. He dated it as a fifteenth-century missal – the latest date the CSP has ever been assigned, and not one which held sway for long (Sinclair himself redated the missal in his subsequent article). The rest of this standard catalogue entry

²⁷ Kelly, “The Codex Sti Paschalis”, 74.

²⁸ As mentioned above, Little owned Ph 12290. Although he referred to the CSP (Ph 12289) in an article written about Ph 12290, there is no indication that he owned it as well.

²⁹ Munby, *Phillipps Studies no. 4*, 180.

included codicological and provenance information identical to that provided by Kelly (and thus, in the case of the CSP's provenance, slightly inaccurate).³⁰

In his next article, '*Manuscrits médiévaux d'origine franciscaine en Australie*', Sinclair provided a more detailed analysis of the missal. It was listed as number 10, an unnamed missal in the library of the Order of Friars Minor, Box Hill.³¹ Sinclair provided a brief codicological description, and on the basis of the script type ('une "littera textualis formata rotunda", d'origine italienne'), dated the missal at the end of the thirteenth century or the beginning of the fourteenth century.³² While not discussing art-historical aspects of the missal in any depth, Sinclair mentioned the 35 illuminated initials and described the historiated initial of f.7rb and the crucifixion miniature of f.182ra. He followed Munby and Kelly on the subject of the missal's provenance, and included an abbreviated list of the missal's liturgical contents, highlighting its Franciscan nature.³³ Sinclair's article, while not adding much to the information already provided by Kelly, was of significance in that it represented the first non-Franciscan Australian scholarship on the CSP. The article itself was a type of catalogue entry, though it was placed under the heading 'Miscellanea' in the journal. Its relatively obscure location in this journal may have had an impact on its limited exposure; at this point the CSP was still largely known and discussed only within the Franciscan scholarly community.

Sinclair again described the CSP in an entry in his *Descriptive Catalogue of Medieval and Renaissance Western Manuscripts in Australia*. The CSP appeared as number '181 Missale (Use of Rome) – in Latin – 14c'.³⁴ This entry was essentially an English translation of his earlier work in the *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum*, repeating the same information. The significant addition of a short bibliography gathered the existing contemporary scholarship on the missal. As the CSP's first inclusion in a catalogue written for both Franciscan and non-Franciscan readers, Sinclair's entry established the missal's place in Australia's manuscript collections and marked the beginning of broader scholarly awareness of the missal.

In 1982, the Comitato Regionale Umbro per le Celebrazioni dell'VIII Centenario della nascita di san Francesco di Assisi published a weighty volume

³⁰ Keith Val Sinclair, "Phillipps Manuscripts in Australia", *The Book Collector* 2 (1962): 336–337.

³¹ Keith Val Sinclair, "*Manuscrits médiévaux d'origine franciscaine en Australie*", *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 57 (1964): 375.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ Sinclair, *Descriptive Catalogue*, 296.

entitled *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi, Codici e Biblioteche, Minature*. This volume contains a comprehensive catalogue of archival documents, theological and liturgical manuscripts and illuminated miniatures that relate to St Francis and his Order. The CSP was listed in the section on miniatures and assigned catalogue number 112, 'Messale francescano'.³⁵ The entry included the same codicological, provenance and descriptive information as the articles listed above, and dated the CSP to the late thirteenth century.³⁶ Also included was an article (not attributed to a particular contributor) on the artistic aspects of the missal – the first such research to be published. This article discussed the palette of colours used throughout the missal's decorative program, which were suggested to be '*caratteristiche della produzione dei manoscritti perugini della fine secolo XIV*'.³⁷ The Crucifixion miniature was analysed in some depth for the first time. It was argued to '*riflette l'influenza di Cimabue*', the first time this claim was made.³⁸ Importantly, the author/s indicated an artistic link between the CSP and two other Franciscan missals of the same period, those of Deruta and Salerno.³⁹ This idea was later explored more fully by Margaret Manion (see below). In addition to this scholarly article, the CSP's entry included black-and-white reproductions of its Crucifixion miniature and historiated initial – the first time its images were reproduced for a wider scholarly audience.⁴⁰ The CSP's inclusion in this seminal catalogue of Franciscana was the first time that the missal was recognised internationally as a significant Franciscan manuscript, and was placed within its historical and scholarly context alongside other important Franciscan missals. The entry's discussion of the missal's artistic features opened the door for further scholarship on this important aspect of the CSP.

Two years after the appearance of this Italian catalogue, Margaret Manion and Vera Vines published their catalogue, *Medieval and Renaissance Illuminated Manuscripts in Australian Collections*. Given the expertise of these two scholars, it is unsurprising that the focus of this book was art-historical. The book was divided into sections by nationality, and the CSP appeared as number 4 in the Italian manuscripts

³⁵ Carlo Pirovano, ed., "112. Messale francescano", in *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi, Codici e Biblioteche, Minature* (Milan: Electa, 1982), 363.

³⁶ *Ibid.* Following the Phillipps catalogue, this study followed the erroneous claim that the CSP was in the library of Santo Stefano, Fossa Nuova before it was acquired by Payne & Foss.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 364.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ *Ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

section. It was named ‘Roman Missal’ and dated at c. 1290.⁴¹ The CSP did not possess a shelfmark at St Paschal Library, Box Hill, and so Manion and Vines used the name Kelly assigned it: the *Codex Sancti Paschalis*. This appears to be the first usage of the CSP’s current name since Kelly’s second article of 1949 (see above).

Manion and Vines provided the same codicological information as all previous studies of the missal, though their section on its provenance included only that which was observable from the manuscript itself, i.e. the ownership of Phillipps. The section on the missal’s decorative program is extensive, and includes a list of all illuminated and historiated initials. Manion and Vines discussed the missal’s Crucifixion miniature in some detail, and analysed the idea of Cimabue’s influence (c. 1240–1302), as well as the links between the CSP and the missals of Deruta and Salerno, suggested in the 1982 Italian catalogue. Manion and Vines also indicated a connection between the CSP and Ms. 8 in the collection of the Duomo of Assisi, dated at 1273.⁴² Both missals depict St John in an unusual pose in their Crucifixion miniatures.⁴³ The figure of St John will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter Three’s analysis of the CSP’s decorative programme.

To date, the most comprehensive of scholarly works on the CSP has been Margaret Manion’s article “The *Codex Sancti Paschalis*” in the *La Trobe Library Journal*.⁴⁴ It was written at the time that the CSP was returned to the State Library of Victoria on permanent loan from the friars at St Paschal Friary, for reasons of conservation. The article expanded upon Manion’s previous work on the missal, and introduced concepts which had hitherto been discussed only in Italian scholarship. Manion followed Munby’s argument that the CSP (and the other Italian Phillipps manuscripts) had come from Nonantola rather than Fossanova (an argument which appears to be erroneous, as discussed above). In addition to the now-familiar codicological information, Manion’s article both described and contextualised the missal, highlighting its importance as a representative of the Franciscan contribution to thirteenth-century developments in both liturgy and art. She gave the missal a date of no later than 1297, based on liturgical and artistic evidence, which included the

⁴¹ Margaret Manion and Vera Vines, *Medieval and Renaissance Illuminated Manuscripts* (Melbourne: Thames & Hudson, 1984), 38.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ Manion, “The *Codex Sancti Paschalis*”, 11–23.

addition of certain feast days and the missal's decorative style.⁴⁵ The missal's stylistic relationship to other contemporaneous Umbrian Franciscan liturgical books was reinforced, as was the influence of Cimabue on the missal's miniature.⁴⁶ Manion also highlighted what she perceived as a distinctively Franciscan union of functionality and beauty in the missal's decorative programme, a conceptualisation which touches on the 1982 Italian catalogue's interest in the idea of a specifically Franciscan style of decoration, characterised by simplicity.⁴⁷ I will return to this conceptualisation of a distinctively Franciscan decorative style in Chapters One and Three.

This Dissertation's Approach: Chapter Outlines

From this brief survey of previous scholarship on the CSP, it can be observed that the majority of this work has concentrated on establishing the provenance and art-historical aspects of the missal. This dissertation aims to expand scholarly discourse on this particular missal and a selection of its cognate manuscripts through a holistic methodology, which considers the physical production of the manuscripts, their scribes and miniaturists, their liturgical contents and calendars, and their function within the communities that used them. The following chapter outlines describe the structure of the dissertation and give a brief exposition of its methodology. A more detailed analysis of the methodologies used by other scholars and by this dissertation can be found in Chapter One and the introductions to each chapter.

Chapter One: The Silent Parchment? A New Methodology for the Study of Missals

The first chapter surveys traditional methodologies for the study of decorated liturgical books, along with innovations to the field in recent decades. The field is dominated by studies of individual manuscripts, which have traditionally concentrated on either decorative or liturgical aspects. Both art historians and liturgical historians have traditionally been careful to maintain their disciplinary boundaries, resulting in an unfortunate lack of dialogue between the two, even where their areas of research overlap. Recently, art historians such as Nigel Morgan have modelled a methodology for a more inclusive study of decorated liturgical manuscripts, which considers their form, function and use through a sensitive reading of the reciprocal relationship

⁴⁵ Ibid., 13.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 19.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 13–16.

between text and image. The CSP and its cognate manuscripts have primarily been studied by art historians working in a more traditional mode, unlike that of Morgan. Methodologically, this scholarship has been concerned with the identification of individual miniaturists (particularly the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno and Venturella di Pietro), the enlargement of these miniaturists' catalogues of works, and the formulation of a conceptual model for a distinctively Franciscan style of decoration. This scholarship, primarily by Italian scholars, is critically examined.

For the first time, a list of the manuscripts considered by these scholars to be artistically related is presented. This information has been gathered from a careful reading of the scholarship, and represents a step towards the delineation of a clearer understanding of the relationships between the two miniaturists, their ateliers and the Order of Friars Minor in Umbria. A name is proposed for this group – the Perugian Liturgical Group – which is used throughout the dissertation.

Within the field of liturgical history, the specialised study of Franciscan liturgical history has been dominated by the magisterial work of Stephen J.P. van Dijk OFM. This chapter outlines his important contribution to the study of the development of Franciscan liturgy, contextualising this contribution within the study of liturgical manuscripts. A more inclusive methodology for the study of liturgical manuscripts, drawing on liturgical history, ritual studies and performance theory, has been modelled by liturgical historians such as Nils Holger Petersen. Adopting elements of Holger Petersen's methodology, a holistic approach to the study of liturgical manuscripts is utilised here. It draws on liturgical history, art history, manuscript studies, ritual studies and performance theory in order to present a richer context for the analysis (in subsequent chapters) of the liturgical calendar of the CSP and selected cognate missals.

Chapter Two: Quarrelling Brothers – Liturgy and Identity, 1209–1274

This chapter presents a detailed analysis of van Dijk's theory regarding the development of Franciscan liturgy, and suggests some significant challenges to van Dijk's model, which has dominated scholarly understanding of the role of liturgy within the Order of Friars Minor. Van Dijk's primary scholarly interest was with the evolution and dissemination of the Papal Curia's liturgy in the thirteenth century, and it was in this context that he viewed the Order of Friars Minor's liturgical activity. He

argued that the Order was a major participant in the spread of the Papal Curia's liturgy, both in its own use of the liturgy and in its itinerant missionary activity. The Order's desire to follow the Papal Curia's rite is adequately demonstrated by the standard *incipit* formula for its missals (*'Incipit ordo missalis fratrum minorum secundum consuetudinem romane curie'*). While the Franciscan missals studied in this dissertation display a level of conformity to the Papal Curia's rite regarding the Canon of the Mass, their liturgical calendars indicate the influence of spiritual interests unconstrained by the prescriptions of the Papal Curia.

Van Dijk's thesis of the existence of the so-called 'Regula' editions of Franciscan missals and breviaries – which he believed were distributed at the 1230 Chapter of Assisi – was quickly accepted by historians working in a variety of fields, despite the fact that no record exists within the Order for distribution of missals at this Chapter, and that no manuscript tradition for a Franciscan missal exists before the 1240s. In Chapter Two, van Dijk's reconstruction of the Regula missal and breviary through the use of later manuscripts is subjected to a significant rereading. Central to this rereading is a critique of two of van Dijk's major conceptual models: his understanding of 'variety' within a liturgical tradition, and his definition of precisely what constitutes a distinctively 'Franciscan' missal. In 1926, Michael Bihl presented a critique of concepts similar to those later employed by van Dijk, but Bihl's arguments have not been adopted by subsequent scholarship. The alternative history of the Order's relationship with liturgy and its production of liturgical books suggested here rehabilitates Bihl's understanding of the development of Franciscan liturgy and his approach to the manuscript tradition. The roles of Elias of Cortona, Haymo of Faversham, John of Parma and Bonaventure (as ministers general) are examined in the pursuit of a more nuanced understanding of the complexities and disputes that characterised the Order's attitude to liturgy throughout its turbulent first century of existence.

Chapter Three: The Order of Friars Minor and the Book

The third chapter examines the Order of Friars Minor's attitude towards book production, as interpreted from relevant passages in the *Earlier Rule* (1209/10-1221), the *Later Rule* (1223) and Francis's *Testament* (1224). While the *Earlier Rule* allowed lay brothers to own and use a breviary, this privilege was revoked in the *Later Rule*;

increasingly, then, books became the province of literate clerics alone. The ambiguous role of books, as property and as necessary to the liturgical activity of the friars, is situated within the controversies over the application of Francis's adherence to apostolic poverty. Papal intervention in the form of Gregory IX's bull *Quo elongati* is discussed in order to contextualise the Order's difficult conceptual relationship with books. This context is then contrasted with the actual realities of the Order's relationships with books, scribes and miniaturists, focusing on thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Perugia.

The Order's disorganised attitude towards book production is discussed with regard also to the impact of such practicalities on the implementation of uniform liturgy. The necessity of book production has been inadequately considered by scholars investigating the development of Franciscan liturgy, such as van Dijk. Indeed, scholars who have researched the Order's production of books have rarely considered liturgical books, instead concentrating on the non-liturgical, theological texts used by the friars in universities. This chapter addresses the way liturgical books have fallen between the cracks of the various methodologies used in the study of Franciscan attitudes to books, and constructs an understanding of the mechanics of liturgical book production and decoration by (and for) the Order.

The relationship between the Order in Umbria and the miniaturists to whom the CSP and its cognate manuscripts are attributed has been largely overlooked by art-historical scholarship, which has concentrated more on stylistic analysis than on the physical construction of these manuscripts. In the course of discussing the artistic contents of the five selected missals, this chapter explores the concept of a distinctively Franciscan style of decoration. This concept, proposed by art historians, relies on several problematic understandings of Franciscan spirituality and of the manuscript evidence available. A more flexible interpretation of the relationship between the Order, the miniaturists and the liturgical books decorated for the Order is suggested. This understanding of the relationship between image and meaning in the selected manuscripts is contextualised by a discussion of the development of Crucifixion iconography in Franciscan manuscripts.

Chapter Four: Calendars – Comparing the Evidence

Chapter Four presents the data drawn from the liturgical calendars of the selected missals: CSP (Melbourne, SLV, Codex Sancti Paschalis), B (Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Ms. Gaddi 7), C (Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 13), D (Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 14) and E (Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 267). This data is presented in table format, for ease of reading, and a key is provided. Brief catalogue entries for the five selected manuscripts include chronological bibliographies of their study. A full list of the CSP's liturgical contents can be found as an appendix.⁴⁸ This data was accumulated through the study of these five manuscripts in their original form; their liturgical calendars are described and analysed for the first time. The tables are introduced through a historiographical survey of methodologies relating to the study of sainthood and its commemoration, with specific reference to the use of liturgical calendars as a source of information about communal ritual activity. A methodology for the use of such calendars is established as context for the following chapter, which draws on the data presented in Chapter Four.

Chapter Five: Celebrating Saints – Articulating Communal Identity through Liturgy

The final chapter examines a selection of feasts from the calendars of the missals under consideration, drawing its information from the tables presented in Chapter Four. Feasts from four distinct categories are considered: 1) Franciscan feasts (or those which are thought to be characteristic of Franciscan liturgy); 2) Local feasts; 3) Feasts from other orders (particularly the Order of Preachers and the Cistercians); and 4) Feasts important in the Roman calendar (in this instance, the feasts of the Virgin have been selected). The inclusion, exclusion, wording and rubrication of these feasts in each of the selected manuscripts are analysed, with reference (where possible) to van Dijk's scholarship regarding the feast. From this information, conclusions are drawn in seven distinct categories: 1) Rubrication⁴⁹; 2) Wording of the entries; 3)

⁴⁸ This information is provided only for the Codex Sancti Paschalis, as it has been the main focus of this dissertation's research. This information has never before been published, and will be of assistance to anyone pursuing further research on the missal. A comparable list of the Codex Sancti Paschalis's artistic contents has been published in: Manion and Vines, *Medieval and Renaissance Illuminated Manuscripts*, 38.

⁴⁹ In this discussion, the understanding of rubrics is naturally limited to feasts written in red ink in calendars, rather than the other definition of the term, which refers to the instructions or non-spoken text in a liturgical book.

Inclusion/exclusion of localised feasts; 4) Inclusion/exclusion of feasts from other orders; 5) The relationship between these Franciscan calendars and the calendar of the Roman Curia; 6) Additions and absences; and 7) Adherence to Haymo's Ordinal. These basic categories of interpretation stimulate reflection on the central concerns of this dissertation: the role of liturgy in the construction and maintenance of communal identity amongst communities of friars in Umbria. This reflection engages with the reappraisal in Chapter Two of van Dijk's conceptualisation of the development of Franciscan liturgy, and suggests a more flexible understanding of the variety inherent in the liturgical activity of these Umbrian communities.

From these reflections, it is possible to offer some broader conclusions about the evidence considered in this thesis and about the previous historiography and methodological approaches used in the study of liturgical manuscripts in general, and more specifically in the study of the Perugian Liturgical Group. Three major questions dominate this research:

1. What do manuscript production networks between miniaturists and the Order in Perugia reveal about the relationships between these groups and the role of the liturgical book in manifesting communal identity?
2. How does a reassessment of the dominant understanding of the development of Franciscan liturgy (as established by the pioneering work of van Dijk) affect scholarly understanding of the manuscript evidence?
3. What do the liturgical variations between the calendars of the five selected missals studied in this dissertation suggest about the identity-defining nature of liturgical activity (particularly the commemoration of saints' feasts) for the Order of Friars Minor?

The contributions offered by this dissertation in response to these three central questions may be prioritised in the following way:

1. A new methodological approach to the study of missals, which adopts the combination of liturgical history and ritual/performance theory modelled by some contemporary scholars (particularly at the Centre for the Study of the Cultural Heritage of Medieval Rituals, University of Copenhagen) to the study of the calendar of saints. This model allows for a discussion of the way in which the calendar may be indicative of the construction and

maintenance of communal identity, especially in its ability to convey to scholars some idea of the shape and memory of a ritual year in the life of a community.

2. A reassessment of the narrative of the unified and unifying nature of Franciscan liturgical practice, as argued by van Dijk in his foundational work from the 1940s to the 1970s, which has been accepted by all subsequent scholars. To some degree, the scholarly approach of Michael Bihl (working in the 1920s) is rehabilitated through consideration of the manuscript evidence.
3. An interpretation of how the performance (or absence) of liturgical feasts contributed to the construction and maintenance of communal Franciscan identity. In this sense, the dissertation presents a micro-history of Franciscan liturgy, using social-history methodology in a cultural-historical model.
4. An evaluation of new material about the CSP's cognate manuscripts: CSP and other manuscripts in its 'group' which are largely unstudied. This dissertation organises and names the group.
5. An exploration of the nature and function of communal spiritual identity amongst communities of the Order of Friars Minor in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Umbria. The dissertation aims to provoke reflection on the nature and function of multiple identities at the individual and communal levels, and the role of liturgy in the articulation of this plurality of Franciscan identities.

Chapter One

The Silent Parchment? A New Methodology for the Study of Missals

1.1 The Historiography of Illuminated Liturgical Manuscripts

The study of decorated liturgical manuscripts such as the Codex Sancti Paschalis has traditionally been undertaken by two disciplines – art history and liturgical history. Art historians have made use of liturgical history (more specifically, the chronology of the inclusion of particular saints’ feast days to liturgical calendars) as an aid to the dating of manuscripts, but aside from this point of exchange, the two disciplines have been largely separate. In the study of medieval missals, in particular, the concern of art history has been with the decorative programmes, while the focus of liturgical historians has traditionally been on the development of liturgies and calendars across the medieval period.

A methodology for a more holistic study of decorated liturgical manuscripts, incorporating all aspects of their production and use, has been established in recent decades. Scholars today are more likely to adopt an inclusive approach to liturgical manuscripts, one that considers the production of such manuscripts as well as the social and cultural attitudes/beliefs embedded in their texts and images (and the interaction between these texts and images).¹ James Boyce’s work on the Carmelite

¹ For example: Veronica Condon, *MS. Douce 313: A Fourteenth century Franciscan Missal in the Bodleian Library*, Oxford, PhD. dissertation, University of Melbourne (Melbourne: Spectrum, 1977); R. Rouse and M. Rouse, *Cartolai, Illuminators and Printers in 15th Century Italy* (Los Angeles: Department of Special Collections, University Research Library, University of California, 1988); Margaret Manion and Bernard Muir, eds., *Medieval Texts and Images: Studies of Manuscripts from the Middle Ages* (Chur: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1991); Christopher de Hamel, *Scribes and Illuminators* (London: British Museum, 1992); Armando Petrucci, *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy: Studies in the History of Written Culture*, trans. and ed. Charles M. Radding (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995); Margaret Manion and Bernard Muir, *The Art of the Book: Its Place in Medieval Worship* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1998); Nigel Morgan, “Texts and Images of Marian Devotion in English Twelfth Century Monasticism”, in *Monasticism and Society: Proceedings of the 1994 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. B. Thompson, Harlaxton Medieval Studies VI (Stamford, 1999): 117–136; R. Rouse and M. Rouse, *Manuscripts and their Makers. Commercial Book Producers in*

liturgy and its articulation of distinctively Carmelite spirituality represents this new mode of discussion for such manuscripts, and has suggested the exciting potential of this emerging methodology.²

While this positive development has done much to stimulate new understandings of the production and function of liturgical books in medieval societies, there remains the fundamental problem of scope: because manuscript production norms varied between regions, and because each liturgical book is by its nature tailored for use in a particular place, time and community (or individual), it is often difficult for scholars to present any more than a case study of one specific manuscript (or, at most, one city). A recent example of an excellent study produced in this fashion is that edited by Yitzak Hen and Rob Meens of the Bobbio Missal.³ Manuscript studies' narrow field of vision as a discipline cannot necessarily be eradicated through new methodology, as it clearly would be unwise to draw broad comparisons in a field where specific details are of paramount importance. The study of liturgical calendars is, however, one field in which this issue can be addressed in a fruitful fashion: a comparison of calendars can involve consideration of manuscript production, artistic style, and regional difference without confusing the relationships between the calendars or drawing overly simplistic/uniform conclusions. Nigel Morgan's ongoing study of the introduction of the Sarum Use to English dioceses in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries provides a model for this type of work.⁴ A similar methodology is employed in this study, which considers the socio-cultural meaning of the development of liturgical calendars amongst communities of Franciscan friars in central Italy in the late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries through analysis and comparison of five missals.

Medieval Paris 1200–1500, 2 vols. (Turnhout: H. Miller, 2000); Bernard Muir, ed., *Reading Texts and Images. Essays on Medieval and Renaissance Art and Patronage in Honour of Margaret Manion* (Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2002); Amy Neff, "'Palma dabit palmam': Franciscan Themes in a Devotional Manuscript", *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 65 (2002): 22–66; Nigel Morgan, "Gendered Devotions and Social Rituals: The Aspremont Psalter – 'Hours' and the Image of the Patron in Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth-Century France", *Melbourne Art Journal* 6 (2003): 5–24.

² James Boyce, *Carmelite Liturgy and Spiritual Identity: the Choir Books of Kraków* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008).

³ Yitzak Hen and Rob Meens, eds., *The Bobbio Missal: Liturgy and Religious Culture in Merovingian Gaul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

⁴ Nigel Morgan, "The Introduction of the Sarum Calendar into the Dioceses of England in the Thirteenth Century", *Thirteenth Century England VIII: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 1999*, ed. M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame (Woodbridge, NY: Boydell Press, 2001), 179–206.

With regard to performance theory, a holistic methodology for liturgical manuscripts has been particularly embraced by the Centre for the Study of the Cultural Heritage of Medieval Rituals, a project established in 2002 by the Department of Church History at the University of Copenhagen. This methodological development in liturgical history has been applied to fields such as medieval sermon studies, with stimulating results.⁵ Founding scholars in the area of sermon studies, such as D.L. d'Avray, acknowledged both the limitations of the approach and its benefits, recognising the fundamental gulf between text and actual performance but defending sermons as vital sources for the study of structures of thinking in given periods.⁶ Performance theory has also found a welcome application in the study of breviaries and psalters/books of hours, which (by their function) can easily be analysed in terms of performance practices and ritual meanings.⁷ The study of individual devotion has, to this point, been more popular than the study of communal devotion. This may in part be because the study of individuals and their devotional practices easily embraces the concerns of gender theory, which, since its beginnings in the 1960s and 1970s, has dominated the intellectual concerns of modern historical scholarship.

The idea of performance has yet to be extensively applied specifically to missals. As books used by male priests and containing prescribed texts, missals have perhaps been considered institutional and static. As such, they have not been perceived as containing the kind of personal and emotional evidence sought by historians of spirituality. Missals are seen as somehow less accessible, less human, than breviaries and books of hours. Amongst its other concerns, this dissertation seeks

⁵ For an overview, see: Carolyn Muessig, "Sermon, Preacher and Society in the Middle Ages", *Journal of Medieval History* 28 (2002): 73–91.

⁶ D.L. d'Avray, *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 104.

⁷ For example: John Harthan, *Books of Hours and their Owners* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1977); Leslie Smith and Jane H.M. Taylor, eds., *Women and the Book: Assessing the Visual Evidence* (London: British Library, 1997); Clare Sponsler, *Drama and Resistance: Bodies, Goods and Theatricality in Medieval England* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997); Bronwyn Clare Stocks, *Text and Image in the Early Italian Book of Hours* (Ph.D dissertation, University of Melbourne, 1998); Kathryn A. Smith, *Art, Identity and Devotion in Fourteenth Century England: Three Women and their Books of Hours* (London: British Library and University of Toronto Press, 2003); Nigel Morgan, "Gendered Devotions and Social Rituals: The Aspremont Psalter – 'Hours' and the Image of the Patron in Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth-Century France" (cited above, note 1); Andrea G. Pearson, *Envisioning Gender in Burgundian Devotional Art, 1350–1530: Experience, Authority, Resistance* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005); Elizabeth L'Estrange, *Holy Motherhood: Gender, Dynasty and Visual Culture in the Later Middle Ages* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008).

to rehabilitate missals as evidence of personal spiritual activity, albeit in a communal mode. This chapter will discuss the methodologies and concerns of art history and liturgical history (both in general terms and in specific relation to the CSP), the use of methodology for the study of the use of liturgical manuscripts such as has been modelled by James Boyce, and the contribution of this dissertation towards establishing a holistic methodology for the study of the production, use and communal spiritual significance of missals in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Umbria.

1.2 Art History and the Codex Sancti Paschalis

To this point, study of the CSP has been conducted primarily within the discipline of art history, and in particular by Italian scholars. As the CSP was the starting point of the research contained in this study, this chapter will outline the scholarship that has dealt with the CSP, and from that discussion will draw out some broader observations about the art-historical study of thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Umbrian liturgical manuscripts. The CSP has been identified by Maria Grazia Ciardi Dupré dal Poggetto, Margaret Manion, François Avril, Elvio Lunghi, Marcella Degl’Innocenti Gambuti and Marina Subbioni as stylistically related to manuscripts attributed to the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno (active late in the thirteenth century). Some of those manuscripts attributed to the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno also show links to the work of the Perugian master Venturella di Pietro (active c. 1311). The overriding interest of the art historians studying Umbrian manuscripts of the late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries has been to enlarge the list of manuscripts attributed to these masters, and, in the case of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno, to justify the identification of an individual miniaturist without documentary evidence for his existence (a common method of research within art-historical scholarship). Other aspects of the manuscripts have been subsumed to this end, so that the focus of the scholarship is on the individual miniaturist rather than the manuscripts themselves. No scholar has formulated a comprehensive list of the manuscripts associated with the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno and Venturella di Pietro, still less named this potential grouping.

While the grouping will not be critiqued here (other than in the course of establishing its parameters), it is important to name it for ease of reference, as the scholarship around this group often constitutes the only work done on certain

manuscripts. With this in mind, I have decided to refer to the grouping of manuscripts related to the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno and Venturella di Pietro as the ‘Perugian Liturgical Group’. This name has been selected because these two miniaturists are commonly spoken of in the scholarship as being representative of the Perugian school of decoration, and because the manuscripts included in the group are (with several exceptions) liturgical. The name is used only within the context of this dissertation – it does not refer to a consensus amongst art historians.

Ferdinando Bologna’s 1962 book *La Pittura italiana delle origini* followed on from his catalogue of a 1955 exhibition in Napoli (*Opere d’arte nel Salernitano dal XII al XVIII secolo*).⁸ In both the catalogue and *La Pittura italiana*, Bologna proposed the existence of a master, whose hand he detected in two missals – those made for use in the cathedrals of Deruta and Salerno. This newly identified artistic figure was accordingly named the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno.⁹ In *La Pittura italiana*, Bologna added Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 16 (a gradual) to the catalogue of this miniaturist’s works, thus initiating the concept of an extensive catalogue for the miniaturist and stimulating interest in these three manuscripts in particular.¹⁰

Bologna had no information regarding the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno as an historical individual, but rather discussed the miniaturist with reference to his stylistic influences and habits (a standard method within art-historical scholarship). Bologna argued for the presence of two major influences on the Maestro’s work: a Spoletine element derived from Giunta Pisano (active 1202–1236), and a Byzantine element derived from Cimabue (1240–1302). Bologna’s proposal of the distinctive features of the unknown and constructed artist’s identity were unanimously accepted by subsequent scholarship. Based on their relationship to Cimabue’s stylistic developments, Bologna proposed dates for the missals of Deruta and Salerno that have been accepted by all other scholars. The missal of Deruta is believed to predate the frescoes in the upper Basilica of San Francesco, Assisi, and is therefore dated to c. 1270–1280, while the missal of Salerno is considered to follow it and thus is dated to c. 1280–1290.¹¹

⁸ Fernando Bologna, *La Pittura italiana delle origini* (Rome: Editori Riuniti, 1962).

⁹ Variations of this title include the “Maestro del Deruta e Salerno” and the “Maestro dei messali di Deruta e Salerno”. For the purposes of clarity and brevity, he will be referred to throughout this thesis as the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno.

¹⁰ Bologna, *La Pittura*, 118–119.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

Bologna's work in constructing the personality of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno was not unusual in a broad sense, as the categorisation of anonymous works of art has often been done in this way in the field of art history. The identification of an individual personality without empirical historical evidence can aid in making sense of the stylistic developments of a particular period, but the practice does have its limitations. As the anonymous artist is not present in the historical record as a 'real' person, his identification is fundamentally subjective, based on stylistic interpretation by art historians, who are working within their own ideological and intellectual structures. Relying too heavily on such a subjective identification can be an obstruction to the progress of research, rather than an aid. The construction of the character of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno by Bologna has had an enormous impact on the scholarship of Umbrian manuscripts from the late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries, but it has not necessarily furthered scholarly understanding of the manuscripts involved. While the oeuvre of the Maestro continues to expand, study of the manuscripts attributed to him is relatively static – aspects of these manuscripts beyond their attribution to a major personality have largely been neglected.

It is notable that very little scholarship regarding these manuscripts has been undertaken outside Italy – the only non-Italians to have written on these manuscripts are François Avril and Margaret Manion. The overwhelmingly Italian majority in this field underlines the distinctive nature of Italians' scholarly interest in these medieval Umbrian manuscripts: there is a sense of personal history involved, which recalls the strong civic pride of their medieval ancestors. This is not a criticism of their work, as the intrinsic connection between these scholars and their material generates an emotive and lively scholarly discourse. The art historian Elvio Lunghi has contributed prolifically to the study of such Umbrian manuscripts. In a 1992 article, Lunghi proposed that the Perugian origin of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno is demonstrated by the identities of the donors of the missal of Deruta: 'Jacobus de Bene' and his nephew 'Schanutius', who commissioned the missal for the soul of 'Jacobus de Perusia'.¹² This argument does not seem entirely convincing, as the identity of the donors proves nothing about the identity of the miniaturist in a period when commercial travel was common and artistic commissions went to the best craftsman,

¹² Giovanni Muzzioli and Mario Salmi, *Mostra storica nazionale della minatura, Palazzo di Venezia, Roma. Catalogo* (Firenze: Sansoni, 1953): 253–254. Quoted in Elvio Lunghi, "Le Miniature dei Manoscritti Italiani", *Una città e la sua cattedrale: il Duomo di Perugia*. Convegno di studio, Perugia, 26–29 settembre 1988 (Perugia: Edizioni Chiesa S. Severo a Porta Sole, 1992), 253.

who was not necessarily local. It is also pertinent to remember that the personality of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno is an historical construct rather than an attested individual, and that identifying the miniaturist of the missal of Deruta as Perugian does not necessarily mean the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno was one single Perugian individual. Proving the Perugian identity of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno may also be regarded as a scholarly reaction to the eminent Italian art historian Mario Salmi's earlier argument that 'Umbria developed no independent idiom in the field of miniature'.¹³

Scholars working in the wake of Bologna's identification of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno have, without exception, accepted the existence of this individual personality and sought to enlarge his oeuvre. Two of the most important scholarly contributions have been from Antonino Caleca and Marcella Degl'Innocenti Gambuti. In 1969, Caleca published his groundbreaking study of the manuscripts in the collection of the Museo dell'Opera del Duomo di Perugia (referred to in this thesis by its current title, the Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Perugia).¹⁴ He evidently envisaged producing further volumes to complement this first study (in order to include the manuscripts in the collections of the Biblioteca Augusta di Perugia, the Biblioteca Comunale di Assisi and the Biblioteca Comunale 'Lorenzo Leonij' di Todi), but this longer project remained incomplete and the first volume stands alone.¹⁵ In the one published volume, Caleca provided a critical analysis and commentary for each manuscript in the Capitolo di San Lorenzo's collection, and in doing so established the foundations for all future study of these manuscripts. He accepted the catalogue of works attributed to the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno established by Bologna, while disagreeing with the earlier scholar on several stylistic points relating to the missal of

¹³ Mario Salmi, *Italian Miniatures*, trans. Elisabeth V. Borghese (London: Collins, 1957), 32. Further challenges to Salmi's claim are indirectly addressed the following: Maria Grazia Ciardi Dupré dal Poggetto, "La Miniatura del Duecento in Italia Centrale" and "La Miniatura del Trecento in Italia Centrale", in *La Miniatura in Italia: Dal tardoantico al Trecento con riferimenti al Medio Oriente e all'Occidente europeo*, ed. Antonella Putaturo Donati Murano and Alessandra Perriccioli Saggese (Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 2005), 194–205 and 206–225.

¹⁴ The entry refers to these manuscripts (and others) as held at the Biblioteca Capitolare di Perugia; however this library does not actually exist. Instead, the Museo Capitolare di Perugia, housed in the cloister of the cathedral of San Lorenzo, holds the manuscript collection in question. It is not a library but an archive: the manuscripts are on display in the museum or in storage, but may be accessed by scholars for research purposes. Thus, it is referred to by its most recent cataloguer, Leonardo Magionami, as the Capitolo di San Lorenzo di Perugia. It shall be referenced as such throughout this thesis.

¹⁵ Antonino Caleca, *Miniature in Umbria: I – La Biblioteca Capitolare di Perugia* (Firenze: Marchi & Bertolli, 1969), 172.

Deruta.¹⁶ Caleca discussed Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 16 in much greater depth than Bologna, and affirmed its place within the manuscripts attributed to the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno.

Caleca's work is not without its problems, however. Internal discrepancies, particularly over the key manuscript Perugia Ms. 16, have resulted in confusion amongst subsequent scholars. In his introduction to the collection, Caleca places Ms. 16 in a group with three other liturgical manuscripts made for use by Franciscan communities. He had earlier noted that some manuscripts were donated to San Lorenzo by the Franciscans at Monteripido (Perugia) in 1860–1862, in the suppression of the monasteries after the unification of Italy.¹⁷ While it is not made explicit by Caleca, one presumes that the Franciscan liturgical manuscripts in the collection of the Capitolo di San Lorenzo may have been those donated by the community at Monteripido. Thus, one may suppose that Ms. 16 is in fact a Franciscan gradual. However, in the full catalogue entry for Ms. 16 later in his book, Caleca specifies that Ms. 16 is unquestionably attributable to the cathedral of San Lorenzo (on the basis of its sanctorale).¹⁸ The gradual is variously cited as Franciscan and as secular, a confusion which has continued to the present day – some scholars (such as Manion) have referred to it as a Franciscan gradual, while others (like Elvio Lunghi) have attributed it to the Canons regular of San Lorenzo. Whether Franciscan or secular, Ms. 16 has remained the lynchpin of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno's catalogue of works in all scholarship since Caleca. Its status as either Franciscan or non-Franciscan does have an important impact on art historians' identification of the Perugian Liturgical Group as being distinguished largely by the Franciscan spiritual identity of some of its manuscripts. This will be discussed in greater depth below.

In 1977, Marcella Degl'Innocenti Gambuti published the first catalogue of the collection of the Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca di Cortona since that of Girolamo Mancini in 1884.¹⁹ She provided entries and detailed commentary for each of the medieval manuscripts housed in the library.²⁰ Her most important contribution was the attribution of Ms. 14 in the collection to the miniaturist

¹⁶ Ibid., 85.

¹⁷ Ibid., 12.

¹⁸ Ibid., 83, 172.

¹⁹ Girolamo Mancini, *I manoscritti della Libreria del Comune e dell'Accademia Etrusca di Cortona* (Cortona: Cortona, 1884).

²⁰ Marcella Degl'Innocenti Gambuti, *I codici miniati medievali della Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca di Cortona* (Firenze: SPES, 1977).

Venturella di Pietro. Unlike the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno, Venturella is historically attested as an individual; that is, evidence beyond stylistic interpretation exists for his life. This miniaturist was active by at least May 1311: the archives of the Comune di Perugia record that Venturella di Pietro was paid 30 *soldi* for painting miniatures in the library of the *podestà* Ottaviano dei Brunelleschi.²¹ A further reference to Venturella appeared in 1313, when he was cited as the ‘*camerlengo dell’Arte*’.²² In 1323, a ‘Pietro di Venturella’, whom Lunghi and others have interpreted as the first Venturella’s son, was recorded as the ‘*rettore dell’Arte dei miniatori*’ in the Perugian city quarter of Porta Eburnea.²³ Degl’Innocenti Gambuti found a scribal note in the margin of f. 7r of Ms. 14 in Cortona’s collection that reads: ‘*Passai a di XVII de marzo a maestro Venturella 4 quinterni*’.²⁴ She interpreted this as a reference to Venturella di Pietro, whose known dates of activity align with Degl’Innocenti Gambuti’s dating of this missal to 1317–1334 (based on liturgical evidence). The attribution of Ms. 14 to Venturella di Pietro has remained the cornerstone of all subsequent research on these Umbrian manuscripts: it is on the basis of similarity to the decorative programme of this key missal that all other additions to Venturella’s oeuvre have been established.

In 1982, in celebration of the 800th anniversary of the birth of St Francis, an exhibition in Foligno and accompanying catalogue of Franciscan texts, objects and images was produced by the Comitato Regionale Umbro per le Celebrazioni dell’VIII Centenario della nascita di san Francesco di Assisi. Drawing together items from international collections, the catalogue (*Francesco d’Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature*) included scholarly articles on all aspects of the material. It was not possible to send the CSP to Italy for the exhibition, but reproductions of the missal’s decorations were sent and displayed, as a result of discussions between Margaret Manion and her Italian colleagues involved in the exhibition and catalogue.

²¹ Elvio Lunghi, “Venturella di Pietro”, *Dizionario Bibliografico dei Miniatori Italiani secoli IX–XVI*, ed. Milvia Bollati (Milano: Edizioni Sylvestre Bonnard, 2004), 988.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.* Lunghi cites Umberto Gnoli, *Pittore e miniatori nell’Umbria* (Foligno: Ediclio, 1980), 342. Cf. Degl’Innocenti Gambuti, *I codici miniati*, 107; A. Rossi “Nota all’articolo: L’arte dei miniatori a Perugia” *Giornale di erudizione artistica* II (1873): 350; Elvio Lunghi, “Altri ‘scriptoria’ nella prima metà del Trecento a Perugia”, in *Francesco d’Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature*, ed. Carlo Pirovano (Milano: Electa, 1982), 253–254, n. 4.

²⁴ “I passed on the 17th of March to Maestro Venturella 4 quires”. *Ibid.*, 107.

While the large number of contributors to the catalogue means that no formal unified attitude to the material can accurately be surmised, certain themes recur in many of the articles and catalogue entries. In the sections concerned with illuminated manuscripts, many of the contributors display an interest in establishing, categorising and defining a particularly Franciscan style of decoration. The assumptions present in this argument – the inherent simplicity of Franciscan spirituality, the deliberate anti-intellectualism and subsequent accessibility of a unique Franciscan decorative style – indicate a broader ideological agenda in the art-historical scholarship of these Franciscan manuscripts. The basic assumption of the simplicity and anti-intellectualism of Franciscan spirituality may readily be called into question. This assumption rests on a tendency to downplay complexities within both Franciscan spirituality (which cannot be spoken of as a unified concept during the thirteenth or fourteenth centuries) and the miniatures under examination. Such an interpretation can pose an obstacle to a discussion of Franciscan manuscripts. As will be explored in greater depth in Chapter Three, the complex attitude of the Franciscan friars to book production and ownership, and the complicated relationships between the friars and the miniaturists involved in the production of this particular group of manuscripts, necessitate a careful assessment of the validity of the concept of a particularly Franciscan style of manuscript decoration. The influence of the 1982 catalogue was far-reaching, and continues to the present. The most recent work to discuss this period of Umbrian miniatures (Subbioni, 2003) continues to seek and argue for the concept of a particularly Franciscan style of decoration, characterised by simplicity.²⁵

Maria Grazia Ciardi Dupré Dal Poggetto (one of the major contributors to the 1982 catalogue) extended this ideological reading of Franciscan decorated manuscripts and the quest to categorise a particularly Franciscan style of decoration, suggesting the existence of a group of manuscripts (including the CSP) that feature stylistic and ideological elements which cross the boundaries of individual miniaturists' oeuvres. Her article, '*Il primo papa francescano, Niccolò IV (1288–1293), e il suo influsso sulla miniature umbra*', argued for the identification of a group of illuminated Franciscan manuscripts whose miniatures display two elements in common: firstly, the diminished size of the figures, and secondly, the presence of a

²⁵ Marina Subbioni, *La Miniatura Perugina del Trecento: Contributo alla storia della pittura in Umbria nel quattordicesimo secolo* (Perugia: Guerra Edizioni, 2003).

French gothic style which was reinterpreted by the Umbrian artist/s as ‘*un classicismo “moderno”*’.²⁶

Ciardi Dupré Dal Poggetto suggested that the French gothic influence may have reached Umbrian artists through the papal court in Rome, under the influence of the first Franciscan pope, Nicholas IV (1288–1293).²⁷ In this, she acknowledged herself to be following Hans Belting’s argument that Nicholas IV championed the decorative style of Cimabue, whose work he encountered in Rome, for use in the upper transept of the Basilica di San Francesco in Assisi.²⁸ Ciardi Dupré Dal Poggetto was, however, the first to cite this French gothic influence in relation to Umbrian miniaturists. Like Bologna and Caleca before her, Ciardi Dupré Dal Poggetto argued that Cimabue’s style had a strong influence on Umbrian miniaturists; she cited Assisi, Archivio Capitolare, Ms. 8 as an example of the way in which Cimabue’s combination of delicacy and expressive power was emulated by Umbrian miniaturists.²⁹

In suggesting several key stylistic elements (the diminished size of the figures and the presence of a new French-influenced classical modernism) as being distinctive of a potential group, Ciardi Dupré Dal Poggetto was the first scholar to lay particular parameters around the concept of a group defined by ideological style rather than individual miniaturist – referred to in this dissertation as the Perugian Liturgical Group. In more definite terms, the entry for the CSP in the 1982 catalogue lists seven manuscripts that may be seen as stylistically (and thus, in this case, ideologically) related to the CSP:

Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 16 (gradual, late-thirteenth-century)

Deruta, Pinacoteca Comunale, Messale francescano (c. 1280–1285, made for use in Deruta)

Salerno, Opera del Duomo, Messale francescano (c. 1290, made for use in Salerno)

²⁶ Maria Grazia Ciardi Dupré Dal Poggetto, “*Il primo papa francescano, Niccolò IV (1288–1293), e il suo influsso sulla miniature umbra*”, *Francesco d’Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature*, ed. Carlo Pirovano (Milano: Electa, 1982), 358.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 358.

²⁸ Hans Belting, *Die Oberkirche von San Francesco in Assisi* (Berlin: Mann, 1977).

²⁹ Ciardi Dupré Dal Poggetto, “*Il primo papa francescano*”, 358. She acknowledges that Ms. 8 dates from c. 1285, before the reign of Nicholas IV, but suggests the integration of Cimabue’s style into Umbrian miniature art was a progressive one, encouraged by the Franciscan Pope during his tenure.

Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Mss. 9, 10, 11
(Franciscan lectionary in three volumes, made for use in San Francesco in
Cortona)

Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 13 (Missal, late-
thirteenth-century, made for use in Gubbio)

Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 14 (Missal, c.
1317–1334)

Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Lat. 41 (Umbrian bible, late-thirteenth-
century)

The entry credits François Avril with suggesting the CSP as part of the group, though no reference is provided for this statement.³⁰ The catalogue entry also lists two fourteenth-century manuscripts that may be considered as a development of the style of the Group – Ms. 38 (a breviary) and Ms. 8 (a missal), both held in the Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Perugia.³¹

The catalogue entries for these other manuscripts listed in the CSP's entry agreed with this formulation of a group, but through a careful reading of other manuscript entries in the catalogue, more manuscripts may be added to the potential group. For instance, the entry for Perugia, Biblioteca Augusta, Ms. 47 notes that it is the work of a miniaturist from the circle of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno, yet Ms. 47 is not listed in the entry for the CSP as an artistically related manuscript.³² Similarly, the entry for Gubbio, Archivio Capitolare, Ms. II C. 20 A lists this ritual as made for the cathedral of Gubbio, and importantly as being the work of Venturella di Pietro.³³ The attribution to Venturella is based on the manuscript's similarities to Cortona, Ms. 14, yet unlike Ms. 14, Ms. II C. 20 A is not listed with the group in the entry for the CSP.

³⁰ Although the entry does not specify a reference for Avril's suggestion, the idea is later found Avril and Marie-Thérèse Gousset's two volume catalogue of Italian manuscripts in the collection of the Bibliothèque nationale de France, published in 1984. In all, seven of the nine Umbrian manuscripts in the BnF's collection are either explicitly or implicitly cited as connected to the CSP in this catalogue. François Avril and Marie-Thérèse Gousset, *Manuscrits enluminés d'origine italienne*, 2 vols. (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1984).

³¹ Carlo Pirovano, ed., "112. Messale francescano", *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature* (Milano: Electa, 1982), 363.

³² Carlo Pirovano, ed., "120. Messale francescano", in *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature* (Milano: Electa, 1982), 374.

³³ Carlo Pirovano, ed., "48. Rituale", in *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature* (Milano: Electa, 1982), 256.

While the 1982 catalogue is a vitally important resource for all scholars of medieval Franciscan manuscripts, the presence of work by multiple scholars made it difficult to achieve a consistent approach to the subject matter, resulting in occasional contradictions between entries. However, it is an indispensable guide to Italian collections of Franciscan manuscripts, as well as a useful introduction to the major scholarship of the field. Regarding the CSP and its cognate manuscripts, this scholarship has been chiefly concerned with two issues: firstly, with establishing the oeuvres of the two major miniaturists involved (the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno and Venturella di Pietro) and secondly with establishing the existence of a specifically Franciscan style of decoration, characterised by a simplicity (the scholars argue) that echoes the spirituality of Francis and his Order. Despite the art-historical tradition of focusing on individual miniaturists, the scholars who have written on these manuscripts have not been concerned with discussing the ramifications of the formulation of a group that transcends the boundaries set by the attributions of manuscripts to particular miniaturists; as a consequence, they have not engaged with the historical context of the production of these manuscripts. This is not a criticism: such context has simply not been the agenda of the art-historical scholarship. Fortunately, it is possible, within the scope of this study, to expand the field of enquiry to include the practicalities of manuscript production alongside a consideration of art-historical aspects, and so to explore the concept of a distinctively Franciscan decorative style with reference to the manuscript tradition.

Similarly, art historians who have discussed the Perugian Liturgical Group have not been concerned with establishing a comprehensive list of the related manuscripts. Compiling such a list is, therefore, only possible through a close reading of the entire scholarly output regarding these manuscripts, and by gathering up the details strewn throughout the historiography. To this end, the following list of manuscripts represents an attempt to gather an up-to-date list of all manuscripts which are believed to form the Perugian Liturgical Group – that is, those decorated by the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno or Venturella di Pietro, and those stylistically related to either miniaturist but without firm attribution to one or the other. Franciscan manuscripts are italicised, and sigla used in this dissertation are included in square brackets, where applicable.

Maestro di Deruta-Salerno:

Assisi, Archivio Capitolare (San Rufino), Ms. 6. Franciscan missal, late-thirteenth-century.

Deruta, Pinacoteca, Missal of Deruta. Franciscan missal, used at San Francesco in Deruta, c. 1280–1285.

Firenze, private collection of Enrico Frascione. A single folio (no further information available).

Gubbio, San Pietro, Liturgical books from San Pietro. Roman Use, late-thirteenth-century.

Melbourne, State Library of Victoria, Rare Books Collection, Codex Sancti Paschalis [CSP]. Franciscan missal, Perugian provenance, late-thirteenth-century.

Paris, Galerie Les Eluminares, cut-out historiated initial of St Michael (no further information).

Perugia, Biblioteca Augusta, Ms. 47. Franciscan missal, Perugian provenance (probably from the convent of Monteripido), late-thirteenth-century.

Perugia, Biblioteca Augusta. Various historiated initials in Mss. 2781–2798. Dominican antiphonals made for use in San Domenico, Perugia, late-thirteenth- to early-fourteenth-century.

Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 16.³⁴ Antiphonal, either Franciscan or for use in San Lorenzo, cathedral of Perugia, late-thirteenth-century.

Rome, Vatican Library, Ms. Reg. Lat. 2048. Roman missal, late-thirteenth-century.

Salerno, Museo del Duomo, Missal of Deruta. Franciscan missal, used in Deruta, 1280–1285.

Siena, Biblioteca Comunale, Ms. I.I.4. Antiphonal, late-thirteenth-century.

Siena, Biblioteca Comunale, Ms. G. III. 10. Franciscan missal, second quarter of the fourteenth century.

Tavernelle Val di Pesa, church of Sant'Antonino a Bonazza. Antiphonal (no further information).

³⁴ As discussed above, at different points in his catalogue, Caleca describes this gradual as Franciscan and as secular. Given the incomplete nature of the manuscript, it may be impossible to tell which it is.

Venturella di Pietro:

Assisi, *Sacro Covento Ms. 263. Franciscan missal, c. 1311–1323.*

Cortona, *Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 14 [D]. Roman missal, possibly used in San Francesco in Cortona, early-fourteenth-century.*

Gubbio, Archivio Capitolare, Ms. II C 20 A. Roman missal used in the cathedral of Gubbio, c. 1320–1330.

Gubbio, Archivio Capitolare, Ms. II C 15. Ritual used in the cathedral of Gubbio, c. 1320–1330.

London, Victoria & Albert Museum, Ms. E.371.1911. Cut-out historiated initial of the Nativity of the Virgin.

London, Victoria & Albert Museum, Ms. E.378.1911. Single folio of the Gospel of John, with historiated initial of St John the Evangelist.

Single folio with historiated initial of Extreme Unction (unknown private Italian collection).

Siena, Museo dell'Opera della Metropolitana, Ms. 13.93.0, f. 44r (historiated initial of the Ascension) and f. 54r (historiated initial of Pentecost).

Todi, Biblioteca Comunale, Ms. 60, f. 2r. Single historiated initial of Francis.

Mss. linked to the CSP and/or mss. listed above, without specific attribution to a master/school:

Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 267 [E]. Augustinian missal, early-fourteenth-century (c. 1312–1334).

Assisi, Archivio Capitolare (San Rufino), Ms. 8. Roman missal c. 1273.

Cortona, *Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 9–11. Franciscan lectionary, used in San Francesco in Cortona, early-fourteenth-century.*

Cortona, *Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 13 [C]. Roman missal (possibly Franciscan), used in Gubbio, late-thirteenth-century.*

Firenze, *Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Ms. Gaddi 7 [B]. Franciscan missal, Umbrian provenance, late-thirteenth-century.*

Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 41. Umbrian Bible, late-thirteenth-century.

Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 3206. Umbrian copy of the *Liber sententiarum* of Peter Lombard, late-thirteenth-century.

Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 17883. Umbrian copy of *De doctrina dicendi e tacendi* by Albertanus Brixiensis, late-thirteenth-century.

Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 2232. Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Job*, early-fourteenth-century.

Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 3990 B. Umbrian copy of *Commentarii in Decretales* by Innocent IV, late-thirteenth-century.

Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 14278. Umbrian copy of *Rationale divini officii* by Guillaume Durand, late-thirteenth-century.

Paris, BnF, Ms. n. acq. lat. 1747. Umbrian copy of Jacques de Voragine's *Legenda aurea*, late-thirteenth-century.

Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 38. Roman missal, Perugian provenance (possibly used in the cathedral, San Lorenzo), fourteenth-century.

This list will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter Three, but is presented here to provide some idea of the scope of the Perugian Liturgical Group and the difficulties in using previous scholarship which discusses these manuscripts, which has thus far failed to establish firm guidelines by which to enable the identification of a group.

1.3 Selection Rationale for the Missals Under Study

Despite the difficulties inherent in the historiography of the Perugian Liturgical Group, the parameters used in the selection of manuscripts discussed in this dissertation were to some extent based on the art-historical scholarship of the CSP (the manuscript which was the launchpad for the questions pursued here). In order to explore how and why different Franciscan communities from a small geographic and temporal space developed their liturgical calendars, manuscripts produced by related Perugian ateliers have been selected. The reason for this is simple – these manuscripts exhibit both spiritual and artistic relationships/similarities, yet demonstrate diversity in their liturgical calendars. In order to strengthen the comparison, an Augustinian missal is included. The five missals have been assigned a sigla (CSP and then letters B to E), for ease of reference within the dissertation. The codicology and provenance of these manuscripts will be presented in detail in Chapter Four, alongside the liturgical data from their calendars. The missals are:

CSP: Melbourne, State Library of Victoria, Rare Books Collection, Codex Sancti Paschalis. Franciscan missal, Perugian provenance, late-thirteenth-century.

- B:** Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Ms. Gaddi 7. Franciscan missal, Umbrian provenance, late-thirteenth-century.
- C:** Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 13. Roman missal, possibly Franciscan, used in Gubbio, late-thirteenth-century.
- D:** Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 14. Franciscan missal used in San Francesco in Cortona, early-fourteenth-century.
- E:** Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 267. Augustinian missal, late-thirteenth-century.

Over thirty manuscripts initially informed the progress of this research. It must be acknowledged that only a small number of these available and relevant manuscripts can be included in this study, otherwise it would become unwieldy and unworkable. Therefore, each of the four manuscripts chosen for comparison with the CSP has been carefully selected from the wider group studied, for specific reasons. In general terms, an effort has been made to ensure that the manuscripts chosen have sufficient intact liturgical information to be of value to the study. However, the fact that one of the selected missals (E) lacks four months of its calendar highlights the difficulties facing the researcher in working with such evidence: such gaps are a frustrating reality of conducting research in this field.

Of the group of manuscripts which art historians have suggested form what is here termed the Perugian Liturgical Group, only four have been chosen for comparison with the CSP. The selected manuscripts have been chosen on the basis of five factors:

1. stylistic connection to the Perugian Liturgical Group
2. type of liturgical manuscript (i.e. missal)
3. religious identity
4. date
5. geographic area of origin

The first factor (art-historical connection to the Perugian Liturgical Group) will be discussed in depth in Chapter Three. As the following discussion of methodologies for the study of liturgical manuscripts makes clear, my focus is on the liturgical calendars and the ritual activity they embody, rather than the artistic contents of the selected manuscripts. Discussion of the art-historical historiography of

these manuscripts is framed by my larger concerns: the broader issues of methodologies for the study of liturgical manuscripts.

The rationale for selecting only missals as comparative material for the CSP (the second factor listed) is self-evident – the CSP is itself a missal, and as the major interest of this study is the celebration of saints' feasts, it is essential that all the comparative manuscripts contain liturgical calendars. While liturgical books other than missals can theoretically contain calendars (such as breviaries and graduals), none of these types of manuscripts from within the Perugian Liturgical Group contained complete calendars, and thus were discounted from selection.

Two of the four comparative missals were definitely made for use by Franciscans, as their *incipit* lines make clear. While the particular spiritual character of these different communities of friars cannot be precisely determined (e.g. mainstream, proto-Spiritualist), this is not especially problematic for two reasons: firstly, such distinctions cannot be applied to the period in question with any clarity or certainty as they are to some extent anachronistic, and secondly, the very fact that there were variations in the expression of Franciscanism between different houses challenges that scholarship which has insisted on spiritual and liturgical unity in the Order in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Two of the other missals included here (C and D) are simply identified as Roman missals in their *incipit* statements. Whether these missals were used by Franciscans or by secular clergy in the cathedrals of Cortona and Gubbio, the fact remains that their calendars feature many Franciscan saints. In particular, there is a strong case for arguing that D was used at some point by a Franciscan community, given the reference to Francis as '*patrus nostri*' in its addition of the Feast of the Stigmata. The nuances involved in interpreting the information from these two missals will be discussed further in Chapter Five. The final missal included for comparison (E) was made for use by Augustinian friars, possibly in Assisi. While it has not yet been extensively studied, art historians have proposed that it is part of the Perugian Liturgical Group, which suggests use somewhere in Umbria. The fact that the missal has been in the collection of the Sacro Convento in Assisi since 1381 has led some scholars to propose it was in fact made for use in that town, though none have explored how it came to be given by the Augustinian friars to the Franciscans.

Liturgical manuscripts are usually dated (by both liturgical historians and art historians) through examination of the inclusion or exclusion of feasts that have a

well-researched history – the feast of Louis of Toulouse, for example, is frequently used as a benchmark for the dating of Franciscan missals. As the discussion in Chapter Five will show, the concept of using feasts such as that of Louis of Toulouse to establish firm dates for missals requires reconsideration – the process of updating feasts in Franciscan missals of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries appears to have been far less uniform than is usually assumed. All five of the selected missals have been dated by art historians (and in certain cases, also by manuscript scholars) to the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. As such, they are contemporaneous with the CSP. This is a necessary parameter for the study, providing firm boundaries as to the study's focus and contribution. While all the additions to each calendar are noted in the following short catalogue entries for the sake of completeness, not every added feast will be discussed in detail, as the resulting information would be too great for the present study. Chapter Five lists the selection of feasts which will be considered (including those in the category of additions) and provides justification for their inclusion in this study. It must be clearly stated that exact dating of each missal is not a primary concern; rather, the *meaning* of liturgical feasts in the assessment of the ritual activity of particular communities is of central interest here. This naturally involves some assessment of their inclusion and exclusion, but these aspects are analysed to explore the lack of uniformity within Franciscan liturgical calendars of the period, rather than with the aim of establishing firm dates for the missals in question. Thus, the attribution of the five selected missals to the end of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth century is sufficient to provide the framework for comparison between the manuscripts. In light of this, the dates given below in each short catalogue entry are deliberately broad, with the exception of C (for which firm evidence exists regarding dating, as will be discussed).

All the selected manuscripts were made for use within Umbria. For three of the missals it is possible to suggest specific towns as the original location of the manuscript: C was probably made for use in Gubbio, D is likely to have been made for use in Cortona and E for use by Augustinian friars in Assisi. The CSP and B provide no clues as to a more specific original location than the region of Umbria. The selection of these four manuscripts for comparison with the CSP thus embraces liturgical calendars used by communities in at least three cities (Gubbio, Cortona and Assisi) while also providing a more generalised Umbrian comparison (in B).

The four manuscripts selected are reasonable choices for comparison with the CSP as they fulfil the five stated requirements. It is hoped that the selection of liturgical manuscripts chosen will provide a solid framework for the discussion of Chapter Five, in which the articulation of communal religious identity through liturgical observation of saints' feasts will be explored – the impact of religious affiliation, location and manuscript production will be assessed as factors in the development and expression of Perugian Franciscan identity as seen in the CSP.

1.3 Towards a New Model for Manuscript Studies: Liturgical History meets Ritual and Performance Theory

With the exception of the first scholarly article written about the CSP (by Celsus Kelly OFM in 1949, the year the missal arrived in Australia), there has been no detailed study of the missal's liturgical contents.³⁵ As discussed above, the focus of scholarly attention on the CSP has come from an art-historical perspective. Kelly's article discussed the codicology and contents of the missal, but as it did not include reference to any contemporaneous comparative material, the article's contribution is necessarily limited. Kelly's focus was the acquisition process, itself a fascinating tussle played out between the English bookseller W.H. Robinson, the State Library of Victoria and the Australian Province of the Order of Friars Minor. Some of the art-historical study of the CSP and stylistically related manuscripts has made reference to their liturgical contents, but only within the framework of establishing a date for the missal that supports attribution to the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno and/or Venturella di Pietro – the presence or absence of feasts being taken as indicative of the missal's date, as is standard practice in liturgical history.³⁶ As discussed, the primary motivation for such work has been the expansion of these miniaturists' attributed works, rather than study of the manuscripts themselves.

In the specific field of Franciscan liturgical history, Stephen Joseph Peter van Dijk OFM (1909–1971) has no equal for either productivity or influence. Van Dijk's seminal works (written with the unspecified assistance of Joan Hazelden Walker) – *The Origin of the Modern Roman Liturgy*, *The Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy: The Ordinals of Haymo of Faversham and Related Documents 1243–1307* and *The Ordinal of the Papal Court from Innocent III to Boniface VIII and Related Documents*

³⁵ Kelly, "The Codex Sti Paschalis", 74–94.

³⁶ See for example: Manion, "The Codex Sancti Paschalis", 13.

(published posthumously) – have provided the basis for all subsequent study of Franciscan liturgy.³⁷ In the first of these works, van Dijk and Hazelden Walker set the Roman liturgy in the thirteenth century within the context of ‘the development of public worship and of its books, within the history of the papal court and of the Order of St Francis’.³⁸ Van Dijk and Walker acknowledged the magnitude and the originality of their task: ‘To say that this is the first attempt to see the thirteenth-century Roman liturgy in its entirety and as part of early Franciscan history, is little more than a confession of incompleteness.’³⁹ Van Dijk and Walker seem to have judged their own work more harshly than have subsequent scholars, for whom these texts are an indispensable guide to the development of the centralised Roman liturgy.

Van Dijk and Walker devoted considerable space in their work to the study of the introduction of particular feasts to the Franciscan calendar, and in so doing underlined a basic historical assumption about the importance of such feasts – which saints entered a calendar and when are considered to be vital in determining differentiated spiritual identity (in this case, of the Franciscans as differentiated from the spiritual identities of other orders).⁴⁰ This attitude to the usefulness of saints’ feasts for the historian is not unique to van Dijk, as will be made clear in Chapter Four’s discussion of methodologies for the study of liturgical calendars. Since the time of van Dijk, very little has been written which significantly expands upon his research into Franciscan liturgy; the tendency of liturgical historians has been to repeat rather than examine van Dijk’s findings about the liturgical activity of the friars. A critique of van Dijk’s theory of the development of Franciscan liturgy will be presented in Chapter Two, which will draw attention to significant problems in his model. More broadly, a new model for the study of the liturgical contents of missals, one that expands beyond the textual boundaries of traditional liturgical history, is required to address the questions posed in the Introduction to this study.

Liturgical history as a discipline is a form of textual history, in which the focus and the limit of scholars’ attention has traditionally been the variations and

³⁷ Stephen J.P. van Dijk OFM and Joan Hazelden Walker, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1960); Stephen J.P. van Dijk OFM and Joan Hazelden Walker, *The Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy: the Ordinals of Haymo of Faversham and Related Documents 1243–1307* (Leiden: Brill, 1963); Stephen J.P. van Dijk OFM and Joan Hazelden Walker, *The Ordinal of the Papal Court from Innocent III to Boniface VIII and Related Documents* (Fribourg: University Press, 1975).

³⁸ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 10.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 11.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 358–397.

development of liturgical rites, as seen through its textual record. The changes in wording (sometimes minute) and the additions to different manuscripts are endlessly cross-examined and compared. When reading traditional liturgical history, one often has the sensation of looking the wrong way through a pair of binoculars – the field of vision is tightly constrained (and prolonged viewing may induce headaches). The value of such work is, of course, obvious: the textual record is and must be a fundamental aspect of study of the past in any discipline. However, the standard paradigm of liturgical history provides information of a necessarily limited type, as it can elucidate only the written aspect of a performed practice: the practice itself, as enacted by a community or individual, is not at the heart of this type of textual study. This observation is not a criticism of liturgical history, which by its nature does not seek to look beyond the written word; as van Dijk and Walker observed in 1960, ‘the parchment always appears to be too patient and too silent’.⁴¹

While understandable in terms of disciplinary boundaries, this approach leaves an obvious gap in scholarly understanding of liturgical manuscripts; after exploring how such manuscripts were produced, one is challenged to ask how they were then used. I must clarify at this point that the physical performance of liturgy is not the main focus of this dissertation: rather, the inclusion or exclusion of certain feasts will be examined in the calendars of the selected missals in order to gauge a liturgical commemoration’s function within the construction of communal identity amongst the Order of Friars Minor. This aspect is kept separate from the study of the evolution of saints’ offices in the sanctoral cycles of missals and breviaries (that is, the study of the textual celebration of saints) because to combine the two would create an unmanageably large subject for one dissertation. D’Avray’s observation (in the field of sermon studies) about the limitations of textual evidence in the extrapolation of the resulting physical performance must also be considered. The ongoing study of the evolution of offices and the study of how such feasts were celebrated in literal, physical terms is a subject for future research.

Performance theory has been an expanding field in medieval studies from the early part of the twentieth century, though a fundamental shift in its use has occurred in the last two decades. Émile Durkheim’s seminal *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (1915) marked the beginning of modern scholarship in the field of

⁴¹ Ibid., 11.

ritual.⁴² Durkheim understood ritual as reinforcing and sacralising social order, which consisted of regulating the boundaries between the sacred and the profane. Karl Young's classic 1933 study *The Drama of the Medieval Church* was foundational in the application of ideas of performance to religious rites and has influenced much subsequent ritual theory, though his interest lay primarily in theatre rather than religious ritual.⁴³ Young identified the mass as a dramatic ritual that necessarily involved ideas of performance and reception. Performance theory has perhaps always been more easily appropriated by disciplines such as anthropology, which has at its heart a concern with human behaviour and activity, than by liturgical history, which is traditionally more devoted to the text. The anthropologist Victor Turner viewed ritual as a transitional, performed process, taking place in a liminal space, which addressed and resolved social crises; for him, rituals expressed the transformative element of social drama.⁴⁴ The application of Turner's ideas (and those of other anthropologists) to the study of medieval Franciscan liturgy, and to the concept of spiritual eremiticism within an urban context, would seem to be an appropriate and potentially fruitful topic for future research.

In the latter half of the twentieth century, ritual theory came to be increasingly embraced by performance theorists, with the resulting hybrid shedding new light on the cultural and spiritual meaning behind the performance of ritual. This idea of ritual as a performance, along with the associated issues of identifying cultural context, space, audience, performers and actions indicative of ritual, has in turn led to various shifts in the way performance theory is applied to ritual, and in the expectations that such an approach evokes. The advent of postmodernist thought and post-structuralist notions of layered, constructed identity have had a profound impact on performance theory – religious rituals can now be viewed as methods of constructing an identity (both for individuals and communities).

Some performance theorists, notably Ronald Grimes and Maurice Bloch, have argued that it is fruitless and even illogical to attempt to use ritual to understand social or religious experiences – they argue that, as performances, rituals are fixed, formalised and without interpretative meaning. Therefore, they suggest, scholars

⁴² Émile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life* (New York: Free Press, 1915).

⁴³ Karl Young, *The Drama of the Medieval Church* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933).

⁴⁴ Victor Turner, *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1977).

ought to value ritual activity over ritual meaning.⁴⁵ This approach appears useless in the context of examining liturgical ritual, for if the Mass had no theological, spiritual or cultural meaning, it would be essentially defunct and self-defeating. Recent advances in interdisciplinary approaches to liturgical history have rebutted Grimes and Bloch's notion, and have reasserted the value of searching for cultural meaning in performed ritual activity. This new method seeks to integrate ritual studies and performance theory with liturgical history to explore the practice and the cultural meaning and heritage of medieval liturgical rituals.

Some leading proponents of this development are James Boyce (in the field of Carmelite liturgy, as mentioned above) and (on an institutional level) the scholars involved in the Centre for the Study of the Cultural Heritage of Medieval Rituals, which was established in 2002 by the Department of Church History at the University of Copenhagen. The volumes published by the Centre form the bulk of the scholarly output that utilises this new methodology.⁴⁶ In exploring the cultural heritage of medieval rituals and performances, the Centre's scholarship seeks to 'construct historical narratives . . . that then constitute a polyphonic web of narratives, together constituting what may be called cultural history – that ties together elements of a medieval Latin religious devotional culture with later and even contemporary cultural performative practices'.⁴⁷ Working across a broad chronological and topical spread, the publications of the Centre's scholars are tied together by this basic thematic

⁴⁵ Cited in Mary Suydam, "Background – An Introduction to Performance Studies", in *Performance and Transformation: New Approaches to Late Medieval Spirituality*, ed. Mary Suydam and Joanna E. Ziegler (NY: St Martin's Press, 1999), 12.

⁴⁶ A selection of works published by the Centre includes: Eyolf Østrem, Jens Fleischer and Nils Holger Petersen, eds., *The Arts and the Cultural Heritage of Martin Luther* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, University of Copenhagen, 2002); Nils Holger Petersen, Nicolas Bell and Claus Clüver, eds., *Signs of Change: Transformations of Christian Traditions and Their Representation in the Arts, 1000–2000* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004); Nils Holger Petersen et al., eds., *The Appearances of Medieval Rituals: The Play of Construction and Modification* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004); Eyolf Østrem et al., eds., *Genre and Ritual: The Cultural Heritage of Medieval Rituals: Special issue of Transfiguration: Nordic Journal for Christianity and the Arts* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, University of Copenhagen, 2005); Sven Rune Havsteen et al., eds., *Creations: Medieval Rituals, the Arts, and the Concept of Creation Ritus et Artes 2* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007); Eyolf Østrem and Nils Holger Petersen, *Medieval Ritual and Early Modern Music: The Devotional Practice of Lauda Singing in Late-Renaissance Italy*, Ritus et Artes 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008); Mette B. Bruun and Stephanie Glaser, eds., *Negotiating Heritage: Memories of the Middle Ages*, Ritus et Artes 4 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008). Scholars connected with the Centre have been prolific contributors to other publications, alongside these of the Centre.

⁴⁷ Nils Holger Petersen, "Introduction", in *Genre and Ritual: The Cultural Heritage of Medieval Rituals*. Ed. Eyolf Ostrem et al., (Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, University of Copenhagen, 2005), 12–13.

foundation. Much of the Centre's work has focused on the performance of liturgical music and speech, both within the actual mass and in liturgical drama.

While the work of the scholars associated with the Centre has brought a new methodology to the study of liturgical manuscripts, embracing the possibility of elucidating actual ritual activity and its cultural meaning(s) from the written word, this structure of interpretation has yet to be applied specifically to the ritual celebration of saints' feasts within particular communities. The underlying assumption of this dissertation, that analysis of the pattern of celebration of saints within particular communities may facilitate an interpretation of the communal spiritual and political identity of those communities (in this case groups of Franciscan friars), will be discussed in depth in Chapter Five, but some justification for this approach is necessary here. It must be emphasised that this approach does not seek to construct one 'true' narrative of Franciscan identity politics in the period under study, but rather agrees with Holger Petersen's proposed 'polyphonic web of narratives', the construction of which assumes both a level of interpretational bias on the part of the scholar and unavoidable complexities of the group under consideration, which together preclude the existence of one true narrative.

The aim of this study is not to categorise Franciscan identity as a singular entity, but to point to the existence of a multiplicity of identities through an examination of communal ritual activity as expressed in missals. There is no shortage of scholarly study of the cult of saints, the concept of sainthood and the importance of ritual celebration of saints in general terms.⁴⁸ Indeed, sainthood and its derivative fields have been posited as a defining element of medieval culture by modern medievalists. Similarly, liturgical history has focused on the introduction and institution of saints' feasts as a central element of its study of medieval liturgy, precisely because the celebration of particular saints is so often the most localised, differentiating element of a liturgy. A community's ritual celebration of a saint (a spiritually distinctive, charismatic individual) is considered by many scholars to be an

⁴⁸ For example: Thomas Heffernan, *Sacred biography: Saints and their Biographers in the Middle Ages* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); André Vauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Joanna Cannon and Andre Vauchez, *Margherita of Cortona and the Lorenzetti: Sienese Art and the Cult of a Holy Woman in Medieval Tuscany* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999); Jeryldene Wood, "Perceptions of Holiness in Thirteenth-Century Italian Painting: Clare of Assisi", *Art History* 14 (1991): 301–328; Rona Goffen, *Spirituality in Conflict Saint Francis and Giotto's Bardi Chapel* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1988).

embodiment of that community's particular preoccupations and concerns. This paradigm has traditionally been applied to communities such as parishes, towns and (in later periods, including the contemporary) to countries/nations, where the community's identity is also expressible in social, political and racial terms. The paradigm has not yet found wide expression in the interpretation of what may be termed 'intra-communities', such as different houses or spiritually differentiated groups within a religious order.

The Order of Friars Minor in the thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries is an ideal case study for such a micro-history, given its fractured and contested nature during that period. The schismatic history of the Order in its first centuries of existence means that one cannot speak of 'identity' in the singular, but rather of a plurality of 'identities'. The identification of such plurality is not an historical construct but a problem consciously experienced by the friars themselves, as will be discussed in Chapter Two. In such circumstances, it is not possible within the confines of one dissertation to explore the identity crisis of the entire Order; instead this study aims to investigate the constructed spiritual identities of Franciscan communities living in a small geographic area (Umbria) in a specific time period (the late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries) through a close examination of the missals used by these communities.

In itself, this study is not exhaustive, but takes as its focus five missals identified as artistically related, including the CSP, the largely unstudied missal which was the inspiration for this methodological approach. In taking this approach to the selected missals, this study extends and expands upon previous scholarship (both specific scholarship on the manuscripts under consideration and, more generally, through a challenge to the dominant methodologies of manuscript studies and liturgical history) by applying a methodology that explores not only the writing and decorating of missals, but also their relation to the construction and maintenance of communal identity, as expressed by the ritual celebration of particular saints. It is anticipated that, by using this methodology, the 'silent' parchment may begin to speak.

Chapter Two

Quarrelling Brothers – Liturgy and Identity, 1209–1274

2.1 The Accepted Narrative of Franciscan Liturgical History

Before analysing the liturgical contents of the Codex Sancti Paschalis and a selection of related missals, it is necessary to examine both the history and historiography of Franciscan liturgy – a highly problematic area of an already complex story. It will be suggested that liturgy was not the primary means by which the Order established (or attempted to establish) a sense of unified communal identity. Reasons for this will be discussed in greater depth in Chapter Five, following detailed analysis of the liturgical calendars of the selected missals. The present chapter will outline the development of Franciscan liturgy from the formal confirmation of the Order in 1209 to the end of the minister generalship of Bonaventure in 1274, while offering some critical evaluation of the historiography of this development, most particularly the work of Stephen J.P. van Dijk OFM. In setting out this context, a new understanding of the friars' attitude(s) to liturgy, and the role of liturgy in building communal identity for the Order will be constructed. Van Dijk's conception of the 'Regula' liturgical books, the controversial leadership of Elias of Cortona (1221–1227, 1232–1239) and the clericalisation of the Order during the 1230s and 1240s will be critiqued. In particular, the liturgical reforms and statutes of ministers general Haymo of Faversham (1240–1243), John of Parma (1247–1257) and Bonaventure (1257–1274) will be discussed as necessary context for understanding of the calendars of the Perugian Liturgical Group. Rather than discussing in depth the specific technical revisions of the liturgy, this chapter will focus on the broader political and structural issues affecting the revision and maintenance of the friars' liturgical activity.

From the 1940s to the 1970s the liturgical historians Stephen J. P. van Dijk OFM and his colleague Joan Hazelden Walker laid the foundations for all subsequent

understandings of Franciscan liturgical development in the thirteenth century.⁴⁹ While it is difficult to ascertain the exact contribution of Walker in their joint works, it is clear that van Dijk was the driving force in these studies. Eric Palazzo's recent work *A History of Liturgical Books: From the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century* surveys the historiography of liturgical studies from the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries.⁵⁰ He situates van Dijk within a broader understanding of the development of liturgical studies as a discipline, which he characterises as developing from a desire to create a typology of liturgical manuscripts, and as thus primarily concerned with writing their histories and with constructing critical editions of such texts.⁵¹ Palazzo sees the work of van Dijk (alongside that of A.-G. Martimort, P.-M. Gy and Cyrille Vogel) as indicative of a new trend in liturgical studies in the mid-twentieth century which broke from the seventeenth-century origins of the discipline with its concern for typology. Indeed, van Dijk and the above-mentioned scholars aimed to build bridges between liturgists and medievalists.⁵² These scholars are presented by Palazzo as both technicians and historians, who brought about 'a renewal in the methods of approach and reflection proper to the study of books'.⁵³ This interdisciplinary approach has continued to be an important feature of liturgical studies since the publication of Palazzo's book in 1998, as the discussion of Nils Holger Petersen's work in Chapter One suggests. In a sense then, van Dijk's work has had a broader impact within medieval studies than its highly specialised subject matter may suggest – Palazzo acknowledges van Dijk is best known for his work on Franciscan and Papal liturgical books of the thirteenth century, but situates this focus within the broader trend of the construction of liturgical history as a discipline. Even given this understanding of van Dijk's wider contribution to the development of interdisciplinary approaches in medieval studies, it remains clear that his highly specialised focus is a small part of what has until recently been a marginalised discipline – Palazzo sees the relationship between history and liturgy as largely

⁴⁹ Prior to the 1960s, the liturgical historian V.L. Kennedy CSB wrote several articles on similar topics, which were largely superseded by van Dijk and Walker's work. V.L. Kennedy CSB, "The Franciscan *Ordo Missae* in the Thirteenth Century", *Mediaeval Studies* II (1940): 204–222; V.L. Kennedy CSB, "The Lateran Missal and Some Allied Documents", *Mediaeval Studies* XIV (1952): 61–78.

⁵⁰ Eric Palazzo, "Studies on Liturgical Books", in *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Madeleine Beaumont (Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 7–18.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ *Ibid.*

characterised by ‘a profound misunderstanding and even by a reciprocal ignorance on the part of the practitioners of the two disciplines’.⁵⁴

Though historians and liturgical historians are developing a greater awareness of the contributions of each other’s disciplines to the study of liturgical manuscripts, it remains generally true that each continues to focus on the primacy of his/her own discipline. This attitude helps to explain why no revision of van Dijk and Walker’s work has occurred in the forty years since their seminal studies of the thirteenth-century Papal and Franciscan liturgies were published. Van Dijk’s main concern throughout his scholarly life was with the reconstruction of the Papal and Franciscan liturgies of the early and middle thirteenth century from the ‘lost’ prototypes which he believed existed. For van Dijk, the Order was central in the diffusion of the Papal Curia’s liturgy (that which ultimately came to dominate the Church in the West). Indeed, it must be clearly acknowledged that the friars did demonstrate an ongoing respect for the liturgy of the Papal Curia throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries: the *incipit* statements of those missals understood as distinctively Franciscan in this study (i.e. those that name themselves as Franciscan, such as the CSP) invariably state ‘*Incipit ordo missalis fratrum minorum secundum consuetudinem romane curie . . .*’ While this respect for the Roman tradition must be acknowledged, as Chapters Four and Five will demonstrate, the missals which bear this incipit frequently exhibit diversity of form and content in their liturgical calendars. This indication of diversity in *practice* is at odds with a traditional understanding of the uniformity of content perceived as inherent in missals which followed the Papal Curia’s rite.

While his focus was on the liturgy of the Papal Curia, van Dijk’s arguments relied on a conception of the Order as a highly unified and organised body, which accurately used and disseminated (through missionary activity) a centralised liturgy. Critical to van Dijk’s thesis is his conceptual understanding of both ‘variety’ and ‘uniformity’ within liturgical traditions, as represented in manuscripts. As will be seen, van Dijk’s understanding of uniformity allowed for much more variety within the manuscript tradition than other scholars, such as Michael Bihl, had been prepared to accept. Equally critical is the definition of a ‘Franciscan missal’. In van Dijk’s work, the term seems to mean any missal used by the Order, but it is appropriate to

⁵⁴ Ibid., xxv.

create a distinction between missals used by the friars (such as those used by the first friars, which were presumably donated to them), and missals which name themselves as Franciscan (that is, which were written specifically for the use of the friars). Based on evidence from the Perugian Liturgical Group, this dissertation aims to go some way towards addressing the lack of scholarship in the field since van Dijk by engaging in a critical evaluation of his scholarship and proposing a reconceptualisation of the role of liturgy in the construction of Franciscan identity.

The findings of van Dijk and Walker's extensive archival research have necessarily been affected by the discovery of unstudied manuscripts in the intervening years, but the task of reanalysing the complex and often confusing liturgical world of the early Franciscans has perhaps daunted would-be revisionists. Instead, most scholarship that discusses thirteenth-century Franciscan liturgy (whether directly or as background to a study of a different aspect of the early Franciscans) relies heavily on van Dijk and Walker's findings, without engagement with the manuscript tradition itself. Examples of recent scholarly works which demonstrate this problematically uncritical appropriation of van Dijk's work are those by Francesco Costa, Fulvio Rampazzo, Richard Pfaff and Edward Foley.⁵⁵ In essence, the narrative of Franciscan liturgy woven by van Dijk and Walker has gone unchallenged. While the overall sense of their findings about the development of the centralised Roman liturgy throughout the thirteenth century is not in question in this dissertation (as the subject requires and deserves its own special focus), it seems appropriate to engage in a critical reading of this scholarship. While a rereading of the entire history of Franciscan liturgy will not be attempted here, van Dijk and Walker's accepted narrative of the unified and unifying nature of mid-thirteenth century liturgical reforms within the Order of Friars Minor will be critiqued, and an alternative reading of the manuscript tradition provided.

⁵⁵ Francesco Costa, "La liturgia francescana", in *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature*, ed. Carlo Pirovano (Milano: Electa, 1982), 298–303; Fulvio Rampazzo, "Fundamental Elements of Franciscan Liturgy: Inquiry on the Development of the Franciscan Calendar of Saints", *Greyfriars Review* 14:3 (2000): 277–294; Richard Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Edward Foley, "Franciscan Liturgical Prayer", in *Franciscans at Prayer*, ed. Timothy Johnson (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 385–412.

2.2 Franciscan Liturgy: the Regula Editions?

The significance and extent of van Dijk's scholarly contribution cannot be overstated: he remains the only scholar to have attempted a history of the evolution of Franciscan liturgy based on detailed study of the manuscript tradition. It is partly for this reason that his work continues to be relied upon by all scholars whose work touches on this field: there is simply no comparable scholarship available. Van Dijk's unparalleled examination of the manuscript tradition of the thirteenth-century Papal and Franciscan liturgies provided a vast resource of technical and paleographic information that would otherwise be inaccessible to most scholars. His extensive bibliography of works on Papal and Franciscan liturgy culminated in the 1975 book *The Ordinal of the Papal Court from Innocent III to Boniface VIII and Related Documents*, published posthumously (after completion by Joan Hazelden Walker). The foundation of van Dijk's study of Franciscan liturgy was his interest in the evolution and eventual dominance of the Papal Curia's liturgy over the other liturgies in use throughout the Roman Church in the thirteenth century. Van Dijk introduced this volume as a collection of the liturgical source material from whence the Franciscan liturgy (as presented in his previous major works *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy*, 1960 and *The Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy*, 1963) stemmed. This dense study presents van Dijk's final assessment of the development of the Papal liturgy in connection to that of the Franciscan Order, as well as his reconstruction of the rubrics, calendars and missals of the Papal liturgy to 1274.

Without undermining the enormous scholarly skill of van Dijk in creating reconstructions of the Papal Curia and Franciscan liturgies, it is necessary to emphasise they are just that – reconstructions. The source documents upon which van Dijk's reconstructions are based (the Ordinal of Innocent III, the breviary and missal of Honourius III and the Regula Franciscan breviary and missal), do not in fact exist in empirical terms – at the very least, we acknowledge (as van Dijk did), that such exemplar manuscripts are yet to be found. Van Dijk's hypothetical reconstructions were a hugely significant contribution towards scholarly understandings of the evolution of the Roman liturgy, but it is necessary to remember that these 'texts' are themselves the product of the strengths and limitations of van Dijk's own scholarship. Thus, his reconstructions require reassessment in light of developments in the field. To quote van Dijk himself: 'Nor should the edition offered here be regarded as

definitive. On the contrary, the editor hopes that it will inspire much painstaking research of detail.⁵⁶ Unfortunately, the research van Dijk hoped would spring from his work never eventuated – though he recognised his work as contingent, subsequent scholarship has viewed this contingency as absolute fact. In re-examining van Dijk’s too-readily accepted narrative of Franciscan liturgical history, this dissertation rises to van Dijk’s challenge and presents new reflections on, and a measured continuation of, some elements of his monumental research.

2.2.1 *The Regula Missal*

Van Dijk’s most influential contribution to the study of Franciscan liturgy was his championing of what he called the ‘Regula’ editions of Franciscan breviaries and missals – that is, breviaries and missals of a specifically Franciscan character which he proposed were composed after the promulgation of the *Later Rule* (1223) and distributed throughout the Order by the General Chapter at Assisi in 1230.⁵⁷ Despite the fact that no manuscripts for this tradition exist, van Dijk’s thesis has received unanimous acceptance. Van Dijk reconstructed the Regula missal through study of five late-thirteenth century manuscripts that he argued were extant copies of the lost original. Van Dijk’s sources were:

Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale, Ms. vi. G. 38. A noted Franciscan missal originally from the friary at Salerno, probably from the third quarter of the thirteenth century.

Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 607. A Franciscan missal without notation, probably from the second quarter of the thirteenth century.

Roma, Biblioteca Corsiniana, Ms. 376 (41.D.27). A (Franciscan?) missal without notation originally from Salerno/Napoli, c. 1261–1264.

Roma, Vatican Library, Ms. Ross. 199 (Ro). An Augustinan missal without notation, fourteenth-century.⁵⁸

It is not possible within the scope of this study to examine these manuscripts and van Dijk’s textual reconstruction of a ‘Regula’ missal per se; rather, van Dijk’s methodology and use of non-liturgical sources will be evaluated in the context of the

⁵⁶ Van Dijk, *The Ordinal of the Papal Court*, v.

⁵⁷ This argument is found throughout van Dijk’s bibliography.

⁵⁸ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 239.

construction of a narrative of Franciscan liturgical development. This dissertation's focus is the impact of the selection of saints' feasts on communal liturgical activity and identity, as expressed in five manuscripts from the Perugian Liturgical Group. Van Dijk's narrative of Franciscan liturgy is a critical resource for the new perspectives presented here regarding Franciscan attitudes towards liturgy in the thirteenth century.

Van Dijk's thesis was suggested to him by Eliseus Bruning, who proposed in 1926 that there was a Franciscan 'Regula' edition of liturgical books.⁵⁹ Bruning's reading of the primary sources (particularly the *Chronica* of Jordan of Giano) was questioned by Michael Bihl OFM in 1933. However, van Dijk's later championing of Bruning's proposal and the lack of a sustained debate on the subject resulted in general scholarly acceptance of the idea.⁶⁰ The argument for the existence of Regula breviaries (and antiphonals) was formulated around a comment found in friar Jordan of Giano's *Chronica*, composed c. 1262. Describing the General Chapter of Assisi in 1230 (at which he was present), Jordan wrote: '*In eodem Capitulo generali (anni 1230) breviaria et antiphonaria secundum Ordinem provinciae* [Glassberger: *provinciis*] *sunt transmissa.*'⁶¹ In translating this passage, van Dijk added an important qualifying phrase: '... breviaries and antiphonals according to [the use of] the Order were sent to the provinces' (emphasis mine).⁶² Bruning and van Dijk understood the passage as a reference to a formalised Franciscan Use, and this continues to be the dominant reading. There are, however, other possible readings. Significantly, scholars have interpreted Jordan's words in a number of ways. For instance, the manuscript reads '*provinciae*' – 'province' in the singular, while in his 1887 edition, Nicolaus Glassberger preferred the plural '*provinciis*'.⁶³ As van Dijk pointed out, Glassberger's variant reading may be due to the fact that c. 1230, the German province of the Order was divided into two.⁶⁴ Whether or not there was in fact more than one province in 1230, Jordan's Latin is clear enough, and allows two

⁵⁹ Eliseus Bruning, "De vroegere mis-formulieren op de feesten van Sint Franciscus vóór het jaar 1570", *Collectanea Franciscana Neerlandica* I (1927): 87–126. See especially 91.

⁶⁰ Michael Bihl OFM, "De S. Francisci Legenda ad usum chori auctore Fr. Thoma Celansensi iuxta novum codicem Senensem", *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 26 (1933): 343–389.

⁶¹ Jordan of Giano, *Chronica Fratris Jordani*, Collection d'études et de documents sur l'histoire religieuse et littéraire du moyen âge 6. Ed. H. Boehmer (Paris, 1908). Cited by Bihl, "De S. Francisca Legenda", 363. See also van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 214, n. 2.

⁶² Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 214.

⁶³ Jordan of Giano, *Chronica Fratris*, *Analecta Franciscana* II, ed. Nicolaus Glassberger (Ad claras aquas (Quaracchi): Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1887).

⁶⁴ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 214.

possible readings: either Jordan believed there was one sole province, or (though there was more than one), breviaries and antiphonals were handed out to the main province alone. In van Dijk's translation, the insertion of the phrase 'the use of' infers specialist liturgical terminology and the existence of a formal Use of the Order. Jordan's account says only that breviaries and antiphonals '*secundem Ordinem*' ('according to the Order') were sent out. This could mean either that breviaries and antiphonals of a special Franciscan type were sent out, or that breviaries and antiphonals were sent out on the authority of the Order.⁶⁵ Whether or not the books in question were sent out to one province or several, what does seem clear is that the Order intended its members to use the books it provided. That these books exhibited a distinctive Franciscan character is far from clear in Jordan's account.

The liturgical activity of the early friars is the subject of some considerable scholarly speculation, as the friars formally recorded little information on the subject. The earliest sources from within the Order are more concerned with the Divine Office than they are with other liturgical practices. The main sources are the *Earlier Rule* (1209/10–1221), the *Later Rule* (1223), Francis's *Letter to the Entire Order* (1225–1226) and his *Testament* (1226); from these early sources, some clues may be uncovered regarding both Francis's personal devotional/Eucharistic practices and his intentions for the Order in this regard. Edward Foley's concise summary of the Order's early devotional and liturgical activity in his recent article 'Franciscan Liturgical Prayer' highlighted the relevance of these early sources.⁶⁶ Foley observed that Francis's own writing on the topic of liturgical activity focused largely on recitation of the Divine Office, which appears to have been a more contentious issue for the early friars than was the celebration of the Eucharist.⁶⁷ The reasons for this are surely practical: the early Order was primarily composed of lay brothers, and as Francis described in his *Testament*, 'we quite willingly remained in churches. And we were simple and subject to all.'⁶⁸ The Eucharistic authority of clerics was never challenged by Francis and his early brothers, who attended mass wherever they

⁶⁵ Indeed, the capitalisation of 'Ordinem' is important in this regard. If the word is lower case, it may have a more generalised application, including orders other than the Franciscans. This point needs to be addressed through consultation of the manuscript originals, unfortunately not possible during the research for this dissertation.

⁶⁶ Foley, "Franciscan Liturgical Prayer", 385-412.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 399.

⁶⁸ Francis of Assisi. "Testament", in *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents: Volume I: the Saint*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong OFM Cap., J. A. Wayne Hellmann OFM Conv. and William J. Short OFM (New York: New York City Press, 1999), 124–126.

happened to be, and followed the liturgical custom of their hosts. Foley points out that although priests joined the Order very early (Sylvester in 1209–1210, Rufino and Leo shortly thereafter), none of these friars accompanied Francis to Rome for Innocent’s confirmation of their way of life in 1209.⁶⁹ The increasing number of clerics in the Order is demonstrated by the subsequent provisions for celebrating the Eucharist: in 1224, the friars received papal permission to celebrate mass in their own chapels, and in 1230 at the General Chapter, the Minister General John Parenti issued decrees about the proper treatment of the host.⁷⁰

Jordan of Giano did not mention missals among the liturgical books to be distributed to the provinces at the General Chapter of 1230 – only breviaries and antiphonals were cited. Van Dijk proposed that this oversight was the result of a scribal error – a misreading of ‘*atifalia*’ (the abbreviation of ‘*antifonalia*’) for ‘*misalia*’.⁷¹ This argument is less than convincing – there is little reason to doubt Jordan’s terminology, as the following discussion suggests. The provisions of the 1230 General Chapter mentioned above indicate that by that time, the friars did possess portable altars and chapels, and were able to celebrate the Eucharist independently of other clerics. Such independence necessarily implies that the clerical friars did in fact possess missals, without which celebration of the Eucharist would have been impossible. There is less evidence that these missals were of a uniform Franciscan character. The four late-thirteenth century missals cited by van Dijk as reliable copies of the Regula missal (see above) in fact show significant variation, as van Dijk himself acknowledges: ‘even with the framework of identical arrangement, their history, date and content differ widely’.⁷² Only two of the four manuscripts cited include the ritual for the Last Sacrament, and in terms of musical notation, one is noted while three are not.⁷³ Van Dijk argued the prototype of these missals (the so-called ‘Regula’ missal) was noted and rubricated, and that it underwent a process of ‘disintegration whereby the notation was separated from the text, thus producing a plain missal and a gradual’.⁷⁴ He then acknowledged that no gradual had been found which corresponded to the notation ‘lacking’ in the three un-noted missals he

⁶⁹ Foley, “Franciscan Liturgical Prayer”, 400.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 394.

⁷¹ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 224.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 241.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 242.

identified as copies of the Regula prototype.⁷⁵ Van Dijk also conceded that the order of the Mass found in these Regula missals, the *Paratus*, was ‘not exactly uniform’.⁷⁶ Regardless, he cited these missals as trustworthy copies of the ‘lost’ court missal of Honourius III, due to ‘the liturgical precept in the Rule of the Friars Minor and the early date of the Regula edition’.⁷⁷ This is somewhat circular and problematic logic. The early date of the ‘Regula’ missal is established only if one follows van Dijk’s challenge to Jordan’s terminology and his flexible attitude to the concept of uniformity amongst the extant missals; the ‘lost’ missal of Honourius III is claimed both as evidence for and as evidenced by this early ‘Regula’ missal, despite the lack of uniformity found in its supposed copies.

In a practical sense, whether the missals used by the early clerical friars were of a specifically Franciscan character or not may have depended upon whether the Order had the resources and desire to produce such books at that stage in its development, or whether instead they were given missals by clerics outside the Order. If the friars were producing their own missals, the character and form of their liturgy would have depended greatly on the exemplar manuscripts available to them. Given the Order’s close ties to Bishop Guido II of Assisi (d. 1228), and the fact that the diocese of Assisi used the liturgy of the Papal Curia itself (rather than that of the Lateran Palace, for instance)⁷⁸, it seems reasonable to propose that the missals used by the early clerical friars would have followed the Papal Curia’s liturgy.⁷⁹ These missals must have been either copies made by the friars from exemplars, or donations from clerics outside the Order (possibly those at the cathedral San Rufino, Guido II’s episcopal seat). Cesare Cenci has argued that a type of *scriptorium* was operating at the Porziuncula even in Francis’s lifetime, to meet the needs of the friars’ liturgical activity and apostolate, though it may have been of the most basic kind.⁸⁰ Certainly by the time the Basilica of San Francesco was under construction (Lower Basilica

⁷⁵ Ibid. Both the Franciscan (that is, which name themselves as Franciscan) missals studied here, CSP and B, are noted missals dating from the late thirteenth century. Further study of the prevalence of noted Franciscan missals in the thirteenth century is necessary before a detailed critique can be undertaken of van Dijk’s understanding of the ‘separation’ of text and notation in the evolution of the so-called ‘Regula’ missal.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 251.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 245.

⁷⁸ Foley, “Franciscan Liturgical Prayer”, 403. Cf. van Dijk and Hazelden Walker, *Origins*, 140.

⁷⁹ For further discussion of the Order’s strong links to Rome and the Papal Curia, see Michael Robson OFM Conv., *Francis of Assisi: the Legend and the Life* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 2007), 62–93. See especially 76.

⁸⁰ Cesare Cenci OFM, *Bibliotheca manuscripta ad Sacrum conventum Assisiensem*, vol. 1 (Assisi Regione dell’Umbria – Sacro Convento di Assisi: Casa editrice francescana, 1981), 5.

completed 1230), a more formalised arrangement for the copying of manuscripts existed in the adjoining Sacro Convento (though it was never referred to as a *scriptorium* in the community's records).⁸¹ Further discussion of the friars' involvement with manuscript production will be taken up in Chapter Three, but for the purposes of this chapter, it is sufficient to observe that it is entirely possible the friars were copying their own missals before 1230. However, even to acknowledge this possibility does not mean that the missals copied by the friars exhibited a specifically Franciscan character: the distinction between missals used by the friars (which could have been the same as those used by many other groups following the Use of Rome) and missals which name themselves as Franciscan in their *incipit* statements (and feature distinctive Franciscan feasts in their calendars and sanctoral cycles) must be maintained in order to gain any clarity regarding the early friars' liturgical activity.

Van Dijk acknowledged the scarcity of copies of the Regula prototype (there are four), and suggests that promotion of lay brothers under the leadership of Elias (1232–1239) may have hindered the spread of the Regula missal beyond a few friaries of central Italy (those that produced the four later missals van Dijk cited as copies of the Regula prototype).⁸² He suggested that this lack of copies resulted in the Four Masters' apparent ignorance of a Franciscan 'Regula' missal, as evidenced by their 1241–1242 exposition of the Order's Rule, *Expositio Regulae Quatuor Magistrorum*. Amongst other issues, this document cited the urgent need for just such a Franciscan missal to be composed.⁸³ Evidence of the diversity of Use amongst missals used by the early friars can be found in the manuscripts themselves, as van Dijk himself acknowledged: one of the earliest surviving missals used by the friars, which is held in the library of the Chiesa Nuova in Assisi and dates to the 1230s, does not even follow the Use of Rome.⁸⁴ One of the earliest examples of what can properly be called a Franciscan missal (i.e. a missal which names itself as Franciscan in its *incipit* and includes specifically Franciscan feasts in its calendar and sanctoral cycle) that does follow the Use of Rome dates only to c. 1255–1260.⁸⁵ Van Dijk concluded that 'the

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁸² Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 245.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 239, 245, 259–260. Cf. P. Livarius Oliger OFM, ed, *Expositio Quatuor Magistrorum super regulam Fratrum Minorum (1241–1242)* (Rome: Edizioni di "Storia e Letteratura", 1950), 137–140.

⁸⁴ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 238.

⁸⁵ Oxford Bodleian Ms. Lat. liturg. f. 26. This portable Franciscan missal is believed to have been made for use in Cornwall. *Bodleian Library Record* 1:11 (Oct. 1940): 177–178; Stephen J.P. van Dijk OFM,

early history of the Regula missal is scarcely less than a mystery'.⁸⁶ Van Dijk's methodology, to construct a narrative of Franciscan liturgical history around 'lost' prototypes (the Ordinal of Innocent III, the missal of Honorius III and the Regula editions themselves), is perhaps more problematic than it is enlightening. While the detailed manuscript work he undertook to construct the Regula missal cannot be underestimated, and in fact cannot be thoroughly investigated in this dissertation, his basic conceptualisation must be reconsidered. The following points summarise the major problems with van Dijk's reconstruction of the Regula edition of the missal:

1. Jordan of Giano does not mention missals being distributed at the 1230 General Chapter.
2. Prior to van Dijk's work in reconstructing the Regula missal from late-thirteenth-century missals, no tradition of such an edition existed (i.e. from within the Order itself). Rather the opposite: the Four Masters cited the urgent need for a uniform Franciscan missal in 1241–1242.
3. The Ordinal of Innocent III and the missal of Honorius III, which van Dijk posits were the exemplars for the Regula missal, do not exist in manuscript form, but are themselves the reconstructions of liturgical historians.
4. Although the friars were celebrating private (as opposed to conventual) masses using their own portable altars and chapels by 1230, it is possible that the missals they used were copied from exemplars provided by the diocese of Assisi, which followed the Papal Curia's rite.
5. There is an important difference between the missals used by the early friars, and distinctively Franciscan missals.

It would seem in keeping with Francis's emphasis on his friars remaining 'within churches' that the missals used by the early clerical friars followed the use of the Papal Curia, rather than a new specifically Franciscan Use. An important qualifier must be added to this conjecture: given the circumstances of the Order's rapid growth in its early years, it seems unreasonable to propose that as a whole, the Order strictly

Handlist of the Latin Liturgical Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library Oxford, 7 vols., 1957–1960 (unpublished typescript), I, 138; O. Pächt and J.J.G. Alexander, *Illuminated Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Oxford*, 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), no. 461. A. G. Watson, *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c. 435–1600 in Oxford Libraries* (Oxford, 1984) I, no. 551, II, pl. 111 (fol. 57v). A description can be found at <http://www.bodley.ox.ac.uk/dept/scwmss/wmss/medieval/chklst/chklatli.htm>.

⁸⁶ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 245.

followed one liturgy. Van Dijk's thesis can be best understood in the context of this rapid expansion: while there may be evidence for the form of the earliest Franciscan missals (such as that gathered by van Dijk from later examples), and evidence that the Order provided its members with certain books to use, there is strong evidence that the form of these books was a) not specific to the Order, but rather an offshoot of the Papal Curia's rite; b) not a uniform tradition but one which encompassed variety of content and form; and c) not uniform throughout the Order, given the informal nature of early Franciscan manuscript production and acquisition.

2.2.2 *The Regula Breviary*

As this dissertation is a study of Franciscan missals, its discussion of breviaries is necessarily limited. Van Dijk's concept of the *Regula breviary* remains significant to this study, however, as the scholarly arguments about it apply in some measure to the *Regula* missal as well. The initial confirmation of the nascent Order's way of life by Pope Innocent III in 1209 did not oblige the friars to recite the Divine Office.⁸⁷ This fact, along with the predominantly lay character of the early Order and their itinerant lifestyle, may explain the *Earlier Rule's* flexible and pragmatic attitude towards the recitation of the Divine Office. This *Rule* stipulated that clerical brothers were to recite the Office (including the Office for the Dead) according to the custom of the clerics with whom they were residing at the time, while lay brothers should replace the Divine Office with a prescribed series of prayers, including the *Our Father*. Clerical brothers were permitted ownership of the books necessary to their liturgical duties, literate lay brothers were permitted to own and use a psalter, while illiterate lay brothers were not permitted to own any book.⁸⁸ The *Later Rule* (1223) further qualified the system for book ownership and usage by removing its focus on literacy:

Let the clerical [brothers] recite the Divine Office according to the rite of the holy Roman Church excepting the psalter, for which reason they may have breviaries. The lay [brothers], however, may say twenty-four *Our Fathers* for Matins, and five for Lauds; seven each for the Hours of Prime, Terce, Sext,

⁸⁷ Foley, "Franciscan Liturgical Prayer", 400.

⁸⁸ Francis of Assisi, "The Earlier Rule", in *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents: Volume I: the Saint*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong OFM Cap., J. A. Wayne Hellman OFM Conv. and William J. Short OFM (New York: New York City Press, 1999), 66.

and None, twelve for Vespers, and seven for Compline. Let them pray for the dead.⁸⁹

The *Later Rule* emphasised the clerical friars' obedience to the Roman rite, and attempted to confine ownership of books to these clerical friars alone. Like the *Earlier Rule*, it did not mention mass amongst the friars' liturgical duties, but only the Divine Office, perhaps indicating that performance of the mass was not yet a pressing concern for the Order: they were still bound to celebrate conventual masses with other communities, rather than holding their own private Eucharistic celebrations.

Michael Bihl's objections to Bruning's concept of the *Regula breviary* focused on the issue of the office for the feast of Francis on 4th October. If, as he contended, there was no such office in existence in 1230, then Bruning's (and later, van Dijk's) interpretation of the Franciscan nature of the breviaries distributed at the General Chapter of 1230 was dubious: Bihl reasoned there could hardly be a specifically Franciscan character to the Divine Office in these books if it did not include an office for the founder, canonised two years previously.⁹⁰ The texts used for the canonisation Mass would have been taken from the Common of a Confessor-non-Pontiff, according to contemporary thirteenth-century practice.⁹¹ These texts would therefore not have been specific to Francis: such an office only came into existence through Julian of Speyer's later work *The Divine Office of St Francis* (1232–1235). Bihl acknowledged the possibility that Julian's rhymed office for Francis was composed before 1230, but dismissed the idea due to the fact if it had been, it would most likely have been used in the canonisation ceremony.⁹² It is possible to speculate that Speyer's work was finished during the 1230 General Chapter and distributed at it. The most recent edited translation of Speyer's work (that by Armstrong, Hellmann and Short in 2000) dates it after the 1230 General Chapter⁹³; further analysis of the manuscript originals would be necessary to challenge this conclusion. Bihl also suggested that had a *Regula breviary* existed in 1230, there would have been no need

⁸⁹ Francis of Assisi, "The Later Rule", in *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents: Volume 1: the Saint*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong OFM Cap., J. A. Wayne Hellman OFM Conv. and William J. Short OFM (New York: New York City Press, 1999), 101.

⁹⁰ Bihl, "De S. Francisci Legenda ad usum chori", 363.

⁹¹ R.J. Armstrong OFM Cap., J.A.W. Hellmann OFM Conv. and W.J. Short OFM, "Introduction to the Liturgical Texts 1230–1234", in *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents: Volume 1: the Saint*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong OFM Cap., J. A. Wayne Hellman OFM. Conv. and William J. Short OFM (New York: New York City Press, 1999), 311.

⁹² Bihl, "De S. Francisci Legenda ad usum chori", 363–364.

⁹³ Armstrong, Hellmann and Short, "Introduction to the Liturgical Texts 1230–1234", 311.

for the revisions of Haymo of Faversham in the early 1240s, given the short amount of time elapsed.⁹⁴ On this point, one sympathises with van Dijk’s counter-argument that the time elapsed between the proposed Regula editions and Haymo’s revisions (some 13 years) would not negate the need for such revisions.⁹⁵ Bihl also highlighted the wide textual variants in the surviving early Franciscan breviaries: such diversity of content and form, he reasoned, indicated the absence of a formalised Franciscan Use for the Divine Office.⁹⁶ Bihl’s view of the significance of such variance is at odds with van Dijk on conceptual grounds: whereas Bihl saw variation of structure and content as evidence of a lack of liturgical uniformity, van Dijk accepted a high level of such variation as within the parameters of a uniform edition of liturgical books.

Van Dijk described Bihl’s arguments as lacking ‘historical insight and knowledge’.⁹⁷ While acknowledging widespread textual variations in the surviving manuscripts, van Dijk positioned this variation as indicative of a process of disintegration from the (lost) prototype.⁹⁸ What constituted significant ‘variation’ is never made explicit: van Dijk’s failure to address this vital issue is a major problem in his methodology and thesis. He insisted that variation in the manuscript tradition of the ‘Regula’ breviary could not ‘be used as an argument against unity of origin’.⁹⁹ Presenting a list of 15 breviaries which he believed to be Regula editions, van Dijk acknowledged their many variations of form and content, and suggested that ‘a seemingly insidious feature of the Regula breviary [was] its inaccurate transmission’.¹⁰⁰ As he noted, ‘the existence of a Franciscan liturgy before Haymo of Faversham was undreamt of before 1942’.¹⁰¹ In an article that year, van Dijk first proposed that despite the great variety of their texts and structure, it was possible to distinguish those breviaries written before Haymo of Faversham’s 1243–1244 Ordinal *Indutus Planeta* (i.e. the ‘Regula editions’), with those written after Haymo’s Ordinal (i.e. the ‘second edition Regula’).¹⁰² Van Dijk’s narrative of Franciscan liturgy was linear in structure: he proposed that Franciscan liturgy began with unity (in the

⁹⁴ Bihl OFM, “De S. Francisci Legenda ad usum chori”, 365.

⁹⁵ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 215.

⁹⁶ Bihl, “De S. Francisci Legenda ad usum chori”, 365.

⁹⁷ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 215.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 223.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 215.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 225.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹⁰² Stephen J.P. van Dijk OFM, “Notae quaedam de liturgia Franciscana mediante saeculo XIII”, *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 54 (1940): 121–164. The issue was actually published in 1942.

creation of the Regula editions), weathered a disintegration of this unity (the result of ‘private initiative’ and changes to the structure of the Order¹⁰³), before returning to unity once more (under the guidance of Haymo of Faversham, to be discussed below). This conception of the development of Franciscan liturgy is problematic and potentially teleological: to propose a process of liturgical unification that was directly associated with the increasingly clerical nature of the Order through the mid-thirteenth century privileges this clericalisation as the only developmental path available to the Order, and therefore as both necessary and praiseworthy. As we will see, van Dijk’s attitude towards Haymo of Faversham was a key element in his construction of a narrative of the Order’s liturgical history.

Subsequent scholars have not taken up Bihl’s objections to the concept of the Regula breviary, and there has never been a challenge to van Dijk’s concept of the Regula missal. Van Dijk’s work has dominated the field of Franciscan liturgical history, and is widely accepted by current scholarship in a variety of fields. A recent example is Richard Pfaff’s 2009 book *The Liturgy in Medieval England*.¹⁰⁴ Pfaff’s discussion of the influence of the Friars Minor on medieval English liturgy is largely based on van Dijk’s scholarship; he proposes the liturgy used by the friars when they first settled in England in 1224 was ‘the close adaptation of the curial breviary called the Regula Breviary, after the Rule which sanctioned it’.¹⁰⁵ Pfaff’s description of the friars’ liturgy as an influence on secular English liturgy is therefore reliant on van Dijk’s understanding of a document of which, Pfaff admits, ‘there is no trace . . . in any surviving manuscript used in England’.¹⁰⁶ Similarly, Edmond Foley’s recent work (cited above) accepts without qualification van Dijk’s reading of the early sources in regard to the friars’ liturgical activity, and most particularly his positioning of Haymo of Faversham as a pivotal figure in the perceived ‘reunification’ of Franciscan liturgy.¹⁰⁷ Throughout this chapter’s assessment of van Dijk’s work, it has become increasingly apparent that (while acknowledging our debt to his pioneering scholarship) there is room for rethinking both his methodology and conclusions, as indeed van Dijk himself anticipated. An important element of this dissertation’s new perspective on the development and maintenance of Franciscan liturgical identity is

¹⁰³ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 225.

¹⁰⁴ Pfaff, *The Liturgy in Medieval England*.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 321.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁷ Foley, “Franciscan Liturgical Prayer”, 395–397.

its recognition of the fact that this reassessment has not occurred. To borrow a sentiment from van Dijk, it is hoped this dissertation may stimulate a scholarly reappraisal of the manuscript tradition of early Franciscan liturgy, beginning with a thorough examination of the concept of the ‘Regula’ editions.

2.3 Elias of Cortona to Haymo of Faversham: the Concept of a Second Founder

Substantial documentary evidence for Franciscan liturgy (both in terms of manuscripts and statutes) starts to appear from the 1240s onwards, largely because of the liturgical reforms that are believed to have been undertaken by the fifth minister general, the Englishman Haymo of Faversham (d. c. 1243). Haymo had been a master at the University of Paris and was thus already a distinguished scholar and lector before joining the Order of Friars Minor in c. 1224–1225. He joined the Order during a period fraught with internal conflict, crystallising around the controversial figure of Elias, one of Francis’s early companions. The fortunes of Elias were intricately bound up with the fortunes of the Order as a whole in the decade following Francis’s death, and Haymo was intimately involved in the events that unfolded. Some summary remarks are essential to contextualise Haymo’s reforms and the development of Franciscan liturgy.

Though Elias and Haymo both had significant impact on the development of the Order, their reputations (both within the Order and amongst later scholars) are vastly different. Scholars have tended to praise Haymo’s dedication to the clericalisation of the Order while characterising Elias’s policy of elevating laity over clerics as undermining the Order’s growth and developing power within the institution of the Church. The constitution enacted against the recruitment of the laity in 1242 under Haymo’s leadership has led Brooke to describe Haymo as ‘the Minister General most responsible for making the Order a more clerical institution’.¹⁰⁸ She describes Haymo as ‘mainly responsible for making secure the foundations of the reformed Order and for setting the course it was to follow’, who therefore ‘has a claim to be considered the second founder’.¹⁰⁹ This statement echoes the earlier opinion of van Dijk and Walker, who cite Haymo as ‘scarcely less than a second founder’, bemoaning that ‘with few exceptions, historians have not treated him with

¹⁰⁸ Rosalind B. Brooke, *The Image of Francis: Responses to Sainthood in the Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 120.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 124.

the respect recommended by the Catalogue of the Ministers General, drawn up at the end of the thirteenth century, in which Haymo was a central figure'.¹¹⁰ They assert Haymo 'made the Franciscan mode of life into the Franciscan Order'.¹¹¹

Elias had been elected minister general of the Order following the death of Peter Catani in 1221, and was a close associate of Francis up to the latter's death in 1226. Elias's first tenure as minister general lasted until 1227, when the General Chapter in Assisi deposed him in favour of John Parenti (d. 1250). In this first period of leadership, Elias divided the Order by accepting relaxations to the *Rule* and particularly for raising a general tax on provinces to pay for the construction of a basilica to house Francis's body. The construction of the Basilica of San Francesco in Assisi was supported by Gregory IX, who laid the foundation stone on the same day as Francis's canonisation in 1228 and announced the Basilica to be the 'head and mother of the entire fraternity', despite Francis already declaring this honour for the Portiuncula.¹¹² The Basilica remained a contentious issue amongst friars – so large and extravagant a building seemed to many to be against the basic spiritual principles of their founder.

After his first deposition as minister general in 1227, Elias continued to work towards the completion of the Basilica and the planned translation of Francis's body from San Giorgio (Francis's parish church in Assisi). He enjoyed ongoing papal support for the venture. Robson notes the various adjustments made to the building in preparation for papal visits – the Basilica was to be the papal residence in Assisi.¹¹³ The translation (to be presided over by Gregory IX) was scheduled to coincide with the General Chapter in 1230, so that those friars in Assisi for the Chapter might also witness the translation of the founder and the fulfilment of Elias's vision for the Basilica. However, Elias's increasing anxiety for the safety of Francis's body led him secretly (that is, without the knowledge of the Pope or the minister general, but probably with the support of the Commune of Assisi) to arrange the early translation of the saint. Elias's concern about the potentially 'dangerous outbursts of piety' which may have accompanied the official translation ceremony was no doubt well-founded, and certainly shared by other citizens of Assisi who assisted him in moving the

¹¹⁰ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 291.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 288.

¹¹² Robson, *Francis of Assisi*, 267.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 268.

saint.¹¹⁴ Elias's actions were viewed as scandalous not only by the leaders of the Order, but also by the Pope – enraged, Gregory rescinded the privileges previously bestowed on the Basilica, put it under Episcopal control, and forbade the friars from either living in or holding any General Chapters in the building.¹¹⁵ Gregory IX relented quickly, but Elias's misfortunes were not over: in the midst of the scandal over the translation, he was involved in an attempted coup and expelled.¹¹⁶ At the General Chapter in 1230 (a very eventful gathering, even by Franciscan standards), a group of ordinary friars (i.e. those not included in the Chapter meeting itself) 'vociferously carried Elias to the chapter-house door, which they broke through, and tried to substitute him as Minister General in place of John Parenti in defiance of the Provincial Ministers'.¹¹⁷ Turned away by the Chapter, Elias voluntarily performed a two-year penance, living in isolation at a hermitage.

John Parenti died in 1232 and Elias, seemingly back in favour with both his Order and the Papacy, was re-elected as minister general. His second stint in leadership lasted until 1239, and was scarcely less controversial than the first. It was characterised by ongoing opposition to both his method of leadership and his interpretation of Franciscan life. Elias is chiefly renowned for having promoted lay brothers above clerical brothers in the organisation of the Order, a policy which could be seen as faithful to Francis's conception of the Order as a band of 'lesser brothers', but which (considering the increasingly diverse membership of the Order) intensified internal divisions. The accusations against Elias levelled by his opponents – that he ruled the Order as a despot, highhandedly removing his enemies at will, and that he lived a luxurious existence with flagrant disregard for his vows as a friar – have been discussed at length by scholars such as Rosalind Brooke.¹¹⁸ Van Dijk and Walker described Elias as 'brilliantly ruthless' and 'unsavoury'¹¹⁹, a strategist who brought the Order into a state of confusion through the 'temporary eclipse of priests'.¹²⁰ In the context of the liturgical history of the Order, van Dijk and Hazelden Walker see Elias's promotion of lay brothers over clerics as antithetical to the establishment of a

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Brooke, *The Image of Francis*, 55.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ Rosalind Brooke, *Early Franciscan Government: Elias to Bonaventure* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).

¹¹⁹ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 282.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 245.

unified Franciscan liturgy. Most subsequent scholars have followed their argument. Rosalind Brooke positions the growing opposition to Elias within the context of the increasing clericalisation of the Order, and the forceful presence of scholastic masters such as Alexander of Hales, John of La Rochelle and Haymo of Faversham.¹²¹

According to van Dijk and Walker, Haymo began formally agitating against Elias as early as 1236.¹²² In 1239, Haymo and his supporters achieved their end when Elias was deposed as minister general and was replaced by Albert of Pisa, while Haymo took Albert's place as the provincial minister of England. For his part, Elias fled the scene and joined the court of the excommunicated Holy Roman Emperor Frederick II. Elias himself was eventually excommunicated for his allegiance to Frederick, and died outside the Order in 1253, the same year that Clare of Assisi died.¹²³ Van Dijk and Walker suggest Haymo was not elected minister general at the first opportunity because the elderly pope Gregory IX 'shrank from [Haymo's] forceful personality and feared the changes Haymo would have introduced'.¹²⁴ It is surely no coincidence that Haymo was the first non-Italian minister general, and the first minister general not to have known Francis in person (unlike Gregory IX, who had known Francis from the earliest days of the Order's formation). After replacing Albert of Pisa in 1240, Haymo instituted fundamental changes to the organisational framework of the Order. Van Dijk and Walker point to the series of rulings and bulls issued to the friars immediately following Haymo's election. These documents addressed issues from housing to the recitation of the Divine Office. Haymo stipulated that friaries should include enough ground to provide for some of the friars' sustenance, so as to alleviate the impact of the friars' begging on the poor.¹²⁵ In the succession of papal bulls issued to the Order under Haymo's leadership, the structure of the Order was reorganised and streamlined, providing increased authority to provincial ministers and curtailing the ability of secular bishops to command obedience from friars.¹²⁶

¹²¹ Brooke, *The Image of Francis*, 123.

¹²² Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 284.

¹²³ Interestingly, from the Order's point of view, evidence of his disobedience to the Order included persistent and unauthorised visits to Clare and her sisters at San Damiano, during a period which saw them increasingly ostracised by the First Order.

¹²⁴ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 285.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 286.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 287.

Haymo was active in instigating liturgical changes within the Order from the very beginning of his tenure as minister general. At the request of the friars (van Dijk and Walker suggest), Gregory IX issued a papal bull in June 1241 which granted that friars celebrating the Divine Office with non-Franciscans (whether religious or secular clergy) need not recite from their own breviary.¹²⁷ Van Dijk and Walker see this privilege as mirroring that instituted by the Dominican Chapter of 1240, and view the measure as a practical one which ‘must have been welcomed by many Franciscans who worked . . . as theologians, canonists, confessors, etc’.¹²⁸ Somewhat more puzzling, however, is the privilege which preceded this one, *Pio vestro collegio*, which stated that the friars ‘may be content with the observance of the Divine Office as contained in their breviaries and prescribed by their Rule’.¹²⁹ Presumably, this meant that clerical friars were bound to observe the Roman Curia’s rite of the Divine Office while lay friars repeated the prescribed prayers in place of this Office (as the *Later Rule* enjoined). However, this privilege would seem at odds with the bull that followed it, which allowed friars to ignore their Order’s own breviary in certain circumstances. Van Dijk and Walker admit the difficulty of explaining this privilege: ‘the troubles of the moment were so complex and many-sided that one explanation is as good as another’.¹³⁰ They suggest Haymo himself may have requested this privilege ‘to end or forestall discussions on the Office of the papal court as laid down by the Rule, and to discourage anyone from casting an envious eye upon other liturgies such as that of the Dominicans’.¹³¹ This explanation does not satisfactorily explain the paradox of these two successive privileges, which respectively reaffirmed and sidelined the Franciscan breviary. Further research is needed to adequately explore the issue, but at the very least these privileges suggest three major points for consideration: 1) by 1241, a distinctive breviary of the Order did exist; 2) that there was such a breviary by 1241 does not necessarily support van Dijk’s thesis of the 1230 *Regula* edition; 3) there was diversity in the friars’ liturgical activity under Haymo’s leadership.

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 288.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹³¹ Ibid.

2.3.1 Haymo's Ordinal

While organisational reforms were clearly of importance to Haymo, the work for which he remains most famous amongst historians (both liturgical and non-liturgical) is an ordinal for Franciscan liturgical books, known from its incipit as *Indutus Planeta*. Scholars generally believe it was presented to the Order at the 1243 Chapter of Bologna. *Indutus planeta* sets out ‘both the “action” or ceremonies to be performed and the “speech” or texts to be said simultaneously . . . “in accordance with the custom of the Roman Church”, i.e. of the chaplain-priests in the papal household’.¹³² The Ordinal continued the Order’s close liturgical association with the Papal Curia. It prescribed the correct order, form and rubrics of the liturgical celebration for each level of feast (e.g. duplex, semi-duplex, ferial etc.), and was typologically an instruction manual for the celebration of private and ferial masses rather than a liturgical book itself.¹³³ It survives in 26 manuscripts, the earliest being Ms. 338 in the Sacro Convento, Assisi which dates to c. 1263.¹³⁴ According to van Dijk’s analysis, the majority of the manuscripts date to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.¹³⁵ While the dating of manuscripts is usually an imprecise science, it is significant that no copies of the Ordinal exist before c. 1260: its distribution may not have been widespread in the thirteenth century, and what copies survive are all of central Italian origin, suggesting a localised distribution of the revision.

Although the Ordinal is now generally attributed to Haymo (in no small part due to van Dijk’s work on the subject), this attribution is itself somewhat problematic: as van Dijk concedes, the ‘unanimous tradition of authorship and issue at the chapter of Bologna in 1243 cannot be traced beyond the *Chronica XXIV Generalium* which dates to 1369’.¹³⁶ Generally believed to be the work of friar Arnald of Sarrant (whom Bartholomew of Pisa cites as minister of the province of Provence, 1361–1383), the chronicle says of Haymo:

In another general chapter of Definitors, held in Bologna, he ordered new rubrics regarding the celebration of Mass, which begin with the words: *The*

¹³² Ibid., 293.

¹³³ For a related discussion of the evolution of liturgical manuals in the twelfth century, see: Sarah Hamilton, “The *Rituale*: the Evolution of a New Liturgical Book”, in *The Church and the Book: Papers Read at the 2000 Summer Meeting and the 2001 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, ed. R.N. Swanson (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004), 74–86.

¹³⁴ Van Dijk, *Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy*, vol. 1, 157.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 157–176.

¹³⁶ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 297.

priest wears the chasuble. He also corrected the divine office with diligence and inserted other new rubrics, which had been declared as privileges to the Order by the lord Pope Innocent IV.¹³⁷

In this recent English translation, Noel Muscat OFM noted that the privileges to which Arnald referred were those of Gregory IX rather than Innocent IV: Gregory's papal bull *Pio vestro collegio*, published from the Lateran Palace on 7th June, 1241, mentioned above.¹³⁸ Indeed, Arnald's account of the first 150 years of the Order frequently muddles the known facts, rendering the *Chronica* an unreliable source of information.¹³⁹ His source for the statements about Haymo is unclear, since no other record of Haymo's liturgical revisions exists.

In light of the unreliability of the *Chronica XXIV Generalium*, it is difficult to ascertain the reliability of the attribution of *Indutus Planeta* to Haymo: while evidence exists that Haymo was active in structural changes to the Order which were to some extent concerned with liturgy, such evidence does not confirm beyond doubt his authorship of *Indutus Planeta*. The late association of his name with the Ordinal is surprising in light of van Dijk's focus on Haymo as the 'second founder' of the Order. Van Dijk and Hazelden Walker use Haymo's preoccupation with gathering commentaries on the *Later Rule* from amongst the provinces as evidence of his concern with reforms to the liturgy, suggesting that such discussion about the *Later Rule* 'made it quite plain that the state of the liturgy was a serious obstacle to discipline and observance in the Order'.¹⁴⁰ Indeed, it seems reasonable that Haymo, who had inherited a divided and sparring Order, would have considered liturgical reform imperative: the growing clericalisation of the Order in the 1230s and 1240s brought with it increasing property and material independence (as evidenced by Haymo's concern for the subsistence of friaries), but also increasing liturgical independence and a corresponding increasing need for a unified Franciscan liturgy. That such a need was perceived does not necessarily suggest a unified Franciscan

¹³⁷ Arnald of Sarrant, "Chronica XXIV Generalium Ordinis Fratrum Minorum", *Analecta Franciscana ad Historiam Fratrum Minorum Spectantia*, edita a Patribus Collegii S. Bonaventurae, Ad Claras Aquas (Quaracchi), prope Florentiam, Tomus III, 1897. English translation by Noel Muscat OFM. Malta: Tau Edition, 2009, Section II: The Ministers General from John Parenti to St Bonaventure (1227–1274), 226. Accessible at http://www.i-tau.org/wp/?page_id=91.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, see note 256.

¹³⁹ See for example Arnald's discussion of the leadership battle between John Parenti and Elias, Section II, 196–201, especially notes 204 and 207.

¹⁴⁰ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 289–290.

liturgy had existed previously, as van Dijk argued: rather, it seems to imply the opposite.

2.3.2 *The Question of Liturgical Unity*

Whether or not Haymo was indisputably the author of *Indutus Planeta* must be the focus of further research. In the present study, it is of greater importance to note that by the time of Haymo's leadership of the Order, there was a move from within the Order to establish greater liturgical unity. While the 1241 papal privileges bestowed on the Order regarding recitation of the Divine Office make it clear that by that time, the friars possessed a breviary of a specifically Franciscan character, there is little evidence that this breviary was standardised, nor that its tradition extended as far back as 1230. Van Dijk acknowledges the widespread variation of these early Franciscan breviaries, as discussed above. Regarding missals, there is no clear evidence before *Indutus Planeta* that a standard model existed within the Order, other than the generally accepted assumption that the missals they did use followed the Papal Curia's rite. Even the publication of *Indutus Planeta* did not guarantee liturgical uniformity in the Order's missals: without exemplar missals to pass around the houses, it would have been difficult to obtain real uniformity, and there is evidence that the ordinal itself was not quickly distributed. While van Dijk's narrative of Franciscan liturgical development insisted on a linear development from unity to disintegration and thence to reunification, the evidence suggests that there was far less liturgical uniformity within the Order in its developmental stages than van Dijk claimed.

Van Dijk and Hazelden Walker argued that the ordinal was envisaged as the precursor to a new edition of Franciscan liturgical books. This seems a reasonable proposition given that an ordinal was an oddly old-fashioned liturgical text to compose, and was a choice which makes more sense if viewed as the first step in a programme of reform. However, a formal edition resulting from the ordinal never appeared. Whether or not he was the ordinal's sole author, Haymo's death in c. 1243 may have stalled the ongoing reform of the Order's liturgy; his successor, the Italian Crescentius of Iesi (Minister General 1244–1247, d. 1263) was more interested in collecting memories of Francis than in liturgical reform. Crescentius, an opponent of the proto-Spiritualist faction, commissioned Thomas of Celano's *Vita secunda*, while

his Order-wide call for personal memories of the founder resulted in documents such as the *Assisi Compilation* (1244–1260) and the *Legend of the Three Companions* (c. 1246). His preoccupation with establishing a dominant representation of Francis must be seen in the context of the growing schism between the different factions within the Order, a problem that still confronted Bonaventure in the 1260s. In a change symptomatic of the powerful split between the factions, Crescentius was deposed as Minister General in 1247 at the Chapter of Lyons and replaced by John of Parma, who favoured the proto-Spiritualist cause.

2.4 John of Parma to Bonaventure: the Difficulties of Achieving Liturgical Unity

John of Parma was an ordained priest who had lectured in theology at the universities of Bologna and Napoli, and as minister general continued the Order's preoccupation with establishing internal unity. He was also intimately concerned with the infamous dispute between the mendicants and the secular clergy at the University of Paris. John did not undertake any major revision of the Order's liturgy but rather sought to reinforce the concept of liturgical unity, which still existed only in the form of the ordinal *Indutus planeta*, rather than in the more useful form of exemplar breviaries and missals. In 1249 John sent a letter to the Tuscan province demanding strict observation of the Order's liturgy, and in 1254 at the Chapter of Metz, he extended this command to all provinces.¹⁴¹ Though historians have noted these directives, the underlying need for any such reinforcements has not been commented upon; such reinforcements necessarily suggest that the liturgical activity of the provinces was diverse rather than uniform. The repeated calls for unity indicate that even by 1254, the liturgical revisions of the *Indutus Planeta* were not uniformly observed. This may in part be explained by the peculiarity of the ordinal's form: had Haymo lived to create exemplar missals and breviaries, their diffusion may have been more easily enforced.

In 1257 at the Chapter of Rome, Bonaventure of Bagnoregio replaced John of Parma as minister general. John's interest in the radical theology of Joachim of Fiore and his sympathy for the proto-Spiritualist friars was problematic, but though he was deposed, the General Chapter appears to have taken his advice in the appointment of Bonaventure (John's colleague at the University of Paris). Bonaventure was

¹⁴¹ Brooke, *The Image of Francis*, 242.

immediately charged with responsibility for the correction of the books for the Divine Office and with writing a new life of Francis, to supersede all previous *vitae*. When he fulfilled this task by presenting the *Legenda Maior* to the General Chapter of Pisa in 1263, he also ordered that all friars possess a copy of his work, and that all other *vitae* of the founder be destroyed. In this process, one sees a continuation of Crescentius of Iesi's earlier interest in establishing documentary evidence of the founder, but also a more concerted effort from the Order to control the image of their increasingly popular founder through a sort of censorship – only the 'correct' image of Francis was permitted to flower. More will be said of this later. Bonaventure made a similar pronouncement regarding the liturgy at the 1260 Chapter. In the multi-volume collection of Bonaventure's work *Doctoris seraphici S. Bonaventurae, S.R.E. Episcopi cardinalis: Opera Omnia*, the relevant section of the Chapter of Narbonne is recorded thus:

*Studeant Ministri, quod usque ad sequens Capitulum generale littera
Breviariorum et Missalium corrigatur ad exemplar verius, quod habere
poterunt, secundum Constitutiones Ordinis approbatas.*¹⁴²

The text also gives a variant manuscript tradition, with an example taken from ff. 24v–25v of *Firmamentum trium Ordinum S. Francisci*, a 1514 edition of Franciscan sources.¹⁴³ In this work, the statement was rendered thus (changes in bold):

*Studeant Ministri, quod usque ad sequens Capitulum generale littera
Breviariorum et Missalium corrigatur ad exemplar **unius**, quod habere
poterunt, secundum **consuetudinem** Ordinis approbatam.*¹⁴⁴

Van Dijk and Walker opted to translate *verius* rather than *unius*:

Before the next Chapter the ministers should see to it that the text (*littera*) of breviaries and missals be corrected on the basis of the more trustworthy models (*exemplar verius*), which is at their disposal, in accordance with the approved custom of the Order.¹⁴⁵

¹⁴² Bonaventure of Bagnoregio, *Opera Omnia*, iussu et auctoritate Rmi. P. Aloysii Lauer, edita Studio et cura PP Collegii A. S. Bonaventurae (Ad Claras Aquas (Quaracchi): Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, tomus VIII, 1898), 464.

¹⁴³ "Praeter promulgationem praecedentium Constitutionum in eodem Capitulo factae sunt aliae ordinationes, quae etiam *memorabilia* illa aetate vocabantur. Lectio dicti codicis Vaticani pluries corrigi potuit textu impresso in opere *Firmamentum trium Ordinum S. Franc.* Paris. 1514. I. pars, fol. 24v–25v., cum inscriptione: << Hic sunt quaedam notabiles definitiones factae in parte, in parte renovatae in Capitulo generali Narbonae celebrato >>. Ibi autem quaedam constitutiones omittuntur, sed in fine plures aliae adiiciuntur. Hanc editionem significamus litteris Fir." 464, n. 4.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 322.

The authors use this statement in their attempt to date the ‘second edition’ of the Franciscan missal – that is, the edition of the missal that followed the revisions attributed to Haymo of Faversham, which was supposedly copied and distributed following Haymo’s death in 1244. Van Dijk and Walker believe this edition of the missal to be the ‘more trustworthy’ model to which Bonaventure referred in 1260, and date the edition to 1254–1257.¹⁴⁶ They suggest Bonaventure’s ‘trustworthy’ exemplar included the new Mass for St Clare as well as an updated calendar (which agrees with the calendar of the breviary published that same year).¹⁴⁷ Van Dijk and Walker interpreted the ‘more trustworthy’ liturgical model as an updated second-edition ‘Regula’ missal based on Haymo’s Ordinal, but such clarity is lacking in the original sources to which they refer. As earlier discussion has shown, it remains unclear whether a really uniform liturgy based on *Indutus Planeta* was ever established. The repeated requests for adherence to the Order’s liturgy from John of Parma do not specify which version of the liturgy he considered this to be.

Bonaventure’s statement highlights his preoccupation with liturgical unity and trustworthy exempla manuscripts. This concern may be seen as stemming from the ongoing difficulties regarding liturgy within the Order, which began in the 1220s during Francis’s own lifetime, as has been explored above. Van Dijk and Walker have suggested that the liturgy remained a central and defining element of the Order’s conception of itself: what type of liturgy the friars observed, and in what manner it was to be observed, were issues (they argue) which cut to the heart of both the Order’s organisation and its fundamental spiritual character. Some comparison with the liturgical activity of the Order of Preachers during the same period is useful in determining to what extent the problems experienced by the Order of Friars Minor were peculiar to their internal political situation, and to what extent they were organisational issues confronting any religious group. Rosalind B. Brooke addresses this question in her recent work *The Image of Francis: Responses to Sainthood in the Thirteenth Century*. The Dominican General Chapter in 1244 initiated measures to unify the texts used for the Divine Office, and elected a commission of four friars to undertake this work.¹⁴⁸ Under the direction of minister general Humbert of Romans

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 338.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 339.

¹⁴⁸ Brooke, *Image of Francis*, 242. As Brooke notes, the major scholarly work regarding Dominican history of the period remains William A. Hinnebusch, *The History of the Dominican Order*, 2 vols. (Staten Island NY: Alba House, 1966).

(elected 1254) further revisions of liturgical offices took place, which were approved and enforced by three confirmations in 1254, 1255 and 1256.¹⁴⁹ The Dominicans appear to have been more organised regarding the process of liturgical reform than were the Franciscans, at least in terms of the records that remain to historians; a new tax was placed on all Dominican provinces to pay for the cost of producing a master copy of the new liturgy, to be kept in Paris.¹⁵⁰ There appears to be no similar ruling amongst the Friars Minor, and it remains unclear whether they too produced master copies of their reformed liturgy, or in what manner the changes were distributed.

Despite the existence of a master copy of the Dominican reformed liturgy, there remains evidence that enforcement of the Dominican reform was less than straightforward. Brooke notes that the General Chapters of 1257 and 1258 instructed all friars to make certain their existing liturgical books (and any new ones) be carefully corrected to conform to the exemplar in Paris.¹⁵¹ Furthermore, she writes, this instruction was reinforced in 1259, with the ‘reassurance’ that there would be no further changes to the liturgy.¹⁵² This repeated reinforcement of the revisions and the coaxing tone of the ‘reassurance’ suggest a reluctance on the part of the Dominican provincial priors to follow the Chapters’ instructions, though Brooke does not discuss this. Clearly the prospect of the time-consuming and costly updating of liturgical books did not appeal to all the Dominican priors, and the best efforts of the General Chapters to provide a clear master copy of the revised liturgy did not translate directly into widespread use of this new version.

2.5 The Friars Minor, Liturgy and Identity in the Thirteenth Century

This analysis of van Dijk’s conceptualisation of the Order’s development in the thirteenth century has raised some issues central to this discussion of the CSP and its related manuscripts from the wider Perugian Liturgical Group. Van Dijk’s narrative of Franciscan liturgy as a linear development (from unity, to disintegration, and a return to unity under Haymo of Faversham) has not been subject to scholarly critique since the 1970s. It now appears that such a critique is both valid and necessary. The evidence for the existence of the so-called ‘Regula’ breviaries and missals is ripe for such analysis: in light of the challenges to van Dijk’s theories, the existence of the so-

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 242–243.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 243.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Ibid.

called Regula editions must be taken as hypothetical rather than factual. That there is room to question the existence of a centralised and unified Franciscan liturgy before the ordinal *Indutus Planeta*, and also to question the uniformity of this liturgy after the publication of the Ordinal, suggests something of the fractured nature of the Order in the first century of its existence. Much of the debate over the nature of Franciscan liturgical reforms must rest on understanding exactly what ‘uniformity’ implies. For van Dijk, uniformity seems to have been largely based on liturgical structure: for example, those manuscripts he cites as later copies of the ‘lost’ Regula missal follow the same basic structure (leaving aside the question of musical notation), but their contents vary widely, as discussed above. In their *incipit* statements and in the structure of their liturgical contents, the earliest missals used by the Order were faithful to the rite of the Papal Curia, as van Dijk argued. That the Order desired to follow the liturgical usage of the Papal Curia does not mean that each community of friars practiced this rite in the same fashion, however. In van Dijk’s narrative, the Order’s liturgy developed in a circular pattern: early unity gave way to disintegration under Elias, with unity restored again by Haymo and then strengthened by Bonaventure. The structural uniformity of the early breviaries and missals (such as it is) was seen by van Dijk as both necessary to and definitive of liturgical unity within the Order, yet it would seem that the manuscript tradition of Franciscan liturgy is a witness to variety rather than uniformity. Variety of content is surely as important as similarity of structure: perhaps more so, since it is evidence of localised devotional practice, so easily overlooked in the paradigm of a monolithic Use of Rome. Arguing for the necessity of liturgical uniformity in constructing a unified communal identity is limiting: such variety existed, and it may be more fruitful to consider the reasons for and consequences of this variety than to characterise it as ‘disintegration’.

Questions over liturgical duties and rights arose within the Order even within Francis’s lifetime, and papal intervention such as Gregory IX’s *Quo elongati* of 1230 did little to quell the unrest. In contrast to van Dijk’s thesis of an early unified Franciscan liturgy, it is reasonable to posit that although the attitude(s) of the friars towards liturgy was one of respect for the Papal Curia’s tradition from the Order’s earliest formation, these attitudes cannot be seen to have constituted a unified approach, in either organisational or spiritual terms. One cannot speak of one attitude towards liturgy, but must rather consider a spectrum of attitudes from within the Order, in tune with the multiple interpretations of Franciscan life which vied for

dominance throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Francis's own attitude to liturgical activity was in keeping with his vision for the friars: he envisaged his brothers participating in the Divine Office where possible, though without this participation necessitating a formal codification in the Order's Rule, nor requiring the formal provision of breviaries. Indeed, Francis explicitly stated that only those friars who could already read should possess breviaries, indicating that friars' participation in the Divine Office was a flexible obligation, and that there was no need for breviaries of a specifically Franciscan character. On the whole, Francis and his friars were to 'remain within the Churches' – that is, under the authority of the secular clergy, and without a differentiated liturgical identity. This flexibility of liturgical activity reflects the demographic and activity of the early friars: for the most part, they were lay brothers (as indeed Francis was for most of his life within the Order), and their main duty was itinerant preaching.

As more ordained men joined the Order, the necessity for organising the Order's attitude to the Mass grew in importance. The death of Francis in 1226 opened the door to the diversity of interpretation of the founder which exists in the wider Franciscan family and which continues to the present day. The contested identity of the founder stands as an apt metaphor for the identity crisis which gripped the Order as a whole. From its earliest days, the Order affiliated its liturgical character with that of the Papal Curia, for both practical and political reasons. The Order's use of the Papal Curia's rite was viewed by van Dijk as a major factor in the growing dominance of the Use of the Papal Curia within the Western Church in the later Middle Ages – the friars' itinerant lifestyle and missionary activity are seen to have been ideal methods of spreading the Use beyond the Papal Curia. Indeed, the friars always acknowledged their relationship to the Papal Curia's liturgy in the *incipit* statements of their missals, as mentioned above. While the friars undoubtedly possessed respect for this tradition, it does not necessarily follow that their liturgical activity was in uniform accordance with that of the Papal Curia. Much of the support for this supposition derives from the work of van Dijk and Walker, whose teleological approach to the clericalisation of the Order underpins their representation of the unified and unifying nature of Franciscan liturgy in the thirteenth century. In particular, van Dijk and Walker's presentation of Haymo of Faversham as a second founder and the man responsible for codifying Francis's spiritual mission into a structured Order suggests a level of bias in their description of the nature of

Franciscan liturgy (as unified and unifying), its evolution (through Haymo's praiseworthy revisions) and its maintenance (through the largely uniform adoption of revisions). Haymo was indisputably an important figure in the early Order's development, but his activity and reputation must be distinguished from the broader picture of the liturgical attitudes of these early friars. While the friars were using the liturgy of the Papal Curia from the Order's earliest days, the manuscript evidence van Dijk relies upon testifies (as he himself acknowledged) to the variety contained within this tradition, rather than its uniformity. As the manuscripts analysed in Chapters Four and Five will show, the ideal of liturgical uniformity and unity suggested by van Dijk and Walker is fragile and conditional.

As discussed, there is no firm evidence that Haymo of Faversham was in fact the author of *Indutus Planeta*: it dates only to 1263 in its earliest manuscript copy, and no source before 1369 mentions Haymo as the author. However, van Dijk's argument for Haymo's authorship is convincing: his evident concern with the Order's liturgy and his scholarly talents make him a likely candidate. The dating of the Ordinal remains problematic, however: it may be that no formal effort to unify the Order's liturgy occurred until the 1250s – a decade after the *Exposition of the Rule* by the Four Masters (1241–1242) had noted the need for a unified liturgy in the Order. In any case, the liturgical revisions of *Indutus Planeta* were not effectively enforced, despite the efforts of subsequent minister generals such as John of Parma: the remaining manuscript evidence suggests the Ordinal was initially distributed only in central Italy. Even the evidence of Bonaventure's concern with enforcing liturgical unity does not specify *Indutus Planeta* as its source. In part, this may be explained by the method Haymo chose to present his revisions: the ordinal, as a form, was old-fashioned even by the 1240s, and may not have been the most expedient way of distributing the revised liturgy. Even if given access to the Ordinal, a province or house still required substantial resources to assemble a new liturgical book adhering to its changes: the scribe would need access to not only the ordinal, but also to the missal and breviary to which it referred, and he would need considerable understanding of the liturgy in order to copy the new text correctly. The financial and human resources required to copy from an ordinal were therefore greater than if a province or house was given an exemplar manuscript, which could be copied word for word, without detailed knowledge of the subject. An equally pragmatic consideration is the death of Haymo shortly after he presented the Ordinal; had he lived longer, he

may well have put great energy in enforcing the revised liturgy, through liturgical statutes and the provision of exemplars.

Haymo's quite sudden death suggests another important consideration in this analysis of the Order's attitude to liturgy: the importance of the founder in the formation of Franciscan identity. Crescentius of Iesi's decision to focus on establishing documentary evidence of Francis rather than to enforce his predecessor Haymo's liturgical reforms suggests that in the context of the continuing schisms within the Order throughout the thirteenth century, the legend of the founder played a more important role in the construction of communal identity than did the liturgy. Of course, the two issues are not mutually exclusive and both had a bearing on the construction and maintenance of identity, as indicated by the way in which Bonaventure addressed both the image of the founder and liturgical reforms during his tenure as minister general. The reading of Franciscan liturgy proposed by van Dijk and Walker (that it was the dominant factor in establishing communal identity) has been widely appropriated by scholars considering the role of liturgy in the general development of the Order throughout the thirteenth century.

A comparison with the Order of Preachers in the same period indicates that while the Friars Minor professed to follow the liturgy of the Papal Curia, they were in practice disorganised regarding liturgical revisions. They lacked the systematic approach of the Dominicans towards providing the necessary financial and organisational resources which could facilitate liturgical unity. Such a comparison also demonstrates that even with strong organisation, liturgical unity was difficult to achieve: the Dominican General Chapters' repeated calls for observance of the liturgy indicate a more diverse reality than is sometimes assumed by scholars. Liturgical unity was therefore difficult to achieve even when prioritised (as by the Dominicans); whilst attempting to create and enforce a unified liturgy, the Order of Friars Minor were distracted from the task by the major schism confronting it in the mid-thirteenth century, which revolved around the identity of its founder and his intentions for the Order. In this sense, it may be argued that for the Order of Friars Minor, the representation of Francis, rather than the liturgy, was the central building block of its communal identity/identities. This hypothesis will be examined against the calendar evidence of the CSP and selected missals from the Perugian Liturgical Group in the following chapters.

A study of the liturgical activity of the Friars requires a discussion of the Order's attitude(s) to book production, an aspect of Franciscan cultural practice which is seldom taken up by scholars. From the seminal work of liturgical historians van Dijk and Walker in the 1940s–1970s to Timothy Johnson's recent work *Franciscans at Prayer* (2007), scholars have concentrated on the existence and use of books within the Order, but largely neglected to discuss their production.¹⁵³ This aspect of the friars' liturgical activity will be discussed in Chapter Three.

¹⁵³ Van Dijk and Walker, *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy*; Van Dijk, ed., *Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy*; Johnson, ed., *Franciscans at Prayer*.

Chapter Three

The Order of Friars Minor and the Book

Francis's attitude towards books is best understood in the context of his deference to priests: he was concerned that liturgical books were treated with the reverence due to all objects involved in the celebration of the Eucharist, and sought to limit the number of books owned by the growing Order, restricting them to the province of clerics. The majority of his comments about books relate to their ownership, rather than their production. Some discussion of this has been raised in Chapter Two, and will be explored in greater depth here. The existence of the Perugian Liturgical Group of manuscripts raises a broader issue of great significance for any study of the construction of communal Franciscan spiritual identity: the juxtaposition of the Order's Rule and its prohibitive stance on book ownership and production with the practicalities of the necessary production of liturgical books for use by the Order's clerics. This chapter will unite the disciplines of art history, manuscript studies and Franciscan history in order to provide an holistic context for the five selected manuscripts presented in Chapter Four. Three key questions will be explored:

1. Who were the scribes of these manuscripts?
2. Who were the miniaturists decorating these manuscripts?
3. How did the relationship between the miniaturists and the Order manifest itself in the miniatures of the Perugian Franciscan Group, and what are the ramifications of the methodology used in the analysis of these miniatures?

As it comes into focus through an examination of these three broad questions, the network of patronage and production which existed between the friars and the high-status miniaturists of Perugia will assist our reading of liturgical commemoration within the Perugian Liturgical Group in particular and, more broadly, will underpin an examination of historiographical trends regarding Franciscan liturgy and identity during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries in Umbria.

3.1 The Scribes

Francis included specific prohibitions about the use of books in several key documents: the *Earlier Rule* (1209/10–1221), the *Later Rule* (1223) and in the *Testament* (1226).¹ The *Earlier Rule* draws together both the *propositum vitae* (orally approved by Pope Innocent III in 1209/10) and developments to this primitive Rule, influenced by both the nascent Order's early experiences and the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council (1216). The *Earlier Rule* is therefore seen by scholars to have been composed from 1209/10, when it first received a form of papal approval, to 1221, when it reached its final state. Armstrong, Hellmann and Short's critical edition of the *Earlier Rule* identifies which passages may be seen to belong to the different phases of its composition. They suggest that verses 4–10 of Chapter III: The Divine Office and Fasting, which deal briefly with the issue of book ownership and use, date to the latter stage of the *Earlier Rule*'s composition.² Thus, Francis's first statement about the use and ownership of books amongst the friars was a development of his thought necessitated by experiential factors, rather than a foundational element of his vision of their collective mission and lifestyle.

In Chapter III of this document, Francis exhorts the Lesser Brothers to recite the Divine Office while undertaking periods of fasting, in order to allay the potentially demoralising effects of suffering such bodily deprivation. Both clerical and lay brothers were required to recite the Divine Office, while clerical brothers bore the added responsibility of reciting it for the souls of the living and the dead, 'according to the custom of clerics'.³ To this end, clerical brothers 'may have only the books necessary to fulfil their office'.⁴ Francis continued by decreeing that 'lay brothers who know how to read the psalter may have one,' while 'those who do not know how to read . . . may not be permitted to have any book'.⁵

While his statements on the ownership of books were relatively clear – only the literate and those whose spiritual work necessitated it were permitted to own

¹ For further information see: Attilio Bartoli Langelì, "Libraries, Books and Writing in the Orders of Friars Minor", trans. Edward Hagman OFM Cap., *Greyfriars Review* 17:2 (2003): 135–159; Bert Roest, *A History of Franciscan Education (c. 1210–1517)* (Boston: Brill, 2000); Neslihan Senoçak, "Book Acquisition in the Medieval Franciscan Order", *Journal of Religious History*, 27:1 (2003): 14–28; Neslihan Senoçak, "Circulation of Books in the Medieval Franciscan Order: Attitude, Methods, and Critics", *Journal of Religious History* 28:2 (2004): 146–161.

² Francis of Assisi, "The Earlier Rule", 65, note b.

³ *Ibid.*, 65.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, 65–66.

books – Francis made no mention of the production or acquisition of books. In Chapter VII: The Manner of Serving and Working, Francis stipulates that while brothers may not fill leadership roles in the places they rest or work, ‘brothers who know how to work [may] do so and exercise that trade they have learned, provided it is not contrary to the good of the souls and can be performed honestly’.⁶ In recompense for their work, such brothers ‘can receive whatever is necessary excepting money . . . and it is lawful for them to have the tools and instruments suitable to their trades’.⁷ After quoting directly from St Benedict’s *Rule* and its stipulations regarding monastic work, Francis reminds his brothers that ‘servants of God . . . must always apply themselves to prayer or some good work’.⁸ In the following chapter (Chapter VIII: Let the Brothers Not Receive Money), Francis strongly prohibits the use or possession of money ‘whether for clothing, books, or payment for some work – indeed, not for any reason, unless for an evident need of the sick brothers; because we should not think of coin or money having any greater usefulness than stones’.⁹

None of Chapter VI’s statements directly address the production of books, though it could easily be argued that scribal work fell into the category of the useful ‘godly’ trades permitted by the *Earlier Rule*. Chapter VIII’s prohibition of brothers receiving money mentions books alongside clothes, in the context of items for which the brothers may not solicit money to purchase. The brothers are also forbidden from receiving money in return for their services. In light of these statements, and those of Chapter III, the position of the Lesser Brothers regarding books is less clear: by avoiding a direct discussion of the production of books, and by permitting brothers to use their pre-existing skills in godly work which did not undermine the prohibition of leadership roles or the use of money, Francis left open the possibility of brothers working as scribes for the production of necessary liturgical books for the Order.

In the *Later Rule*, approved by Pope Honorius III in November 1223, there were several key changes to the wording of the statements examined above from the *Earlier Rule*. Rather than citing the ability to read as a factor in the ownership of books, the *Later Rule* stated that clerical brothers could own breviaries for the recitation of the Divine Office ‘according to the rite of the holy Roman Church,’

⁶ Ibid., 68.

⁷ Ibid., 69.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid., 69–70.

while lay brothers were instructed to recite certain numbers of *Our Fathers* for the canonical hours, in place of the Divine Office itself.¹⁰ A detailed discussion of the liturgical ramifications of these changes was raised in Chapter Two. In terms of book production, the *Later Rule* may have been designed to curtail the friars' need for books: lay brothers could no longer possess any book, while clerical brothers could possess only a breviary. No mention of missals was made by Francis in either version of the *Rule*: as previously suggested, this may be read in the context of his desire for the friars to remain 'within the churches', dependent on external clerics for their Eucharistic celebrations. However, as noted, the friars were in fact celebrating private (as opposed to conventual) masses from as early as 1224 – that is, within Francis's own lifetime.¹¹ It has previously been suggested that the earliest missals used by the friars may have been donated by the Diocese of Assisi, under the guidance of Bishop Guido II, a supporter of the Order. Indeed, there must be a distinction between early missals used by the Franciscans, and early Franciscan missals: the former's original state may not reflect specifically Franciscan interests, while the latter can be identified as such precisely because of their distinctively Franciscan calendar and sanctoral cycles. As discussed in Chapter Two, van Dijk argued for the existence of an edition of Franciscan breviaries and missals from as early as 1230 (the so-called 'Regula' edition). The arguments for and against this thesis do not require repetition here, but it is necessary to recall that there is no concrete evidence for Franciscan missals (of the type defined above) before the 1250s.

The Codex Sancti Paschalis and its related manuscripts (the Perugian Liturgical Group) all date to the late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries: they are therefore unaffected by the arguments relating to the earlier period of Franciscan missal scribal production. However, questions still remain about how such later missals were produced. Evidence that friars were copying their own theological and liturgical texts occurs very early in the Order's history, as Bert Roest's authoritative study of Franciscan education has established.¹² Cesare Cenci too has discussed the friars' practices regarding manuscript production, in his two-volume catalogue of the collection of the Sacro Convento in Assisi. While Cenci's work does not mention the CSP or the Perugian Liturgical Group, it contains pertinent information regarding the

¹⁰ St Francis of Assisi, "The Later Rule", 101.

¹¹ Deduced from Honorious III's privilege allowing the friars the use of portable altars.

¹² Roest, *A History of Franciscan Education*, 229–234.

scribal production of these manuscripts. Evidence exists that the friars were engaged in manuscript copying even during Francis's lifetime, at the Porziuncula.¹³ Upon the translation of Francis's body to the newly completed Sacro Convento, the scribal workshop of the friars relocated to that site, forming the beginnings of a library which Cenci cites as second only to Avignon and Paris during the medieval period.¹⁴ In the 1239 Constitutions, all convent prelates were instructed to compel their friars to write, an instruction repeated in the Narbonne Constitution of 1260.¹⁵ Such provisions probably relate more to theological texts than they do to liturgical books, but they provide an insight into the important role of books in the Order more broadly. There is a frustrating gap in scholars' knowledge of the friars' manuscript production during the thirteenth century: relatively little is documented about their scribal activity throughout that turbulent century.

Evidence for the late-fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is more plentiful: Neslihan Senoçak has counted ninety friar-scribes who signed (non-liturgical) manuscripts during this period.¹⁶ Cenci lists a number of names of friars found in manuscripts in the Sacro Convento from the 1381 inventory onwards, which demonstrate the activity of friars at the Sacro Convento as the scribes and purchasers of books that were passed on to other friars or to the library upon their deaths.¹⁷ Kenneth Humphreys has explored the five main ways in which the Order acquired books: donation, legacies, purchase, scribal activity by individual friars, and acquisition of the libraries of deceased friars.¹⁸ Humphreys cites numerous examples of friar-scribes from the fourteenth century: Giovanni de Novaplatea (1310), Giovanni Giorgio di Bologna (1382) and Angelo Salvetti (1396).¹⁹ An example found during the course of research for this dissertation is Ms. 269 in the Sacro Convento, Assisi, an early-fourteenth-century Franciscan missal which contains a note naming the scribe as *fratris Johannis de Ryseley Anglici* (f. 378v). It is also apparent that friars sometimes employed professional scribes to write texts for them.²⁰ Humphreys'

¹³ Cenci, *Bibliotheca manuscripta ad Sacrum conventum Assisiensem*, vol. 1, 5.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Senoçak, "Medieval Franciscan Book Acquisition", 26.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 27.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 15.

¹⁸ Kenneth W. Humphreys. "Le biblioteche francescane in Italia nei secoli XIII e XIV", in *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature*, ed. Carlo Pirovano (Milano: Electa, 1982), 138.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 136.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

research does not concern liturgical books, however; the practice of paying a commercial scribe would seem more appropriate to the production of theological texts, as used by the increasing number of friars attending universities. While Cenci notes the names of several friars known to have written some manuscripts in the Sacro Convento's collection, he stops short of describing the activity at the Sacro Convento as an actual *scriptorium*. Citing the example of a Benedictine abbey, Cenci defines a *scriptorium* as a room within the guest quarters of a religious house where the house's notary would be stationed for the purposes of writing legal contracts with the house's dependents – a room therefore provided with everything necessary for writing.²¹ He contends that while the Sacro Convento did produce manuscripts necessary to the religious activity of the community, and possibly even wrote them in a specially designated room, 'the fateful word "scriptorium" does not peek out from the documents'.²² Humphreys agrees that the friars did not possess the type of systematised *scriptoria* constructed by the monastic Orders.²³

In view of this information, further research is necessary to determine whether the friars of the Sacro Convento had any hand in the scribal production of the liturgical manuscripts in the CSP's group, but it remains important and relevant to remember that relatively early in the Order's history Franciscan friars did engage in scribal activity for the liturgical, study and preaching purposes of their own community, albeit in a non-systematised fashion. Whether Franciscan friaries contained *scriptoria* in a formal sense and in what manner they produced books of any kind remain matters for debate, but liturgical books seem to have been viewed by the friars themselves as a special case: in 1260, minister general Bonaventure of Bagnoregio issued an instruction manual for scribes which indicated that the copying of liturgical texts was a task for friars, too important to be left to secular scribes.²⁴ It is quite possible then, even likely, that the scribes of the manuscripts studied by this

²¹ Cenci, *Bibliotheca manuscripta ad Sacrum conventum Assisiensem*, vol. 1, 24, n. 41.

²² Ibid. (Translation mine.)

²³ Humphreys, "*Le biblioteche francescane*", 138.

²⁴ Bonaventure of Bagnoregio, "Statum saec. XIII pro scribendis libris choralibus cum notis quadratis ad usum Fratrum Minorum", ed. Benvenuto Bughetti, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 21 (1928): 402–412. Cited in Roest, *A History of Franciscan Education*, 231, n. 147. In the same year, Bonaventure also prohibited the friars from giving copies of new theological works to scribes outside the Order without permission from the general and provincial minister. Senoçak reads this as a response to the case of Gerardo di San Donino, the Franciscan friar and student whose 1254 *Introduction to the Evangelical Gospel* was deemed heretical and banned but continued to be copied by secular scribes in Paris, bringing opprobrium on the Order as a whole. Senoçak, "Medieval Franciscan Book Acquisition", 25.

dissertation were friars, though their locations remain unknown. This would appear to be confirmed by the minute scribal prayer which follows the end of the original folios of the CSP:

Ante conspectu[m] diuine maiestatis tue reus assisto q[ui] i[n]uocare *nomen* s[an]c[t]u[m] tuu[m] p[re]sumo miserere m[ichi] d[omi]ne **homini p[re]cc[at]ori ignosce indigno sacerdoti** (*parc[ere]*) man[us] oblatio uidet[ur] offerri. p[ar]ce p[re]cc[at]o[i] labe p[re]cat[or]is capitaliu[m] polluto. [et] non intres in iudiciu[m] cu[m] s[er]uo tuo. Quia n[on] iustificabit[ur] in conspecto tuo om[n]es uiuens. uiciis ac uoluptatib[us] (*cupidines*) agrauatus sum. Recordare d[omi]ne q[uo]d] caro su[m] q[ui]a *in tuo conspectu celi eciam non sunt mundi Domine quanto magis ego peccator homo t[er]renus et immundus sic[ut] pa[n]nus menstruate indignus sum d[omi]ne* Ih[esu] x[rist]i ut sum *uiuam sed tu qui n[on] uis mor[tem] p[re]c[ca]toris (sed) x[rist]us tot[us] [et] uiuat da m[ichi] uen[iam] i[n] carne* constituto ut p[er] *penitencie labores uita eterna perfrui* merear. P[er] te ih[esu]m xpr[istum]²⁵

The scribe here refers to himself as an unworthy priest (bold emphasis mine in the above text). The reference to ‘menstrual rags’ is drawn from Isaiah 64:6, and indeed the prayer appears to be that attributed to St Ambrose in the fourth century.²⁶ There is no strong reason to doubt that the CSP’s scribe was in fact a priest. As the above discussion has indicated, it is reasonable to conclude that he was a Franciscan priest working as a scribe for his community, though he may not have operated within a formal *scriptorium* environment.

²⁵ “I, in my guilt, who presume to invoke your holy name, am present before the sight of your divine majesty; have mercy, Lord, on me, a human being a sinner; forget an unworthy priest: spare an unworthy priest; let the offering of the hand be seen to be offered; spare a sinner; let slip the pollution of mortal sins, and do not enter into judgment of your servant. Because each living man will not be justified in your sight; I am weighed down with vices and lusts. Remember, Lord, that in your sight I am flesh, because in your sight, even the heavens are not pure; how much more am I an earthly and impure sinful man; I am unworthy Lord Jesus Christ like the rag of a menstruating woman so that I might live; but you who do not wish the death of a sinner, but may Christ let me live completely; give pardon to me, established in flesh, so that through the efforts of penitence I may deserve to enjoy eternal life. Through you, Jesus Christ.”

This prayer is almost illegible in the CSP, due to the tiny script and its worn appearance. Text in square brackets is abbreviated in the original. Text in round brackets, or empty round brackets, indicate illegible and as yet indecipherable text. Text in Italics is illegible in the CSP, and has been taken from the only other example of this prayer uncovered during research, that of the early fifteenth-century Burnet Psalter (Aberdeen, Aberdeen University Library, Ms. 25, f. 38r–38v). For more information on the Burnet Psalter and access to a full digital copy and transcription, see <http://www.abdn.ac.uk/diss/historic/collects/bps/index.html>. My thanks to Prof. Constant Mews for assistance with the translation of this prayer.

²⁶ My gratitude to Professor emeritus Margaret Manion for drawing the Ambrosian origin of the prayer to my attention. As Professor Manion also noted, the prayer was included in the Ordinary of the Mass in the Celtic Stowe Missal. Further research is necessary to discover the precise history of usage of this prayer in the Ambrosian and Roman Rites. Fr Kristopher G. Dowling (trans. and ed.), *Celtic Missal: The Liturgy and Diverse Services from the Lorrha (“Stowe”) Missal, Used by the Churches of Ireland, Scotland, Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland, and Northern Italy* (Akron, OH: Ascension Western Rite Orthodox Church, 1995), 7.

3.2 The Miniaturists

While there is strong evidence that the scribes of the Perugian Liturgical Group were friars, it seems that their miniaturists and decorators were probably lay, and commercially employed to undertake the work. Although the last two decades of scholarship has seen an increased interest in the production and patronage of Franciscan art, this work has largely been concerned with monumental art and architecture rather than with manuscript decoration. Louise Bourdua has studied the historiography of this subject, pointing to the parallel studies by Joanna Cannon regarding the Dominicans (for whom good records of patronage exist) and to Martin Kemp's reconstruction of the process of producing an altarpiece, among others.²⁷ Bourdua highlighted the difficulties in ascertaining the activity of Franciscan friars as artists and patrons, given the lack of records from within the Order regarding such activity.²⁸ The fact that the Franciscan friars were (officially, at least) prohibited from handling money and therefore required the use of intermediaries when dealing with the financial aspect of artistic patronage and production adds yet another layer of complexity for scholars.²⁹ The 1316 Constitutions of Assisi, which explicitly banned friars from writing books to sell, highlight that the financial aspect of book production and distribution was an ongoing source of trouble for the Order.³⁰ The fascinating example of friar Nicola di Assisi (described as *scriptor librorum* at the convent of Avignon) who received thirty florins of gold for working as a scribe for Benedict XII in 1338 demonstrates that these Constitutions did not necessarily affect practice.³¹ Studies have shown that mendicant friars did sometimes work in the production of art, such as the Franciscan mosaicist Jacobus de Camerino (known to have worked on San Lorenzo in Vicenza³²), friar Bartolomeo Guiscolo (a Franciscan scribe and miniaturist active in Parma in 1226 and in France in 1248³³) and friar Egidio degli Scalzi (d. 1283, a Perugian Dominican and noted miniaturist³⁴). These are, however, isolated examples: the Order's organisational mechanisms around friars working as artists are

²⁷ Louise Bourdua, "The 13th- and 14th-century Italian Mendicant Orders and Art", in *Economia e Arte secc. XIII–XVIII. Atti della "Trentatreesima Settimana di Studi"*, 30 aprile – 4 maggio 2000, a cura di Simonetta Cavaciocchi (Firenze: Le Monnier, 2002), 479.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 482.

³⁰ Humphreys, "Le biblioteche francescane", 138.

³¹ *Ibid.*

³² Bourdua, "The 13th- and 14th-century Italian Mendicant Orders and Art", 480.

³³ Humphreys, "Le biblioteche francescane", 138.

³⁴ Subbioni, *La Miniatura Perugina del Trecento*, 4.

far from clear. As has been discussed above, it has been established that friars at the Sacro Convento were copying manuscripts from c. 1230, but whether the friars *routinely* engaged in illumination as well as scribal work is yet to be firmly established. Marco Assirelli and Emanuela Sesti contended that friars at the Sacro Convento were indeed both scribes and miniaturists, though they acknowledge the absence of any supporting documentation for this claim.³⁵ They proposed that the Sacro Convento was the birthplace of a major decorative Assisian style, which differed from that of the more famous Perugian ateliers by virtue of a characteristic ‘*semplicità*’.³⁶ Assirelli and Sesti suggested that it was the presence of the Order of Friars Minor in Assisi which stimulated the formation of ‘*una cultura artistica incentrata su un linguaggio per immagini e sull’espressione più sentimentale che intellettuale*’, implying that the simplicity they perceived as characteristic of the proposed Assisian style was also characteristic of the emotional, un-intellectual nature of Franciscan spirituality.³⁷ This notion of a distinctively simplistic Franciscan style of decoration will be examined against evidence from the selected missals in section 3.3, below. While Assirelli and Sesti’s study of the Sacro Convento provided some information on the possibility of friar-miniaturists in Assisi, there is (as they acknowledged) no documentary evidence to support the idea – it relies upon a stylistic interpretation and on a conception of the simplicity of Franciscan spirituality. Their argument raises three separate but interrelated issues which are at the heart of this discussion of the production of Franciscan decorated books: 1) the suggestion of the existence of friar-miniaturists; 2) the basic conceptualisation of ‘simplistic’ Franciscan style and its meaning, as formulated by the art historians who have discussed the Perugian Liturgical Group; 3) the examination of this proposed Franciscan style of decoration against manuscript evidence from the selected missals of the Perugian Liturgical Group studied by this dissertation. The first two of these will be discussed in this section, while the third and most extensive forms a new section.

³⁵ Marco Assirelli and Emanuela Sesti, eds., “La Biblioteca del Sacro Convento di Assisi: ipotesi per uno ‘scriptorium’”, *La Biblioteca del Sacro Convento di Assisi. II. I libri miniati del XIII e del XIV secolo*. (Assisi: Sacro Convento, Casa Editrice Franciscana, 1990), 63.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 65.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 67.

3.2.1 *Friar-miniaturists in a scriptorium in Assisi?*

While there has yet to be a focused study of the Perugian friars' activity as miniaturists or patrons, the identification of the missals under study in this dissertation as decorated by lay commercial miniaturists means it seems reasonable in this case to concentrate on the relationship of the friars to such commercial miniaturists, rather than on the possibility of friar-miniaturists in Perugia. That the five missals under consideration in this dissertation are thought to have been decorated in Perugia by commercial miniaturists raises some doubt about the idea of a major centre of friar-miniaturists in Assisi: it seems that while there may have been some friar-miniaturists, the Order frequently utilised the resources of commercial miniaturists. However, as Humphreys suggests regarding friar-scribes, friars often continued working in their previous professions after entering the Order, providing such work did not contravene the Rule.³⁸ As suggested above, the work of scribes and miniaturists would appear to fall within the confines of the 'godly work' permitted by Francis in the *Later Rule*. While the *Later Rule* therefore does not preclude the possibility of friar-miniaturists (and indeed several examples of such are known, as will be discussed below), it does not suggest any information about whether such individuals were common, nor the organisational mechanisms by which the Order controlled their activity. With what frequency the Order commissioned commercial miniaturists to produce their books is not known, but it may be noted that amongst the surviving Franciscan liturgical manuscripts, there are more examples known of commercial miniaturists than of friar-miniaturists. The lack of documentary records from within the Order perpetuates the difficulties of attempting to formulate a precise understanding of the Order's mechanisms regarding book production, though it would appear that the Order's relationship with commercial miniaturists was more routinely notarised from the fourteenth century onwards, as suggested below.

Venturella di Pietro is known to have been a commercial, lay miniaturist, and it has been argued by art historians that his atelier had a special relationship with the Order in Perugia.³⁹ Marina Subbioni has presented extensive information about the structure of the commercial book decoration industry in Perugia, which serves as a useful starting point for contextualising the decoration of the Perugian Liturgical

³⁸ Humphreys, "Le biblioteche francescane", 138.

³⁹ While the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno is a reconstructed figure, the scholarship appears to assume he was lay rather than a member of a religious order.

Group. The development of miniaturist art in Perugia at the end of the thirteenth century was spurred on by several factors and supported by a *Comune* which wished (and could afford) to emphasise the town's noble origins, as evidenced by their many commissioned works during the period.⁴⁰ This patronage and organisational structure, along with Pope Clement V's official establishment of a *Studium generale* in 1308 (though it was already active from 1285) that catered for the education of both religious and lay members of the city, resulted in an environment which sustained the artistic ferment of the period and provided it with an outlet – book production and decoration. Certainly a key factor stimulating Perugia's book decoration industry was the privileged position the town held in regard to the papacy. In 1303, the conclave to elect a new pope was held in Perugia. It elected the Dominican Nicolò Boccasini, who took the name Benedict XI. The ill-fated new pope ruled for less than one year, and died suddenly (some thought suspiciously) in Perugia in 1304.⁴¹ In honour of Benedict XI's death, new antiphonals were written for the use of the Perugian Dominicans at San Domenico, the decorative style of which had a lasting impact on Perugian miniaturists.⁴² Indeed, the miniatures in these antiphonals are considered to be the work of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno (referred to by some scholars as the Primo Miniatore Perugino). Elvio Lunghi has suggested that the demand for updated images in books and the presence in the town of several well-regarded ateliers gave Perugia a unique role in the market of book decoration in central Italy, with an ornamental repertoire distinct from those of the university towns of Bologna, Siena and Firenze, though he does not discuss precisely any actual elements of this ornamental repertoire, nor those of the other towns cited. From the end of the thirteenth century, various popes and their courts were frequent visitors to Perugia, and during the Avignon papacy, papal legates resided in Perugia. Subbioni suggested some Perugian miniaturists may have moved to Avignon when it became a more stable papal seat, under Pope John XXII (1316–1334).⁴³ This close association with the papacy facilitated the diffusion throughout Europe of the distinctive Perugian decorative style.

⁴⁰ Subbioni, *La Miniatura Perugina del Trecento*, 1. For a detailed discussion of wealth and patronage in Perugia, see: Sarah Rubin Blanshei, "Population, Wealth and Patronage in Medieval and Renaissance Perugia", *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 9:4 (1979), 597–619.

⁴¹ Lunghi, "Le Miniature dei Manoscritti Italiani", 256.

⁴² *Ibid.*

⁴³ Subbioni, *La Miniatura Perugina del Trecento*, 3.

Some sort of corporation of Perugian miniaturists was formed c. 1310, as documents in the Archivio di Stato di Perugia demonstrate, naming Venturella di Pietro as a ‘*camerleng[o]*’ of the miniaturists in 1313.⁴⁴ These documents also name *Petrus Venturelle*, taken to be the son of Venturella di Pietro, as rector of the miniaturists for the quarter of the Porta Eburnea in Perugia in 1323.⁴⁵ Subbioni suggests the existence of such a corporation of miniaturists is clear evidence of the importance the book industry had in Perugia, which presumably grew from the *scriptoria* of the Canons regular at San Lorenzo and the Benedictines, and that the miniaturists held a special reputation in the area of book decoration.⁴⁶ Whether or not the Perugian miniaturists did possess a special reputation amongst the many centres of book production in Europe at the time is not clear, although it would seem that as a university town Perugia might well be expected to be recognised as a leader of book production in the region, if nothing else. Miniaturists of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were usually referred to in documents by the title of ‘*pictor*’ (painter), suggesting they lacked a specific distinction from artists working in other mediums.⁴⁷ The verb associated with the decoration of the public registry books was also ‘to paint’: in a document dated 11 May, 1311, it is recorded that Venturella di Pietro, ‘*pictor*’, was paid ‘*per scudectis quas pinxit in libris domini Octaviani de Brunelleschis*’.⁴⁸ Subbioni suggests this important document indicates that in Perugia, unlike in other cities, there was no distinction between painters and miniaturists. This would seem to be borne out by example such as Matteo di ser Cambio (primarily a goldsmith), who records himself as being the scribe, painter and miniaturist of one particular manuscript.⁴⁹ Despite the early formation of a corporation of miniaturists in the city, the first statutes for the Guild of Painters (of which the miniaturists may have

⁴⁴ Ibid., 1, n. 1.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 1.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 3.; Silvestro Nessi, “Documenti sull’arte umbra. Pittori perugini del Duecento e del primo Trecento”, *Bollettino della Deputazione di Storia Patria per l’Umbria* 85 (1988): 113.

⁴⁸ Subbioni, *La Miniatura Perugia del Trecento*, 3; Nessi, “Documenti sull’arte umbra”, 147, n. 37.

⁴⁹ Subbioni, *La Miniatura Perugia del Trecento*, 4–5. In an intriguing point, Subbioni notes a document of 26 April 1333 which cites a certain *Venturam Petri notarium de castro Sigilli* as having been condemned (in his absence) for making a false donation. She is cautious regarding his identity, and explicitly stops short of affirming that this notary and the miniaturist Venturella di Pietro are the same person, but rather uses the coincidence of names as a reminder of the complementary activities of notary and miniaturist, citing the famous Neri da Rimini (who fulfilled both offices) as an example.

been members) do not appear until 1366.⁵⁰ It is uncertain whether this suggests a gradual and informal process of absorption of the miniaturists into the Guild of Painters, or simply that their earlier records as Guild members have been lost to history. Lunghi had earlier proposed that the Perugian miniaturists and scribes were formed into a *Matricola* in the early fourteenth century and received an independent status from the other arts in Perugia, due to demands of the booming *Studium generale* and the ecclesiastical authorities who so frequently visited the city.⁵¹ Whether the miniaturists and scribes did form one *Matricola*, and whether this *Matricola* came under the jurisdiction of the Guild of Painters remains uncertain, though Subbioni's thesis seems convincing.

Information regarding the physical location of the miniaturists' workshops can be deduced from a reference in a document dated 11 February 1346 (a register of spending by the Comune di Perugia, now found in the Archivio di Stato di Perugia), which notes payment to a Vannes Pucci (Vanni di Puccio), '*pictor et legator librorum*'.⁵² Subbioni proposes this indicates that Perugian miniaturists were engaged in activity such as binding as well as in decoration. Given this, their workshops must have been in close proximity to the stationers' shops, placing them near a street still known as '*la via dei Cartolari*'. Another document in the Archivio di Stato di Perugia, dating from 1342 records that the stationers' shops were located in '*la scalella del Verçαιο*', now via del Verzaro, in the quarter of Porta Santa Susanna, near San Lorenzo.⁵³ This would place the miniaturists' workshops in close proximity with the Duomo and the obvious potential employment of decorating manuscripts for the Canons regular. More broadly, it is clear that Perugian miniaturists regularly worked for religious groups, and although specific records are lacking, it is evident that some (such as Venturella di Pietro) frequently worked for the Perugian Franciscans.

⁵⁰ Marco Roncetti, ed., "*Per buono stato de la citade*". *Le Matricole delle Arti di Perugia*. Palazzo della Penna, 20 guigno – 15 settembre 2001 (Perugia: Comune di Perugia – Volumnia Editrice, 2001), 161. The statues to which this citation refers are contained in Perugia, Biblioteca Augusta, Ms. 961.

⁵¹ Lunghi, "Le Miniature dei Manoscritti Italiani", 257.

⁵² Subbioni, *Le Miniature Perugina del Trecento*, 5.

⁵³ Ibid.

3.2.2 *Scholarly conceptualisation of a simplistic Franciscan decorative style and its meaning*

While Subbioni observes that Perugian miniaturists' workshops drew clients from all sectors of society (burghers, nobles, university men, lay-religious, clerics) and decorated every kind of manuscript (liturgical and sacred books, books for private devotion, classical Latin works, legal texts and romances and cycles in the vulgar tongues), she suggests certain workshops might have had specialties.⁵⁴ A prime example given is the workshop of Maestro Venturella di Pietro, whose work Subbioni characterised with the adjective '*pauperistico*', suggesting a certain style suitable for the particular spirituality of Venturella's most frequent clients, the Franciscan convents.⁵⁵ This term appears to be invented by Subbioni, and does not refer to a category of decoration recognised in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. While it is reasonable to posit that several ateliers in Perugia specialised in decorating Franciscan manuscripts (or were frequently hired to do so by the Order), art historians such as Marina Subbioni, Marco Assirelli and Emanuela Sesti have also proposed the concept of a distinctively Franciscan style of illumination, which emphasised emotion over intellect. It is essentially an ideological argument: Franciscan miniatures and decorative programmes are seen to exhibit a common element of simplicity in their composition, style and content, which reflects the simplicity perceived as characteristic of Franciscan spirituality more broadly. This concept also implies that the friars had a degree of control over the decoration of their liturgical books, which raises questions about the relationship between the Order and commercial miniaturists that have yet to be thoroughly explored.

It is difficult to ascertain precisely what is meant by 'simplicity' in this instance: the scholars who adhere to the argument generally do not provide a precise definition for the concept or comparisons with 'complex' decoration, but rather speak in broad terms about both the miniatures and Franciscan spirituality. Emanuela Sesti has provided the most coherent argument for a distinctively Franciscan decorative style, and in so doing, provided some scholarly framework for the concept of 'simplicity' in this context. She asserted that in the thirteenth century, the Umbrian cultural 'matrix' was largely shaped and informed by the ideological concerns of the

⁵⁴ Subbioni, *Le Miniature Perugina del Trecento*, 3–4.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 4.

new order of friars (the Franciscans), and that their dominance found particular expression in an intense artistic renaissance, especially in miniatures.⁵⁶ Sesti saw in the decorative programmes of the Umbrian Franciscan codices of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the unification of two forms, the didactic and the decorative, which were realised together in a new type of image, easily comprehended by the general populace and imbued with the ideological spirit of Franciscanism (itself a spirituality of simplicity, accessible by the common people).⁵⁷ The miniatures produced drew (she argued) on a distinctively Umbrian antique style whilst adding a new cosmopolitan dynamic, resulting in a style both homogenous and original, and distinctly different from that of other Italian schools.⁵⁸ Sesti argued that the discernible Franciscan influence on these miniatures lies in their simplicity: the pared-down method of illustration paves the way for a deep, dramatic expressivity of figure and scene, using a direct visual language deliberately lacking in intellectualism.⁵⁹

Sesti links the diminished size (compared to earlier manuscripts) of the figures in these Umbrian Franciscan miniatures with the increased depiction of decorative vegetative elements, and sees in this proliferation of foliage a connection with the decorative vegetation adorning Umbrian frescoes (such as those in the Upper and Lower Basilica of San Francesco in Assisi, Santa Chiara in Assisi and Santa Chiara in Montefalco) and architecture (such as San Rufino in Assisi, the Duomo of Todi and the Duomo of Citta di Castello).⁶⁰ Sesti also notes that the combination of such vegetative decoration with the reduction of each miniature's scene to a few simple elements and the exaggerated facial expressions and gestures of the scene's protagonists results in a composition of almost severe simplicity, lacking in any decorative geometric elements.⁶¹

Sesti's characterisation of a distinctively simplistic Franciscan decorative style can be tested against the decorated and historiated initials from CSP and B-E – the Franciscan and non-Franciscan missals under consideration (Figures 1–6).⁶² The similarities between the decorative initials of all these manuscripts, including the

⁵⁶ Emanuela Sesti, "Aspetti della miniatura umbra nei secoli XIII e XIV in rapporto all'Ordine francescano", in *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature*, ed. Carlo Pirovano (Milano: Electa, 1982), 366.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

⁶¹ *Ibid.*

⁶² Photos are in colour where possible, and unless otherwise stated were taken by the author.

Augustinian missal and the non-Franciscan works of Venturella, are evident in both their design elements and palettes. The use of swirling vegetative tendrils, the white vine pattern and a muted palette of pink, orange, blue, green and grey with gold illumination is distinctive of Perugian manuscripts, and evident in all these manuscripts. But how do the non-Franciscan initials compare with the Franciscan ones? E displays almost identical decorative elements to the Franciscan manuscripts, suggesting that its creation for the Augustinian friars did not influence its decorative programme so much as did its Umbrian provenance. It is so like the decoration attributed to Venturella that it is reasonable to suggest adding this manuscript to his catalogue, though more research on E as a whole is undoubtedly necessary. The decorated initials of E do include geometric forms (such as the use of *tappeto decorativo* in the backgrounds of many of this missal's initials), a feature Sesti observed as lacking from the proposed Franciscan style. While this would appear to confirm her observation, it must be acknowledged that Venturella's non-Franciscan works also lack this geometric element, and that geometric forms are found in the crucifixion miniature of B, an Umbrian Franciscan missal (as will be discussed further below). This suggests that geometric form is not necessarily an indicator of a more complex (and hence less Franciscan) decorative style, but is rather an element not commonly found in Umbrian decoration. Though it seems an obvious point, it is clear from the fact that Venturella's *oeuvre* includes both Franciscan and non-Franciscan manuscripts that his style is recognised for its intrinsic qualities rather than for the spiritual context of the initials in question.

Quite aside from these pragmatic considerations, it is necessary to posit some basic criticism of the thesis for a simplistic Franciscan style (presented mainly by Sesti and Assirelli), as it contains questionable assumptions and generalisations. Firstly, we may note that the concept of a simplistic style, in so far as it has been demonstrated with reference to assessable evidence, relies on a subjective interpretation of stylistic features within the miniatures under consideration. Elements such as the reduced size of figures and the lack of geometric patterns are not adequately justified, as no comparison to other miniatures which lack these features is provided. When such comparison is undertaken, the features are found to be less unique to Franciscan manuscripts than has been suggested. In fact, not all the manuscripts associated with this decorative style are actually Franciscan, as will be demonstrated below. The 'simplicity' of the style in question is not assessable without

comparative material – the highlighted features appear in fact to be more common than has been acknowledged. More broadly, such a style appears to be more the product of region than spirituality. Even if we were to agree that the miniatures in question (from the Perugian Liturgical Group) exhibit a level of simplicity that is remarkable, i.e. that distinguishes them from the miniatures found in books used by other orders or by the secular clergy, there is still the problem of meaning: just because these miniatures are simplistic in their stylistic elements, it does not follow that their *meaning* is simplistic. Sesti and Assirelli's interpretation of the sources of artistic style, in their various expositions of this argument, suggests a straightforward relationship between an image and its meaning. This is problematic: to assume that an image contains one obvious meaning which is directly correlated to its stylistic elements is (ironically) a simplistic approach to the complexities of visual language and its relationship to spirituality and ideology. As Jeffrey F. Hamburger suggested, while it is 'not difficult to match texts with images... the danger is in assuming any kind of congruency, even when the text and image can be shown to stem from what, at first blush, appears to be the same historical context.'⁶³

The problems of such an approach are particularly clear in this instance, as the spirituality in question is that of the Order of Friars Minor, whose contested spiritual identity throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries is well known. The assumption of scholars who have supported the idea of a simplistic Franciscan decorative style (that Franciscan spirituality itself was simplistic and readily understandable by the wider populace) is not explicitly explained or justified in their work, and in fact is highly questionable. Francis himself is often seen as a simple man, whose spirituality was centered on a literal interpretation of the apostolic life and the Gospels. This is true, as his writings make clear – he frequently describes himself in terms of greatest humility. His selection of the name *fratres minores* – 'lesser brothers' for his Order suggests the humble societal role he wished his

⁶³ For a recent discussion of the complexities involved in reading medieval religious images, see: Jeffrey F. Hamburger, "The Place of Theology in Medieval Art History: Problems, Positions, Possibilities", in *The Mind's Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jeffrey F. Hamburger and Anne-Marie Bouché (Department of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University: Princeton University Press, 2006), 21. Hamburger's discussion of the relationship between text and image includes a critique of Panofsky's characterisation of Gothic architecture as expressions of scholastic theology. Hamburger refutes Panofsky's use of a 'Hegelian mode in locating the impetus of historical development outside the sphere of individual human actions and subjecting the material entirely to the dictates of the realm of disembodied ideas', 18. This critique is equally applicable to Assirelli and Sesti's conceptualisation of a simplistic Franciscan decorative style.

companions to play. This desire for simplicity did not manifest itself as a simplistic spirituality, however. Francis was not a scholar, but neither was he a simpleton. The schism which developed in the Order throughout its first and second centuries is testament to a great irony – Francis’s so-called simplicity was in fact highly complex: to live an apostolic life in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries required a delicate negotiation of urban merchant society. Similarly, the Order’s developing role in the universities saw it produce some of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries’ leading theologians, such as Bonaventure (1221–1274) and Duns Scotus (1266–1308). It is reductive to compress the many spiritual and theological complexities of Francis’s spirituality and that of his Order (remembering that they are not necessarily the same thing) into one simple, accessible Gospel-centric vision.

Figure 1 – CSP, *incipit* page, f. 7r.

Figure 2 – B, decorated initial from Common Prefaces, f. 148r. Photo courtesy of the Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana.

Figure 3 – C, decorated initial, f. 102v. Photo: Alessandro Gambuti, in Marcella degli'Innocenti Gambuti, *I Codici miniati medievali della Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca di Cortona* (Firenze: SPES, 1977), 105.

Figure 4 – D, historiated initial of St Francis receiving the stigmata, f. 255v.

Photo: Marina Subbioni, *La Miniatura Perugina del Trecento: Tavole fuori testo* (Perugia: Guerra Edizioni, 2003) fig. XLV.

Figure 5 – E, decorated initial, f. 6v.

Figure 6 – E, decorated initial of St Dominic, f. 253r

3.3 ‘*Pauperistico*’? Franciscan spirituality in Perugian miniatures

It has been noted that some workshops in Perugia are believed to have had ongoing commercial relationships with particular religious communities: it is claimed that the atelier of Venturella di Pietro had such a relationship with the Order of Friars Minor in Perugia. Of the two major figures associated with the CSP and the Perugian Liturgical Group, Venturella remains the only historically attested miniaturist – the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno is an ahistorical figure, around which art historians have constructed a body of work. Chapter One discussed the complexities of that methodology, and the pitfalls of the concept of a constructed master.

It is clear that Franciscan manuscripts form a significant number of the group of manuscripts that scholars propose were decorated by the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno, Venturella di Pietro and their respective ateliers.⁶⁴ Of the 36 manuscripts and single folios listed in Chapter One, 11 are Franciscan. It should be noted that of the five manuscripts upon which this dissertation focuses, one is attributed directly to Venturella di Pietro (D), three may be linked to Venturella’s atelier (B, C, and E) and one is considered connected to the atelier of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno (CSP). There is also the suggestion of a stylistic relationship between the two masters: Marcella Degl’Innocenti Gambuti, the scholar who first drew attention to the scribal note mentioning Venturella in D, also suggested a link between C (itself a possible product of Venturella’s atelier) and Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 16 (attributed to the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno).⁶⁵ This suggestion implies that the Master of Deruta-Salerno had some influence on the work of Venturella, but just how this influence was manifested has yet to be discussed by art historians. Whilst Franciscan miniatures do constitute a significant portion of the manuscripts attributed to the miniaturists in question, this number is less than half their total proposed output. This suggests a strong pragmatic argument against the concept of Franciscan style of decoration: not all the manuscripts which feature the style associated with the Perugian Liturgical Group are actually Franciscan.

⁶⁴ See the list provided in Chapter One, 36–8.

⁶⁵ Degl’Innocenti Gambuti, *I codici*, 105.

3.3.1 *Crucifixion miniatures from the selected missals*

The problematic nature of the concept of a distinctively Franciscan decorative style is even more clearly evident when Crucifixion miniatures are compared. The Crucifixion miniatures of the manuscripts considered by this dissertation – CSP, B and C (D and E lack these miniatures) – are clearly all by different hands. Indeed, there appear to be different hands even within each of these missals, with a miniaturist of greater skill employed to paint the major miniature. The CSP provides perhaps the best example of this observation. A comparison of the historiated initial of Christ in Majesty on f. 7r in the CSP with the Crucifixion miniature on f. 182r shows both the difference of hands and the high quality of the miniaturist working on the Crucifixion scene. Art historians' interest in the CSP has focused on this miniature. It is described as a fine example of the gothic humanism of late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth century Italian miniatures.⁶⁶ A good comparison may be made with the Crucifixion miniature of B. As the following chapters will discuss, the calendar and liturgical contents of B are extremely similar to the CSP, as is the scribal hand. While its provenance is unknown, the original calendar and decorative initials strongly suggest an Umbrian location. Despite many textual and other decorative similarities, its miniature is entirely different from that of the CSP: it features an historical rather than a devotional scene, in which the figures are emphasised by the application of thick black outlining. Here, the use of geometric patterning and the proportionately larger size of the figures in this Franciscan missal raises questions about Sesti's concept of the characteristics of the proposed Franciscan decorative style. The decorative initials of these two missals are very similar, as discussed above. However, the differences in the Crucifixion miniatures (one is devotional and includes only three figures on a blue background, while the other is historiated, includes a crowd of figures and a backdrop of *tappetto decorativo*) suggest a difficulty with the notion of a cohesive Franciscan decorative style. Whether the miniatures were expressive of the individual style of the miniaturist, or whether the commissioning friar(s) retained the right to dictate the style and elements chosen is not recoverable, given the total lack of documentary records of such patronage.

An analysis of the CSP's Crucifixion miniature reveals a complex image with multiple theological and devotional messages. Positioned in the usual place for such a

⁶⁶ Manion, 'The Codex Sancti Paschalis', 19.

miniature – the beginning of the Canon of the Mass – it seems to provide a pause for devotional, emotional reflection for the celebrant before reciting the most solemn section of the liturgy. Recent scholarly interest in the physical and emotional function of such images has suggested new avenues of understanding for their interpretation, which incorporate elements of performance theory and neuropsychology alongside traditional art-historical reading of iconographic elements. Jill Bennett’s 2001 article on Francis’s stigmata and his experience of the Passion narrative through imagery proposed a reconsideration of the performative nature of images in medieval spirituality, and has sparked further scholarly investigation of the relationship between Franciscan spiritualities and imagery.⁶⁷ Bennett’s methodology drew on previous scholarship, particularly that by Daniel Arasse and Mary Carruthers, which explored the relationship between memory, space and representation in medieval culture (the *ars memoria*, a concept found in Aristotle, extensively discussed by medieval theologians such as Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus).⁶⁸ Extending Carruthers’s argument that medieval images functioned as signs for the memory that recollected a past event or experience (rather than imitated the event or experience), and picking up on Arasses’s connection between such memory images and medieval devotional images, Bennett investigated *how* such representations may have interacted with memory for medieval people, and thus how they stimulated emotive responses (the definition of an ‘affective’ image).⁶⁹ Bennett suggested that the naturalism for which thirteenth century Italian art is famed was in fact more complex than a teleological conception of the increasing skill of artists to depict human forms:

Rather than a representation simply reflecting or reproducing objects in the world – the objective of which would be a form of illusionistic representation, mimicking the conditions of sight – this form of representation operates on a double axis: the axis of the picture plane, so to speak, intersected by a temporal axis so that the mode of address is always in part to the spectator’s

⁶⁷ Jill Bennett, “Stigmata and Sense Memory: St Francis and the affective image”, *Art History* 24:1 (2001): 1–16. A recent study which draws on Bennett’s methodology is: Beth Mulvaney, “The Beholder as Witness: The ‘Crib at Greccio’ from the Upper Church of San Francesco, Assisi and Franciscan Influence on Late Medieval Art in Italy”, *The Art of the Franciscan Order in Italy*, ed. William R. Cook (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 169–188.

⁶⁸ Daniel Arasse, “Fonctions de l’image religieuse au XV siècle”, *Faire Croire: Modalités de la diffusion et de la reception des messages religieux di XIIe au XVIe siècle*, Collection de L’École Française de Rome: 51 (Rome, 1981), 132–146; Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Bennett, “Stigmata and Sense Memory”, 3.

⁶⁹ Bennett, “Stigmata and Sense Memory”, 2–3.

(devotee's) own memory, but in particular to a sense memory which renders real any images of suffering.⁷⁰

Thus, the affective image (such as a Crucifixion scene) creates a 'mnemonic landscape', in which the viewer/devotee is allowed the space to experience, drawing on whichever memories are most effective for him/her, the action taking place in the image.⁷¹ In a sense, space becomes a metaphor for emotional experience. In this fashion, Bennett argued that visual experience was in fact psychologically transformative, not merely cognitive or interpretative.⁷² Such a schema is obviously useful for understanding Francis's own experience of the stigmata (as Bennett goes on to investigate), but it is also potentially a vital context for understanding the spiritual function of images such as the Crucifixion miniatures of the selected missals from the Perugian Liturgical Group. The question remains, to what extent was the mnemonic experience of the Franciscan clerics viewing these miniatures distinctive of their identity as members of the Order? To look at the question from another angle, are the miniatures themselves distinctively Franciscan? As will be explored further below, it is necessary to contextualise the images themselves within the broader history of the development of Crucifixion iconography before answers to these complex questions can be formulated.

The Crucifixion image in the CSP is typical of iconography of the Crucifixion in Italian art of the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. Many of the expressive elements associated with the iconographic development of the subject in this period are seen as reflecting the affective spirituality in the Western Church. Visually the image combines elements from the older Byzantine iconographical tradition with the emotive naturalism of Cimabue and his followers. The second volume of Gertrud Schiller's seminal study of the development of iconography in the Eastern and Western Churches focuses exclusively on the iconography of the Passion.⁷³ Schiller suggests the emergence of a new theme in iconography of the Crucifixion, the *Christus patiens* (suffering Christ), reflected a response to the new emphasis on the humanity of Christ which flowered in Western Christian spirituality

⁷⁰ Ibid., 5.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Ibid., 6. Cf. Richard Viladesau's recent study of the theological aesthetics of 'beautiful suffering', a stimulating discussion of the structures, meanings and functions of images of Christ's suffering. Richard Viladesau, *The Beauty of the Cross: The Passion of Christ in Theology and the Arts From the Catacombs to the Eve of the Renaissance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

⁷³ Gertrud Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art – Volume 2: The Passion of Christ*, trans. Janet Seligman (Greenwich: New York Graphic Society Ltd., 1972).

from the ninth century onwards.⁷⁴ Schiller found the expression of this new iconographic trend particularly evident in thirteenth-century Italian monumental painted crosses, which initiated new methods of portraying the theological and spiritual connotations of the suffering of Christ.⁷⁵ This representation of the suffering/dead Christ gradually superseded the strongly Byzantine-influenced image of the *Christus triumphans* – in which Christ appeared as the unconquerable king of the cosmos, strong and alive – which had dominated Crucifixion iconography in both the East and West from the earliest Christian imagery until the ninth century.⁷⁶ From the ninth century (the Carolingian era), increased devotion to the Cross was evident in Western Christian spirituality with a corresponding shift in iconography – the humanisation of the crucified Christ began.⁷⁷ As Schiller wrote, ‘the accent shifted very gradually from Christ’s victory on the Cross to the sacrificial nature of his Death; in this it was moving parallel with the development of the sacramental interpretation of the Passion in religion’.⁷⁸ The transition was not rigid, however: ‘often the two elements, of the Ruler of the world and of the Servant of God, exist side by side in the same work’.⁷⁹ In Italy the influence of Byzantine conventions combined with the Romanesque tradition of central Italian painters to produce a new, deeply emotional representation of Christ’s Passion, which Schiller suggests was due in no small part to the spirituality of Francis of Assisi, particularly his focus on the crucified Christ.⁸⁰ As Schiller notes, the majority of Italian painted monumental crosses that intimate this devotion to the crucified Christ have a Franciscan provenance.⁸¹

Anne Derbes’s 1996 study of ideologies and iconographies of the Passion in late medieval Italy provides a valuable critical survey of both the historiography and history of this subject, particularly the Order of Friars Minor’s contribution to the

⁷⁴ For more recent discussions of the *Christus patiens*, see: Rona Goffen, *Spirituality in Conflict: Saint Francis and Giotto’s Bardi Chapel* (University Park PA: the Pennsylvania State University Press, 1988), 21–22; Hans Belting, *The Image and its Public in the Middle Ages: Form and Function of Early Paintings of the Passion*, trans. Mark Bartusis and Raymond Meyer (New Rochelle, NY: A.D. Caratzas, 1990), 143–148.

⁷⁵ Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, 149–151.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 104.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 100.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 117.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 144.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 150.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

evolution of Passion imagery in the thirteenth century.⁸² The Byzantine influence on Italian painting of the thirteenth century was long viewed by art historians in negative terms, particularly by Italian art historians, which Derbes suggested was ‘in some ways the heritage of Vasari’.⁸³ This critical view has been corrected by more recent scholarship, as Derbes discussed, and she argued cogently for the need to investigate ‘how central Italians – both the artists and their patrons – responded to Byzantine art, and why they did, and why, at times, they did not’.⁸⁴ While there are no straightforward answers to these questions, as Derbes acknowledged, she suggested that one of the most important causal factors in central Italian painters’ appropriation of Byzantine iconography was that it served the needs and desires of their patrons, the most important and prolific of which was the Order of Friars Minor.⁸⁵

It has been recognised by scholars in fields other than art history that Franciscan spirituality (though one might more accurately say ‘spiritualities’) was a prominent example of many of the changes which occurred in Western Christianity in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, but was not in itself entirely unique. Derbes’s extensive discussion of the relationship between Franciscan spirituality and iconographic traditions raises this vital point: even within Franciscan imagery, patterns of narrative and iconographic elements varied widely.⁸⁶ Derbes, together with Caroline Walker Bynum, distinguished between Franciscan spirituality and *uniquely* Franciscan spirituality. Derbes suggested the emphasis on the Passion in Franciscan spirituality, though powerful, was not unique, just as ‘the emphasis on the *imitatio crucis* was not confined to the Franciscans’.⁸⁷ As Derbes also noted, John Fleming suggested a similar argument in an article published the year after that of Walker Bynum. Fleming posited that although the Order was ‘in one sense the most important and vital expression of the European evangelical revival . . . there is inevitably much in medieval Franciscan literature which is in no way unique or even markedly

⁸² Anne Derbes, *Picturing the Passion in Late Medieval Italy: Narrative Painting, Franciscan Ideologies and the Levant* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 13.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 12–14.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*; Caroline Walker Bynum, “Franciscan Spirituality: Two Approaches”, in *Medievalia et Humanistica* 7 (New Series), *Medieval Poetics: Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Culture*, ed. Paul M. Clogan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 195–197.

distinctive'.⁸⁸ The arguments of these scholars, and of Derbes, are indicative of a shift in thinking about medieval Franciscan spirituality which has been absent from the art-historical and liturgical historical scholarship that studies the Perugian Liturgical Group and medieval Franciscan liturgical manuscripts more broadly. Franciscan spiritualities were reflective of spiritual issues and themes which concerned all Western Christians; the Order did not exist in a vacuum, but responded and contributed to spiritual themes considered important by the society which informed its development. The Order's important social status and political power in medieval society, as one of the fastest growing of the new mendicant orders (especially favoured by the papacy), has somewhat blinded some subsequent scholarship to the commonalities between Franciscan spirituality and its context. It is almost as though scholars have wanted to find the Order more distinctive than it actually was, and more unique than a critical and wideranging reading of the evidence (both textual and visual) suggests. This reminder of the necessity to contextualise is vital to a well-balanced appraisal of the concept of a particularly Franciscan style of simplistic manuscript decoration: as has been shown through this chapter's analysis of the CSP and the four selected related missals, there is more evidence in favour of a specifically Perugian style of decoration than there is for a Franciscan style, and the artistic contents of these five selected missals do not exhibit 'simplicity', nor do they demonstrate identical iconographic elements. They may not in fact even show a distinctively Franciscan style, but rather demonstrate a wider shift in Western Christian understandings of the Passion and its visual representation.

A close analysis of the miniature of the CSP, a particularly fine example of the fusion of Byzantine and Gothic conventions in thirteenth century central Italian depictions of the *Christus patiens*, will confirm the argument formulated above. Visually, the humanity of Christ is revealed in the sway of his (unnaturally) elongated body, and in the manner in which his head (with closed eyes) rests on his chest: such realistic details indicate the body hanging lifeless from the cross. These lifelike features are typical of the new Western emphasis on the suffering humanity of Christ, and contrast with an older Byzantine representation of the hieratic, stylised body which showed no lifelike trauma (reflecting the Eastern Church's belief in the

⁸⁸ John Fleming, *An Introduction to the Franciscan Literature of the Middle Ages* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1977), 11–12. Cited in Derbes, *Picturing the Passion*, 186, note 29.

invulnerability of Christ's body).⁸⁹ However, Christ's hands are flat, with the thumbs splayed upwards – a typical feature of earlier Byzantine Crucifixion scenes.⁹⁰ In the miniature of B, Christ's hands are curled over in a more lifelike fashion. In both the CSP and B, the cross includes a *suppedaneum*, the foot support on which Christ stands and to which his feet are nailed. This feature is distinctively Byzantine, and gradually disappeared from Western Crucifixion scenes over the centuries; it is relatively rare in Crucifixion scenes from the fourteenth century onwards.⁹¹ The inclusion of the *suppedaneum* in both of the selected missals' Crucifixion scenes is perhaps an indication of both the flexible use of conventions by artists and the Franciscan preference for Byzantine elements in their miniatures. The use of four nails in the Crucifixion (that is, one in each foot as well as in each hand) is also a Byzantine convention that is found in all three Crucifixion miniatures analysed here.⁹² The composition of each of the three Crucifixion miniatures under analysis is also of key interest: the CSP is a three-figure scene, while B is a historically inspired narrative scene. The Early Byzantine period did use the three-figure and thus devotional composition in Crucifixion miniatures, though it is more often recognised for its use of narrative scenes.⁹³ In the Crucifixion miniature of the CSP, Christ's *perizoma* (loin cloth) is knotted in the middle, in the Middle Byzantine style.⁹⁴ In the miniature of B, the *perizoma* is knotted on Christ's left side, indicating the very gradual shift between iconographic traditions alluded to by Schiller – the miniatures have key features from both Byzantine and Western traditions.

Despite the pronounced Byzantine features of these miniatures, in theological terms they are unmistakably representations of the *Christus patiens* of the Western Church. In each case, Christ is depicted dead on the cross, his head on his chest, eyes closed and body sagging beneath its own weight. Blood pours from each of his wounds in both miniatures, and its direction is specific and meaningful, as will be discussed below. In the miniature of the CSP, the figures of Mary and John represent differing responses of sorrow and grief over the Crucifixion: they model these emotional responses for the viewer, suggesting that for the miniaturist, elements such as gesture, pose and facial expression were as integral to the successful representation

⁸⁹ Schiller, *Iconographies*, 99, 142.

⁹⁰ Such as in the Rabula Gospels, written in 586 in northern Mesopotamia. Schiller, 91.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*,

⁹² *Ibid.*, 97.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 94.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 99.

of the underlying theological truths as more symbolic elements such as the *suppedaneum*. Schiller notes that it was only in the thirteenth century that Mary and John's roles shifted from witnesses to mourners, representations of human responses to Christ's sacrifice.⁹⁵ The inclusion of iconographic traditions from East and West in these Franciscan miniatures is suggestive of a complexity overlooked in the formulation of a Franciscan decorative style based on simplicity: these are in fact complex images, with theological and iconographic resonances which, though reflecting Franciscan spiritual interest in the crucified Christ, also echo wider shifts in Western Christian iconography and spirituality of the period.

The miniature of the CSP can be taken as a useful case study for both the iconographic fusion of late thirteenth century central Italian representations of the crucifixion and the hypothesis of a distinctively simple Franciscan style of decoration. It also suggests the care with which scholars must approach such polyvalent images, which are capable of sustaining multiple interpretations. The diminished size of the figures (diminished that is compared to other such miniatures, such as B) is emphasised by the vivid blue starry background. The cross dominates the image, and extends into the borders at top and bottom. Trinitarian imagery is suggested: the blue starry sky representing God the Father (as in the Judaic tradition of non-figurative representations of God), the suggestion of wind (seen in the swirling of Christ's loincloth and the fine white decorative line work in the sky) indicating the Holy Spirit (the breath of God), and of course the central figure of the suffering Christ. While it had been common in preceding centuries in both the Eastern and Western Churches to include cosmographical elements in Crucifixion scenes, such as a sun and moon (*Sol* and *Luna*, suggesting Christ as ruler of the cosmos), the CSP's miniature presents a similar theological statement in a highly sophisticated and subtle fashion, through the naturalised forms of the sky, wind and Christ's body itself.⁹⁶

Through graphically displaying Christ's suffering, the miniature unmistakably points forward to the Resurrection. This is seen chiefly in the miniature's composition, which can be read as consisting of three interlinked circles. The first circle encompasses Christ and Mary: the eye follows the blood arching from the wound on Christ's side towards his mother, who stands with head bowed and hands

⁹⁵ Ibid., 146.

⁹⁶ See for example the crucifixion miniature of the Coronation Sacramentary from the Court School of Charles the Bald (9th c.). Paris, BnF, MS. lat. 1141, f.6v. An image appears in Schiller, figure no. 362.

pressed to her cheek in quiet sorrow. The wound on Christ's side and the direction of its bleeding suggest the medieval interpretation of this wound as a lactating breast, feeding redemptive blood to humanity (a metaphor which resonated with the medieval interest in the spiritual aspect and allegorical significance of lactation and feeding).⁹⁷ The breast/wound feeds Mary, circular imagery that recalls a central tenet of Christianity – Mary gave God life in human form, and as she gave him natural life, so in death he repaid her and all humanity by giving them eternal spiritual life. The blood flowing from Christ's wrist falls on Mary's head, rather than dripping down Christ's arm as it would in life (the miniaturist is clearly skilled in naturalistic representation of human forms).

The second compositional circle consists of Christ and John: the eye follows the blood which drips from Christ's wrist to John waiting below, his hands stretched towards Christ. In contrast to the restrained pose of Mary, John stands in an agitated pose with hands wrung in front of his knees, his legs splayed apart as if in movement, and his head flung upwards to look at Christ. This distinctive posture has yet to be formally identified by art historians; however Margaret Manion has suggested it could well indicate penitence.⁹⁸ John's pose is highly unusual in manuscript illumination: only two other examples have been discovered in the course of research for this dissertation. The first predates the CSP's miniature, and is found in the crucifixion miniature of Assisi, Archivio Capitolare, Ms. 8, a Roman missal dated to 1273 by art historians. The occurrence of John's unusual pose in this missal has led some art historians to suggest that the pose is an echo of an older Assisian tradition.⁹⁹ The unusual posture is also found in a late-thirteenth- to early-fourteenth-century Venetian painted panel of the Man of Sorrows, in the collection of the Museo Provinciale di Torcello (Venice).¹⁰⁰ Edward B. Garrison suggested that this panel's distinctive representation of John drew on an iconographic tradition which spread from Tuscany

⁹⁷ Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: the Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 270–271.

⁹⁸ Comments made in private discussion with Professor Manion, February 2006.

⁹⁹ Ciardi Dupre Dal Poggetto, "Il primo papa francescano, Niccolò IV (1288–1293)", 358–359; Manion, "The Codex Sancti Paschalis", 19.

¹⁰⁰ The panel, which appears to be a combination of the "Man of Sorrows" iconography and a standard crucifixion scene, depicts Christ in the extreme foreground, with arms folded, backed by a cross. In the background stand the small figures of the Virgin and John (in his unusual pose), while two angels hover above. Its brief entry in the visitors' guide to the Museo Provinciale di Torcello describes it as a Venetian panel of the suffering Christ, c. 1300. *Museo Provinciale di Torcello: Guida alla visita*, Elena Culos (cura redazionale) (Provincia di Venezia: Assessorato alla Cultura e al Patrimonio Culturale Museale, 2008), 23.

to Venice, primarily through the Byzantine-influenced works of Giunta Pisano (active c. 1202–1236).¹⁰¹ Giunta Pisano was closely linked to the Order of Friars Minor: Elias commissioned him to paint the cross which hung over the altar in the upper church of the Basilica of San Francesco in Assisi.¹⁰² Garrison cited a number of other small panels which include the gesture, all of which are attributed to Venetian artists, indicating that the gesture was more likely to be used in panel paintings than in manuscript miniatures.¹⁰³ The significance of the frequent use of the pose in painted panels has yet to be explored. Garrison referred to the pose as one of ‘anguish’, but did not explore its meaning further.¹⁰⁴ Barbara Pasquinelli has interpreted a similar gesture (by an angel) in Pietro Lorenzetti’s Crucifixion fresco in San Francesco, Siena, as ‘*una reazione emotiva, un picco di angoscia, dolore e disperazione*’.¹⁰⁵ Pasquinelli’s reference highlights that this posture is not exclusive to John, though it is John who stands in the pose in three of the four examples cited here. Further research into the iconographic significance of this pose would be valuable; for now we can note that the distinctive characterisation of John’s posture in the CSP’s miniature indicates grief and desperation, though its tradition is not yet firmly established. In terms of the compositional circle suggested above, John’s posture could be interpreted as suggestive of the redemption offered by the Eucharist. The blood from Christ’s left wrist falls on John’s upward-tilted face – he has raised his head as if to literally drink Christ’s sacrificial blood. John’s facial expression is also a clue – despite his agitated posture, his face is calm, and he seems to be almost smiling.¹⁰⁶ Perhaps John smiles because he is receiving the literal blood of Christ, the key to humanity’s resurrection and redemption.

The third compositional circle encompasses all three figures – Mary, representing the female role in creation; Christ, suffering and dying but hinting at his resurrection through the blood flowing towards the mound at the base of the cross (the ‘place of the skull’ in Mark’s Gospel [15:22 NRSV], later believed to be the burial

¹⁰¹ Edward B. Garrison, “Post-war discoveries: Early Italian Paintings – II”, *Burlington Magazine* 89:533 (August 1947), 210.

¹⁰² Derbes, *Picturing the Passion*, 171.

¹⁰³ Garrison, “Post-war discoveries”, note 7.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 210.

¹⁰⁵ Barbara Pasquinelli, *Il gesto e l’espressione (I Dizionari dell’Arte, a cura di Stefano Zuffi)* (Milano: Electa, 2005), 178.

¹⁰⁶ For a discussion of facial expressions and their relationship with mystic rapture in Italian art, see: Paul Binski, “The Angel Choir at Lincoln and the Poetics of the Gothic smile”, *Art History* 20 (1997): 350-374.

place of Adam); and John, representing all humankind's penitence and participation in Christ's Eucharistic sacrifice. The three figures are visually linked together by the eye through the lines created by the blood flowing from Christ's wounds. In John's Gospel, Christ creates a further link between Mary and John by giving them a new familial relationship: '[Christ] said to his mother, "He is your son." Then he said to the disciple, "She is your mother"', [John 19:26–27 NRSV]. The symbolic and theological significance of these simple words is echoed in the CSP's miniature – the circle of Mary, John and Christ indicates both the literal and spiritual familial relationships between the three figures. Might the fact that the same pale blue and grey colors are both used to describe Mary and John's costumes underline these theological and spiritual relationships? The circle is not static – it involves continual, reciprocal exchange between the three. The cyclical nature of life, death and resurrection is represented visually here, and it cannot continue without each figure participating.

In light of the preceding discussion of the debatable uniqueness of Franciscan spiritual emphasis on the Passion, this analysis of the CSP's miniature has proposed a reading of the image which draws on the image's wider artistic and theological context. Through close analysis of the images in the CSP and B, challenges to the concept of a distinctive Franciscan decorative style as argued by several Italian art historians have been raised. Firstly, it has become clear that there is little that is simplistic about the decorative programmes of the selected Franciscan missals. Their Crucifixion miniatures in particular highlight the multiple iconographic and theological traditions which coexisted in Western Christian spirituality during the period, and the complex appropriation of Byzantine conventions and associated theological beliefs which took place in Western Europe during this period. Both in terms of iconography and composition, these miniatures are complex images that invite multiple levels of interpretation. Secondly, while one could to some extent argue that a specifically Franciscan spirituality is represented in the miniatures by virtue of their affective, emotive rendering of the crucified Christ, scholars outside the discipline of art history have called into question the originality of these aspects of Franciscan spirituality. Scholars such as Anne Derbes and Caroline Walker Bynum have suggested a more flexible reading of the Order's relationship to these important spiritual themes of thirteenth-century Western Christian society – as a mirror for such themes, rather than their inventor. The concept of a simplistic Franciscan decorative

style is called into question by these points, as well as by the comparison of Franciscan and non-Franciscan decorated manuscripts of the period, as discussed above. In a sense, the strongest argument against the concept is the fact that miniaturists such as Venturella di Pietro did not work exclusively for the Order: a comparison of Franciscan and non-Franciscan works by the same miniaturist suggests that in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the most important characteristics of the works may have been those related to the individual style of the miniaturist, rather than the spiritual identity of his commissioning patrons. Further confirmation of this suggestion can be found through a broader comparison of thirteenth and fourteenth century Franciscan and non-Franciscan works from Perugia. The Augustinian E has already been cited as an example of a decorated non-Franciscan missal that closely resembles the decoration of the Franciscan missals studied in this dissertation. Similarly, the Dominican antiphonals of San Domenico in Perugia feature the same style of decoration which is evident in the Franciscan missals under consideration here. The first ‘series’ of these antiphonals (which have been divided into two phases of decoration by art historians) have been linked to the atelier of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno by Marina Subbioni.¹⁰⁷ This adds weight to the thesis that the spiritual identity of the commissioning Order had less impact on decorative style than did location. It may also be noted that not all the manuscripts connected to the CSP are liturgical books: Paris, BnF, Ms. 3206 (late-thirteenth-century Umbrian copy of the *Liber sententiarum* by Peter Lombard), Paris, BnF, Ms. 17883 (late thirteenth century Umbrian copy of *De doctrina dicendi et tacendi* by Albertanus Brixianensis) and Paris, BnF, Ms. 2232 (early fourteenth century copy of Gregory the Great’s *Moralia in Job*) demonstrate that the miniaturists concerned also decorated theological texts, which may or may not have been used by the Order.

¹⁰⁷ Subbioni, *Le Miniature Perugina del Trecento*, 11.

Figure 7 – CSP, Crucifixion miniature, f. 182r. Photo mine.

Figure 8 – B, Crucifixion miniature, f. 148v. Photo courtesy of the Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana.

3.4 Conclusions

This chapter's assessment of the production of the Franciscan missals from the Perugian Liturgical Group has involved substantial enquiry into fields of historical research which are often separated by the bias of discipline. Drawing together different approaches to these manuscripts may stimulate a richer context for the study of Umbrian liturgical manuscripts in general. Exactly what mechanisms the Order used in the production of its liturgical manuscripts remains unclear, due to the lack of documentary evidence. However, a reasonable amount of circumstantial evidence survives, and compilation of this evidence results in some measure of clarity about the Order's production of such books. It is clear that while an organised *scriptorium* of the sort which existed in monastic orders was not operating in the Sacro Convento or elsewhere, friars did work as scribes throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The very fact that in the thirteenth century, the Order did not have an organised system of scribes producing liturgical manuscripts adds weight to the doubts raised in the preceding chapter regarding van Dijk's concept of the 1230 Regula editions of breviaries and missals. There is scant documentary evidence for the professional relationships the Order formed with commercial miniaturists, despite the artistic evidence that such relationships existed. Without archival records of these exchanges, what measure of control the Order had over the style and content of its decorated missals is not clear.

A distinctively simplistic Franciscan style of decoration has not been sufficiently characterised by the scholars who have argued for its existence. The ramifications of such a style have not been fully explored: if such a distinctively Franciscan style of decoration existed, it would necessarily have had a profound impact on the spiritual experiences of those who viewed it (such as the clerics who viewed the Crucifixion miniatures analysed in this chapter), as has been made clear by scholarship which investigates the mnemonic function of devotional images. Even leaving aside this important methodological consideration, the proposed Franciscan decorative style is not well supported by the manuscript evidence, which appears to indicate that the characteristic style of the individual miniaturist was little affected by his commissioners' spiritual identity. Strengthening the challenge to this concept is recognition of the commonalities shared between Franciscan spirituality and wider Western Christian spirituality of the period: while the Order may have been one of the

strongest proponents of affective spirituality and focus on the humanised Christ, it was not alone in highlighting these aspects, in text or in visual art such as the selected missals' Crucifixion miniatures. The variety of iconographic elements used within Franciscan visual art and the complexity of the miniatures studied also suggest that the proposition of a distinctive Franciscan style may be in danger of oversimplifying a more complex area.

Through both detailed art-historical analysis and broader consideration of the spiritual and religious climate of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, this chapter has underscored the complexities inherent in studying the decorative programmes of the selected missals. It has highlighted the necessity of utilising the type of multidisciplinary approach that this dissertation adopts, which previous scholarship of these manuscripts has not: such manuscript evidence requires an holistic approach to its textual and visual components, which cannot be arbitrarily separated from either each other or from their broader social context. The idea that location rather than spiritual identity informed the decorative style of the selected missals considered in this study will be now tested against the liturgical calendars of these missals. The liturgical data presented in Chapter Four and its interpretation in Chapter Five will determine whether such regionalism is confined to the decoration, or whether it may also be seen to have an impact on the liturgical activity of the Order in Umbria.

Chapter Four

Calendars – Comparing the Evidence

This dissertation utilises a methodology that draws on traditional modes of interpreting and categorising liturgical data, as well as on newer approaches which emphasise diversity of ritual performance. Previous chapters have explored the historiography of the Perugian Liturgical Group, as well as the historiographical trends of the study of Franciscan liturgy more broadly. The dominant understanding of Franciscan liturgy (as an undifferentiated whole which developed along a chronological dialectic from diversity to unification, which was seen to mirror the Order's perceived unity of identity) has been challenged and revised in Chapter Two. There, it was suggested that the Order did not possess such a unified identity during the thirteenth century, and more specifically, that liturgy was not the primary means used by the Order to try and establish a unified identity. The diversity inherent in the manuscript tradition of Franciscan liturgy has been highlighted, to this end. In a similar vein, Chapter Three demonstrated the lack of centralisation and unity in the Order's attitude to manuscript production and decoration. The concept of a distinctively Franciscan style of decoration has been challenged, indicating diversity in visual expressions of Franciscan spirituality that has not been adequately acknowledged by previous scholarship. This chapter will present information drawn from the liturgical calendars of five selected manuscripts from the Perugian Liturgical Group, in order to examine the concept of liturgical unity amongst the late-thirteenth- and early-fourteenth-century Umbrian Friars, testing the conclusions of Chapters Two and Three.

Four manuscripts have been selected for comparison with the Codex Sancti Paschalis. The liturgical calendars of all five missals have been transcribed for the first time, and are presented here in order to draw out a sense of the ritual activity of certain houses of Franciscan friars in late-thirteenth- and early-fourteenth-century

Umbria. Even this relatively simple statement involves a set of assumptions regarding the meaning of such liturgical commemoration in the construction of shared identity that must be explained before the analysis can take place. In order to contextualise the approach taken here, some discussion of the historiographical trends regarding the study of saints and of liturgical calendars is necessary. This discussion is relatively brief for two reasons: firstly, the primary focus of this chapter is the hitherto unpublished information presented in the following tables of liturgical data, and secondly, because the nature of this dissertation's analysis differs from previous studies of similar material, and thus in a sense, the possible bibliography is itself brief. This historiographical context is followed by a discussion of the rationale for the selection of manuscripts, and a brief catalogue entry for each of the manuscripts. These catalogue descriptions deliberately exclude the artistic contents of the manuscripts, as the manuscripts' decoration has been discussed separately in Chapter Three (see Chapter One for a discussion of this rationale).

4.1 The Historiography and Methodology of Studying Sainthood, Liturgical Calendars and the Commemoration of Saints

The study of saints has not always been considered a valid field of historical enquiry: twentieth century scholars of medieval spirituality reclaimed it as a valid field of scholarly enquiry, challenging the preceding Enlightenment view of popular piety as a lesser form of devotional activity to that of the literate noble and clerical classes. One of the first historians to embrace the study of saints in its own right, Peter Brown, traced the growth of the phenomenon from late antiquity to the medieval period, and provided a foundation for developing scholarly appreciation of popular piety in his famed study *The Cult of the Saints*.¹ Since Brown's work, saints have been the subject of a variety of historical approaches: Michael Goodich investigated the political aspect of papal attempts to contain and control the canonisation process, while scholars such as Caroline Walker Bynum and Catherine Mooney have explored the gendered aspect of sainthood and female expressions of popular piety.² Sociologists

¹ Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints* (London: SCM Press, 1981).

² Michael Goodich, *Vita Perfecta: The Ideal of Sainthood in the Thirteenth Century* (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1982); Michael Goodich, "The politics of canonization in the thirteenth century: lay and Mendicant saints", *Saints and their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore and History*, ed. Stephen Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 169–188; Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast*; Catherine M. Mooney (ed.), *Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and their Interpreters* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999).

and anthropologists too have had their turn with the saints: in the early 1960s, the Belgian scholar Pierre Delooz formulated a framework for a sociological study of sainthood through the centuries, indicating the strong value that saints possess as barometers of social/cultural categories, memories, interests and anxieties.³ André Vauchez's contribution to the study of popular devotion and the cult of the saints is best represented by his authoritative study *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages* (originally published in French in 1988).⁴ This seminal work encompassed all aspects of sainthood as a social and devotional phenomenon, from its development in the early Church to the codification of canonisation in the medieval period. Vauchez's methodology was to some extent borrowed from that of sociologists, in that he sought to categorise and define differing forms of saintliness and sainthood within their religious and cultural contexts. Through detailed case studies of individual saints and their cults, he drew out the broader thematic concerns of the subject for historians of all fields. *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages* is still considered a standard reference work for the subject, some thirty years after it was first published. It is unnecessary to give a summary of the entire work here (were it even possible); Vauchez's analysis of the typology of mendicant saints (both male and female) informs the conceptualisations found in Chapter Five, which will interpret the liturgical information presented in the current chapter.

Through all these different methodological approaches, hagiographical sources remain central to what may be seen as the two major subdivisions of the field: the investigation of individual saints and their cults, and broader surveys of changing attitudes to sainthood and canonisation across the centuries. Visual sources have played an increasingly important role in this scholarship in recent decades, as befits the interdisciplinary methodology that medieval historians have embraced so fruitfully. Studies of specifically Franciscan saints have largely followed the same methodological lines as the broader field, as described above. Naturally, studies of

³ Pierre Delooz, "Pour une étude sociologique de la sainteté canonisée dans l'Eglise catholique", *Archives de sociologie des religions* 13 (1962), 17–43; Published in English as "Towards a sociological study of canonized sainthood in the Catholic Church", *Saints and their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore and History*, trans. Jane Hodgkin, ed. Stephen Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 189–216.

⁴ André Vauchez, *The Spirituality of the Medieval West: From the Eighth to the Twelfth Century*, trans. Colette Friedlander (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1993); André Vauchez, *The Laity in the Middle Ages: Religious Beliefs and Devotional Practices*, trans. Margery J. Schneider (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993); André Vauchez, *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*, trans. Jean Birrell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); André Vauchez et al. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 2000).

Francis himself dominate this area of Franciscan studies, whilst studies of the development of the offices for and cult of other major Franciscan saints have been conducted, primarily those of Clare of Assisi and Louis of Toulouse.⁵

Until recently, it would be fair to say that liturgical calendars have been an under-utilised resource even within the discipline of liturgical history. While Guido Maria Dreves (1854–1909) and Clemens Blume (1862–1932) had pioneered the cataloguing and study of liturgical hymns and sequences from medieval noted manuscripts in the late-nineteenth century, a comparable study of liturgical calendars may be seen to begin with the seminal works of Victor Leroquais (1875–1948), a paleographer and cataloguer of medieval illuminated breviaries and missals in French collections in the twentieth century.⁶ Leroquais was at pains to establish a chronology for the introduction of saints' feasts, and thence used calendars in part to assist with the dating of liturgical books. His methodology in this regard has been consistently used by subsequent manuscript scholarship (particularly in the discipline of art history, which often relies on the inclusion and exclusion of feasts to confirm stylistic dating of a manuscript).

Though Margaret R. Toynbee explored both the usefulness and the vagaries of medieval liturgical calendars (in terms of the associated complexity of extrapolating social and spiritual meaning from such documents) as early as 1929, the study of Franciscan liturgical calendars in particular has continued to be dominated by the accumulation and categorisation of data and the search for unity in the manuscript tradition, as Chapter Two's discussion of van Dijk's study of papal and Franciscan

⁵ Giovanni Boccali OFM, "Testi liturgici antichi per la festa di santa Chiara", *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 99:1–2 (2006): 3–32, 99:3–4 (2006): 417–466, 100:1–2 (2007): 149–220; Margaret R. Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse and the Process of Canonisation in the Fourteenth Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1929); Jacques LeGoff, "La sainteté de Saint Louis: Sa place dans la typologie et l'évolution chronologique des Roi Saints", *Fonctions de saints dans le monde occidental (IIIe–XIIIe siècle): actes du colloques* (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1991), 285–293; Cecilia Gaposchkin, "Philip the Fair, the Dominicans, and the Liturgical Office for Louis IX: New Perspectives on *Ludovicus Decus Regnantium*", *Plain-song and Medieval Chant* 13:1 (2004): 33–61; Cecilia Gaposchkin, *The Making of St Louis: Kingship, Sanctity and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008); Miles Pattenden, "The Canonisation of Clare of Assisi and Early Franciscan History", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 59:2 (2008): 208–226; Constant J. Mews, "Remembering St Thomas in the Fourteenth Century: Between Theory and Practice", *Przegląd Tomistyczny* XV (2009): 71–91.

⁶ Guido Maria Dreves and Clemens Blume, *Analecta hymnica medii aevi*, 55 vols. (Leipzig: Fues, 1886–1922); Victor Leroquais, *Les sacramentaires et les missels manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des France*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1924); Victor Leroquais, *Les livres d'heures manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale* (Paris: Mâcon, Protat frères, 1927); Victor Leroquais, *Les pontificaux manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, 4 vols. (Paris: [s.n.], 1937); Victor Leroquais, *Les psautiers manuscrits latins des bibliothèques publiques de France*, 2 vols. (Paris: Mâcon, Protat frères, 1940–1941).

liturgies has illustrated.⁷ In the present century, the work of Dutch scholar Els Rose stands out as exemplary of a new approach to the interpretation of liturgical calendars, in which the commemoration of saints as expressed in calendars is used to gain access to the social and spiritual meanings of such acts of communal devotion and remembrance, a methodology which embraces an anthropological attitude towards the study of medieval spirituality.⁸ Rose's work has primarily focused on the Gallican rite, but her methodological framework has a wider importance for all scholars of liturgical history. The themes of her summation of the concept of liturgical unity in terms of the Gallican rite apply in some measure to this discussion of the development of Franciscan liturgy:

There was a certain pursuit of unity as far as the *ordo* of the mass was concerned, but the exact content of the liturgical calendar as well as the choice of prayers and scriptural readings was something decided by the local bishop. As a consequence, there was a good deal of variation from place to place, in particular with regard to the *Sanctorale*. The student of early medieval Gallican liturgy must, therefore, realize that what is found for one town in Gaul is not necessarily applicable to another place. This is even more true with regard to the liturgical veneration of the saints. The cult of the saints is by its nature a local event, and this is likewise true of the liturgical cult of the saints.⁹

While there is some irony in appropriating remarks which caution against generalisation, the themes of Rose's approach are surely relevant to problems inherent in the methodology of the scholarship of Franciscan liturgical development. Rose also noted that previous scholarship had frequently sought unity in the tradition of the Gallican rite, sometimes to the detriment of the historical record: 'the search for unity outweighed the endeavour of delineating the diversity of the rite'.¹⁰ Van Dijk's search for unity in the development of Franciscan liturgy drew on assumptions that have been questioned in Chapter Two.

Elements of the different methodologies discussed above are adopted here in order to continue Rose's rehabilitation of liturgical calendars as vital sources in the study of communal ritual. Despite differing approaches, most historians of spirituality would agree that the figure of the saint is in some way representative of a community's ideal: as the sociologist Pierre Deloos commented, 'all saints are more

⁷ Margaret R. Toynbee, *S. Louis of Toulouse*, 208–211.

⁸ Els Rose, "Liturgical Commemoration of the Saints in the *Missale Gothicum* (Vat.Reg.Lat. 317). New Approaches to the Liturgy of Early Medieval Gaul", *Vigiliae Christianae* 58:1 (2004), 75–97.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 76.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

or less *constructed* in that, being necessarily saints *for other people*, they are remodeled in the collective representation which is made of them'.¹¹ Saints are also representative of the hierarchy of memories functioning in a community: as only the dead can be canonised saints, 'sainthood therefore depends on a community's recollection of a dead person's past existence'.¹² In this sense, saints as represented in liturgical calendars are a reliable indicator of the communal memory of a group, and also of the ritual commemoration which this memory stimulates. This dissertation explores how the calendar of saints for five different communities (as represented by CSP and B–E) can be read as indicative of communal identity as forged through ritual. The underlying question addressed here is whether the communal identity expressed in the selected calendars can be interpreted as distinctively Franciscan, or whether a different hierarchy of priorities is identifiable in the ritual activity indicated by the calendars. The following chapter (Chapter Five: Celebrating Saints – Articulating Communal Identity Through Ritual) will select a number of feasts for analysis and discussion from the calendars presented in this chapter (Figures 9–20). It is anticipated that the reader may return to Figures 9–20 while reading Chapter Five's discussion, and find in these tables a clear and readable method of comparing the calendars of CSP and B–E.

4.2 Short Catalogue Entries for CSP and B–E: Codicology and Provenance

CSP: Melbourne, State Library of Victoria, Rare Books Collection, Codex Sancti Paschalis

Missal, Franciscan (noted)

Use of Rome

In Latin

Italy, Perugia, late-thirteenth century

Melbourne, Franciscan Friars – Province of the Holy Spirit, on deposit to Melbourne, State Library of Victoria, Rare Books Collection.¹³

¹¹ Delooz, "Towards a sociological study of canonized sainthood", 195. (Emphasis his.)

¹² *Ibid.*, 194.

¹³ Margaret Manion and Anna Welch, "Missal [Codex Sancti Paschalis]", in *The Medieval Imagination: Illuminated Manuscripts from Cambridge, Australia and New Zealand*, eds. Bronwyn Stocks and Nigel Morgan (Melbourne: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 56.

Parchment, ii (paper) + 395 + i (paper) fols., 335 mm x 245 mm, text 215 mm x 160 mm, 2 columns, 25–26 lines, ruled in brown ink (except for the calendar and first page of the Canon).

Script: Gothic bookhand (textualis)

Binding: recently rebound in red alum-tawed goatskin.

Calendar:

St Francis (4 October), Translation of St Francis (25 May), St Clare (12 August), St Anthony of Padua (13 June), St Bernard (20 August), St Elisabeth of Hungary (17 November), St Herculanus (1 March), Passio of St Herculanus (7 November).

Calendar Additions:

Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary (2 July), Octave of St Anthony of Padua (20 June) and an entry reading *Votum sancti Ambrosii de thamorum in bono* (7 June).

Liturgical Contents:

ff. 1r–6v Calendar; ff. 7r–250v Temporal Cycle and Canon; ff. 253r–319v Proper of the Saints; ff. 319v–354v Common of the Saints; ff. 355r–389v Votive Masses; f. 389v Prayer by scribe (*Ante conspectum divine maiestatis . . .*).

Incipit, f. 7r: *Incipit ordo missalis fratrum minorum secundum consuetudinem romane curie . . .*

Liturgical Additions:

ff. 252r–252v Corpus Christi; ff. 390r–394r Feast of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary; Feast of St Louis Bishop and Confessor (canonised 1317, feast decreed 1319); Feast of St Louis King of France (canonised 1297); Sequences for Easter (*Victime Paschali*), the Holy Spirit (*Veni Sancte Spiritus*), Corpus Christi (*Lauda Syon*, composed by Thomas Aquinas), and for the Dead (*Dies Irae*); f. 395v Three benedictional prayers (in different hands). Marginal glosses in several later hands are present, as well as Arabic numerals indicating Gospel and Psalm numbers.

Provenance:

The missal was made in the late thirteenth century in Perugia for use by a Franciscan community. While it was listed in the Phillipps catalogue among those manuscripts from the Cistercian abbey of Fossanova acquired by Payne & Foss in 1848, there is no evidence that it came from either Fossanova or the Benedictine abbey of Nonantola, as was later thought. The library of Nonantola was taken over by the Cistercian abbey of Sessoriana in Rome, and then acquired by Gianbattista Petrucci, a Roman bookseller. It seems likely that in fact the CSP did not come from either Nonantola or Fossanova, but was grouped with manuscripts from many locations under the heading 'Fossanova' by Petrucci. In Sir Thomas Phillipps's collection it received the shelfmark Ph 12289. Celsus Kelly OFM believed that the CSP had been acquired by Rev. A.G. Little, although Little had in fact bought Ph 12290, a different Franciscan manuscript. The CSP was part of the Phillips collection sold in 1949 to W.H. Robinson, London booksellers, and exhibited at the State Library of Victoria in Melbourne. That same year it was bought by the Australian Province of the Order of Friars Minor.¹⁴ It is now held in the Rare Books collection of the State Library of Victoria.

Chronological Bibliography

The Phillipps Manuscripts. *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum in Bibliotheca D. Thomae Phillipps, BT. Impressum Tupis medio-montanis 1837–1871*, with an introduction by A.N.L. Munby (London: The Holland Press, 1968), 216.

Little, A. G. "Description of a Franciscan Manuscript formerly in the Phillipps Library now in the Possession of A.G. Little'." *Publications of the British Society of Franciscan Studies* V (1914): 9–17.

Kelly, Celsus (OFM). "Franciscan Scholarship in the Middle Ages." *The Catholic Review* 5:2 (1949): 213.

Kelly, Celsus (OFM). "The Codex Sti Paschalis." *The Provincial Chronicle of the Holy Ghost Province, Australia–New Zealand* 3:2 (1949): 74–94.

Munby, A.N.L. *Phillipps Studies no. 4: The Formation of the Phillipps Library from 1841 to 1872*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956, 180.

¹⁴ Margaret Manion and Anna Welch, "Missal", 56.

- Sinclair, Keith Val. "Phillipps Manuscripts in Australia." *The Book Collector* 2 (1962): 336–337.
- Sinclair, Keith Val. "Manuscrits médiévaux d'origine franciscaine en Australie." *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 57 (1964): 367–377.
- Sinclair, Keith Val. *Descriptive Catalogue of Medieval and Renaissance Western Manuscripts in Australia*. Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1969, 296–297.
- Condon, Veronica. *Ms. Douce 313: A Fourteenth Century Franciscan Missal in the Bodleian Library, Oxford*. Ph.D. dissertation, the University of Melbourne. Melbourne: Spectrum Publications, 1977, 6.
- Ciardi Dupre dal Poggetto, Maria. "La miniatura nei libri francescani." In *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi, Codici e Biblioteche, Miniature*. Ed. Carlo Pirovano. Milano: Electa, 1982, 323.
- Ciardi Dupre dal Poggetto, Maria. "Il primo papa francescano, Niccolò IV (1288–1293), e il suo influsso sulla miniatura umbra." In *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi, Codici e Biblioteche, Miniature*. Ed. Carlo Pirovano (Milano: Electa, 1982), 358–359.
- Pirovano, Carlo, ed. "112. Messale francescano." In *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi, Codici e Biblioteche, Miniature*. Milano: Electa, 1982, 363–365.
- Manion, Margaret and Vera Vines. *Medieval and Renaissance Illuminated Manuscripts in Australian Collections*. Melbourne: Thames & Hudson, 1984, 28–39, no. 4, pl. 4, figs. 12–23.
- Rubin, Miri. *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991, 196.
- Lunghi, Elvio. "Le miniature nei manoscritti Italiani." In *Una città e la sua cattedrale: il Duomo di Perugia*. Ed. Maria Luisa Cianini Pierotti. Perugia: Edizioni Chesa S. Severo a Porta Sole, 1992, 254.
- Manion, Margaret. "The Codex Sancti Paschalis". *La Trobe Library Journal* 13:51–52 (1993): 11–23.
- Subbioni, Marina. *La Miniatura Perugina del Trecento: Contributo alla storia della pittura in Umbria nel quattordicesimo secolo*. Vol. 1. Perugia: Guerra Edizioni, 2003, 12.
- Manion, Margaret and Anna Welch, "Missal [Codex Sancti Paschalis]." In *The Medieval Imagination: Illuminated Manuscripts from Cambridge, Australia*

and New Zealand. Ed. Bronwyn Stocks and Nigel Morgan. Melbourne: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, 56–57.

Welch, Anna. “Presence and Absence: Reading Clare of Assisi in Franciscan Liturgy.” In *Gender, Catholicism and Spirituality: Women and the Roman Catholic Church in Britain and Europe, 1200–1900*. Ed. Carmen M. Mangion and Laurence Lux-Sterritt. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, 19–37.

B: Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Ms. Gaddi 7

Missal, Franciscan (noted)

Use of Rome

In Latin

Italy, Umbria (possibly Perugia), late thirteenth century

Parchment, i + 311, 330 mm x 220 mm, 2 columns in lines of 24, text 230 mm x 160 mm

Script: Gothic bookhand (textualis)

Binding: Wooden boards covered in brown leather. The binding has been restored and is in good condition.¹⁵

Calendar:

St Herculanus (1 March), St Peter Martyr (29 April), Translation of St Francis (25 May), St Anthony (13 June), St Dominic (5 August), St Bernard (20 August), St Francis (4 October), *Passio* of St Herculanus (7 November).

Calendar Additions:

St Apollonia (9 February), Consecration of the church of San Miniato (10 February), [illegible entry] (11 February), Macarius of Egypt (2 May), St Margaret (20 July), St Albert (7 August), Consecration of the church of St Sylvester of Caspiano (2 October), St Reparata (9 October), St Minus (25 October), Dedication of the Basilica Saluatoris (9 November), Dedication of the Basilica of St Mary Transtibertine (15 November), St Leonini (24 November),

¹⁵ “113. Messale francescano”, in *Francesco d’Assisi: Documenti e Archivi, Codici e Biblioteche, Miniature*, ed. Carlo Pirovano (Milano: Electa, 1982), 365.

The calendar does not include (either in its original state or as additions) the Franciscan feasts of St Clare (12 August), St Elizabeth of Hungary (19 November), St Louis of Toulouse (19 August) and St Louis King of France (26 August).

Liturgical Contents:

ff. 1r–6v Calendar; ff. 7r–204r: Temporal Cycle and Canon; ff. 205r–256v: Proper of the Saints; ff. 257r–310r: Common of the Saints.

Incipit, f. 11r: *Incipit ordo missalis fratrum minorum secundum consuetudinem romane curie*.

Liturgical Additions:

ff. 9v–10r: Missa Eucharistie; ff. 10r–v: Feast of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary f. 310v: Prayers and the Nicene Creed, in different hands (*‘Victime paschali’*, *‘gloria excelsis deo’*, *‘Credo in unum deum’*); f. 311r: *Dies Irae*.

Provenance:

Made in Umbria (possibly Perugia) in the late thirteenth century for use by a Franciscan community, probably in Umbria; found in Firenze by 1478 (attested by the presence of a dated marginal note on the inside of the back cover – *‘Domenica a di 26 aprile 1478 in le 15 overo 16 hore fu in palagio fu in Santa Maria del Fiore infra le 14 le 15 hore mori Giuliano de Medici e Francesco Mori missa celebravit cardinalis’*); in the collection of Giovanni Gaddi (1495–1542); bought in 1755 (along with all the Gaddi family library) by Emperor Francesco I and given to the Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana in Firenze, where it is currently held.

Chronological Bibliography:

Bandini, A.M. *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Medicae Laurentianae*, vol. II. Firenze: 1792, 5–10.

Lampen, W. “Manoscritti liturgici francescani.” In *Studi francescani*, vol. XIV. Arezzo: Beucci, 1924, 290.

Pirovano, Carlo, ed. “113. Messale francescano”. In *Francesco d’Assisi: Documenti e Archivi, Codici e Biblioteche, Miniature*. Milano: Electa, 1982, 365.

C: Cortona, Biblioteca dell'Accademia di Etrusca, Ms. 13

Missal, possibly Franciscan (noted)

Use of Rome

Italy, Umbria (Perugia? For use in Gubbio), c. 1288

Parchment, iii paper + 225 + iii paper, 352 mm x 242 mm, text in two columns, lines of 31–32.

Script: Gothic miniscule (Italian), in black ink. Titles and instructions rubricated. Several scribal hands.

Binding: leather, from 1876. Condition good. 367 mm x 250 mm.

Calendar:

St Ubaldo (16 May, rubric), Translation of St Francis (25 May, rubric), St Anthony of Padua (13 June, rubric), Death of Innocent III (15 July, rubric), St Dominic (5 August), St Clare (12 August), St Bernard (20 August), St Francis (4 October).

Calendar Additions:

St Juliane (9 February), St Apollonia (9 February), St George (24 April), Canonisation of St Anthony of Padua (30 May, rubric), St Mustiole (2 July), Death of Felix, rector of the church of St Basil 'u.d.y.ecc xl.viii' (4 July), Our Lady of the Snow (5 August), St Louis of Toulouse (19 August), St Louis King of France (26 August), 'obitum gregorii filii domini Vgucii decasale' (26 September), SS Cosmos and Damian (27 September), St Thecle (15 November), Dedication of the church of St Vincent (24 November), St Savini (8 December), 'obitus d[omi]ni dominice rettore ecclesie sancti and[rei]' (27 December).

Liturgical Contents:

ff. 2r–7v: Calendar; ff. 8r–135v Temporal Cycle and Canon; ff. 136r–179v: Proper of Saints; ff. 180r–224v: Common of Saints; ff. 225r: end of original Missal.

Incipit, f. 8r: *Incipit ordo missalis secundum consuetudinem romane curie*

Liturgical Additions:

f. 1r–v: Office for Corpus Christi; f. 225v: Office for Corpus Christi (alternative); f. 160r: Prayer to the Virgin (origin as yet unidentified)

Provenance:

This missal's exact provenance is unknown, but its use in Gubbio seems likely given the prominence in the calendar of St Ubaldo, the city's patron saint. Degli'Innocenti Gambuti suggested on the basis of additions to the calendar that the missal was found in Cortona by at least 1348.¹⁶ On the basis of St Louis of Toulouse's addition to the calendar and the presence of Easter Sunday in the calendar on 28 March, Degli'Innocenti Gambuti suggested the missal dates to either 1277 or 1288 (the years in the late thirteenth century when Easter fell on that date).¹⁷ Stylistically, Degli'Innocenti Gambuti associates the missal with Ms. 16 (Capitolo di San Lorenzo) and thus with the late-thirteenth-century school of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno.¹⁸

Chronological Bibliography:

Mancini, G. *I Manoscritti della libreria del Comune e dell'Accademia Etrusca di Cortona*. Cortona 1884, 7.

Ebner, A. *Missale Romanum in Mittelalter. Iter Italicum*. Freiburg: B. Herder, 1896, 24.

Sorbelli, A., *Inventari dei Manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia*, vol. XVIII. Firenze: 1912, 9.

Degli'Innocenti Gambuti, Maria, *I Codici Miniati Medievali della Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca di Cortona*. Firenze: SPES, 1977, 105–106.

D: Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 14

Missal, later used by Franciscans (noted)

Use of Rome

Italy, Umbria (Perugia?), second quarter of the fourteenth century

¹⁶ Degli'Innocenti Gambuti, *I codici miniati*, 105.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

Parchment, iii paper + 290 + iii paper, 350 mm x 235 mm, dry-ruled, text in two columns, lines of 25. (Ff. 91r–92r and 125r–126v written in one column with empty space for musical notation. Ff. 141r–147v also in one column.)

Script: Gothic miniscule (Italian), in black ink. Titles and instructions rubricated.

Binding: leather, from 1876. Condition good.

Calendar:

St Peter of Verona (29 April), St Anthony of Padua (13 June), St Dominic (5 August), St Clare of Assisi (12 August), St Louis of Toulouse (19 August), St Francis of Assisi (4 October), St Elizabeth of Hungary (19 November).

Calendar Additions:

St Margaret (13 July), Stigmata of St Francis (17 September), Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary (8 December).

Liturgical Contents:

ff. 1r–6v Calendar; ff. 7r–200r Temporal Cycle and Canon; ff. 200v–263v Proper of Saints; ff. 264r–291v Common of Saints. The missal is incomplete: the text ends mid-way through the mass for the Holy Trinity (f. 291v).

Incipit, f. 7r: In nomine domini nostri iesu Christi incipit ordo missali secundum consuetudinem romane curie.

Provenance:

Unknown. It was very likely made in Perugia, given the scribal note identifying ‘Maestro Venturella’ as the miniaturist (f. 7r). The missal was most probably made for use by a Franciscan community in central Italy. It is quite possible that this community was that of San Francesco in Cortona, given the current location of the missal (the Biblioteca Comunale e dell’Accademia Etrusca di Cortona), and the fact that this collection holds several other manuscripts from San Francesco which Gambuti Degl’Innocenti has identified as related to Ms. 14 (i.e. Mss. 9–11, a three-volume Franciscan lectionary, and Ms. 13, a Franciscan missal).

Chronological Bibliography:

Mancini, G. *I Manoscritti della libreria del Comune e dell'Accademia Etrusca di Cortona*. Cortona 1884, 7.

Ebner, A. *Missale Romanum in Mittelalter. Iter Italicum*. Freiburg: B. Herder, 1896, 24.

Sorbelli, A. *Inventari dei Manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia*, vol. XVIII. Firenze: 1912, 9.

Degl'Innocenti Gambuti, Maria. *I Codici Miniati Medievali della Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca di Cortona*. Firenze: SPES, 1977, 107–120.

Pirovano, Carlo, ed. "127. Messale romano." In *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi, Codici e Biblioteche, Miniature*. Milano: Electa, 1982, 378.

E: Assisi, Sacro Convento Ms. 267

Missal, Augustinian (noted)

Use of Rome

Italy, Perugia, late-thirteenth/early-fourteenth century

Parchment, ff. 332; text in two columns; 346 mm x 245 mm.

Script: Italian Gothic bookhand (textualis)

Binding: Antique but not original; brown leather metal-stamped with vegetative motifs. The manuscript lacks several folios, and has had many miniatures (such as the crucifixion miniature) excised.

Calendar:

The calendar lacks the months January, February, May and June, and has a random quarto inserted between August and September. There are no additions to the calendar, despite addition of saints' offices at the end of the missal.

Herculanus (1 March), *Ansiminus* (?) (13 March), Peter of Verona (29 April), Anniversary of the dead of our Order (rubric, 7 July), Margarite (20 July), *Tius* (?) (27 July), Dominic (rubric, 5 August), Bernard of Clairvaux (rubric, 20 August), Augustine (rubric, 28 August), Anthony (2 September), Francis (rubric, 4 October),

Ursula and the Eleven Hundred Virgins (21 October), Dedication of the Basilica of St John Lateran ('*Christo Salvatori*') (rubric, 9 November), Dedication of the Basilica of SS Peter and Paul (rubric, 18 November), Elizabeth of Hungary (rubric, 19 November), Thomas (29 December).

Liturgical Contents:

ff. 1r–4v: Calendar; ff. 5r–224v Temporal Cycle and Canon; ff. 224r–74r Proper of the Saints, ff. 274v–328v Common of the Saints; ff. 329r–331v: additions (see below).

Incipit, f. 5r: *In nomine santissime trinitatis: incipit ordo missalis fratrum heremitarum sancti augustini secundum consuetudinem romane curie*

Liturgical Additions:

f. 329r: Office for St Stanislaw (canonised 1253 in Assisi by Innocent IV); Office for St Rupert of Salzburg (?); f. 329v: Office for St Louis of Toulouse; Office for the Stigmata of St Francis; ff. 331r–v: Unidentified chant.

Provenance:

The missal belongs to the Perugian Liturgical Group – that is, it was decorated by either the atelier of the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno, the atelier of Venturella di Pietro or a closely related workshop. Given this, its provenance is clearly Umbrian, probably Perugian. The presence of Perugia's patron saint Herculanius (1 March) in the calendar supports this hypothesis. However, the 1982 catalogue of Franciscan manuscripts suggests that this missal was held in the sacristy of the Sacro Convento in Assisi, and at some time after 1754, that it passed into the Sacro Convento's archives.¹⁹ The strong presence of Franciscan saints in the missal may suggest it was adapted for use by the Augustinian hermits from a Franciscan original, partially explaining its presence in the Sacro Convento. Further research is necessary to determine the validity of this suggestion, and to develop scholarly knowledge of the provenance of this well-used missal. The 1982 catalogue entry also suggested a date of between 1312 and 1334 for the missal, based on the presence of the feast for the

¹⁹ "128. Messale agostiniano", *Francesco d'Assisi*, 379.

Dedication of the Basilica of SS Peter and Paul, and the absence of the feast of the Holy Trinity (established 1334).²⁰

Chronological Bibliography:

Mazzatini, G. *Inventari dei Manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia* IV (Forli: 1896), 64.

Alessandri, L and F. Pennacchi. *Inventari della Sacrista del Sacro Convento di Assisi, compilati nel 1338, contenuti nel codice 337 della Comunale di Assisi*. Quaracchi: 1914, 25.

Cenci, Cesare (OFM). *Bibliotheca Manuscriptorum ad Sacrum Conventum Assisiensem*. Vol. 2. Assisi Regione dell'Umbria – Sacro Convento di Assisi: Casa editrice francescana, 1981, 27.

Pirovano, Carlo, ed. “128. Messale agostiniano.” In *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi, Codici e Biblioteche, Miniature*. Milano: Electa, 1982, 378–379.

4.4 The Calendars Compared

It will be noted that the following tables represent only the inclusion or exclusion of feasts in the calendars of the five selected missals: the ranking assigned to feasts is not provided, nor will it be discussed in the following chapter. The decision to exclude this information has been made for practical reasons alone: its inclusion would create too much data for the analysis manageable in one study. An analysis and comparison of the ranking of liturgical feasts in Franciscan calendars is the subject for future research; indeed, a study of how the ranking of feasts may have been updated in liturgical calendars in response to changes of papal policy would be fascinating. Due to the decision to exclude this data, certain terminology used in Chapter Five must be understood in a specific way. For liturgists, the term ‘Commemoration’ refers to a specific type of liturgical celebration, which is of lesser importance than a solemn or ferial celebration. Because the ranking of liturgical feasts is not under consideration here, it must be noted that the word ‘commemoration’ is used in its wider sense, referring to the ritual activity undertaken in the observation of a liturgical feast, i.e. the act of ritually remembering a person or event. If the term is used to refer to its

²⁰ Ibid.

technical definition as a specific ranking of feast, it will be capitalised (e.g. ‘Commemoration’).

Key to symbols and abbreviations

✓ = The feast appears in this calendar as a regular, original entry, which exactly matches the entry in the CSP. Differing spellings are included for comparison.

✓ or *abcde* = The feast appears in this calendar as in the CSP, but as a rubric.

+ = The feast appears as an addition to the original calendar.

Italics = Note to the text.

(a) = abbatis

(ap) = apostolis

(cf) = confessoris

(e) = episcopis

(ev) = evangelis

(m) = martyris

(pp) = papae

(pr) = presbyteris

(proph) = prophetae

(v) = virginis

Figure 9 – January

Figure 10 – February

Figure 11 – March

Figure 12 – April

Figure 13 – May

Figure 14 – June

Figure 15 – July

Figure 16 – August

Figure 17 – September

Figure 18 – October

Figure 19 – November

Figure 20 – December

4.5 Conclusions

Liturgical calendars can supply information that cannot be accessed from any other type of evidence: the shape and memory of a year in the ritual life of a community. The approach adopted here follows in the methodological footsteps of Els Rose and rehabilitates calendars as unique and informative sources of evidence for the communal ritual activity of Umbrian Franciscans. While the cult of the saints is now recognised as a valuable site of information for scholars of spirituality and medieval culture more broadly, sources used in its study do not usually include liturgical calendars. This is true in both the fields of spirituality (which has preferred the use of hagiographic and visual sources) and in liturgical history proper (which has relied upon the text and music of liturgical offices, often closely connected to hagiographical *vitae*). Calendars have the distinction of being a form of evidence for which absence can be as revelatory as presence. They also record the spiritual activity and preferences of a group about whom nothing further may be known. As Rose pointed out in her discussion of the Gallican rite, the localised nature of the cult of the saints means that calendars are the most accurate repositories of information for the provenance of a liturgical book: they are highly specialised indicators of the tradition of communal worship for a particular town (or at most, a region).²¹ Thus, liturgical calendars provide information for both the liturgical historian (studying a particular rite, manuscript or textual tradition) and the cultural historian, whose interest lies in hermeneutical readings of such communal rituals. The discussion which follows in Chapter Five combines aspects of both these disciplines of history, and searches for cultural and spiritual meaning in the patterns of inclusion and exclusion of feasts in CSP and B–E.

²¹ Rose, “Liturgical Commemoration of the Saints”, 76.

Chapter Five

Celebrating Saints – Articulating Communal Identity through Liturgy

5.1 Selection of Feasts for Analysis; Methodology

As discussed in the previous chapter, liturgy is perceived by historians, anthropologists and sociologists of religion as one means by which a group can express its communal spiritual identity, primarily via the celebration of particular feasts and the exclusion of others. The underlying inference of this understanding of the liturgical commemoration of saints is that saints themselves can be read as symbolic indicators of the shared interests, concerns and anxieties of the community that commemorates them. In this sense, saints may be understood in the framework of sacred symbolism formulated by Mircea Eliade, in which ‘the essential function of the symbol is precisely in disclosing the structures of the real inaccessible to empirical existence’.¹ To follow Delooz’s definition of saints as necessarily constructed ‘for other people’, saints are powerful symbols of the cultural and spiritual attitudes responsible for naming them as saints in the first place.² As Eliade noted, a defining characteristic of the symbol is its multivalent nature: saints too are capable of shifting their meaning depending on context, absorbing and mirroring the concerns and interests of different communities.³

Scholars from a variety of disciplines (primarily history, art history, manuscript studies and sociology) have studied the cult of the saints at length, though their representation in liturgical calendars has only infrequently been the focus of such studies. Recent studies of the development of Franciscan calendars (the most notable being that by Fulvio Rampazzo, discussed in Chapters Two and Four) rely

¹ Mircea Eliade, *Symbolism, the Sacred and the Arts* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1986), 4.

² Delooz, “Towards a sociological study of canonized sainthood”, 194.

³ Eliade, *Symbolism*, 5.

heavily on the scholarship of van Dijk and other liturgical historians. These studies have sometimes failed to make reference to any actual manuscript evidence, instead referring to the adoption of feasts in general terms.⁴ Studies such as Rampazzo's assume a high level of control on the part of the General Chapters of the Order, inferring that all friaries in all regions uniformly adopted the liturgical decisions of this ruling body. In this sense, such studies have failed to add new understandings of either the 'grassroots' evolution (as opposed to the official record of development) or function of the liturgical calendar for different communities within the Order. It is essential for research to focus on manuscript evidence, from which conclusions can be drawn about the development and use of the Franciscan liturgical calendar in a specific region and time (central Italy in the late-thirteenth and early-fourteenth centuries). This focus on manuscript evidence allows for potential diversity amongst different communities, and takes into account the variety of factors which affected the adoption of different feasts into liturgical calendars, such as local loyalties, regional differences, and the political relationships of different religious Orders (such as those connecting the Franciscans, Dominicans and Cistercians).

As has been discussed in Chapter Two, throughout the study of Franciscan liturgical history, it has been implicitly maintained that liturgy has been a distinguishing element of Franciscan spirituality (formulated in van Dijk's notion of so-called 'Regula' editions of Franciscan breviaries and missals), and that this distinctive spirituality can itself be observed within the form and content of the mass as celebrated by the Order. The liturgical data presented in Chapter Four, drawn from the five missals under consideration here, will now be analysed and some conclusions drawn regarding the mechanics of expressing communal identity through liturgy. As the discussion in Chapter Three has indicated, the decorative style of the Perugian Liturgical Group of manuscripts (particularly those studied here) is arguably more Perugian than it is Franciscan – distinguished by location rather than spiritual affiliation. Can the same be said of the liturgical contents of these missals? In order to explore this question, selected feasts from the calendars of the five Umbrian missals (four Franciscan and one Augustinian, as presented in Figures 9–20 of Chapter Four) will be compared. The corresponding offices for these feasts in the Proper of the

⁴ For example, Rampazzo's discussion of the introduction of feasts for Francis, Anthony of Padua, Clare, Elisabeth of Hungary and Louis IX: Rampazzo, "Fundamental Elements of Franciscan Liturgy", 287–288.

missals will not be explored as the weight of evidence involved would require a separate study, and the inclusion or absence of feasts from the calendars is sufficient as an indicator of the ritual activity of the communities. Similarly, discussion of the ranking of feasts included in these calendars (double, semi-double, Commemoration etc.) would require more space than is possible here, as has been discussed in section three of Chapter Four. These limitations require a careful approach to the extrapolation of meaning from the calendars, but also shed light on the complex relationship between calendars, offices and the concept of communal commemoration. As will be discussed regarding St Herculanus, the martyr bishop and patron saint of Perugia, inclusion in the calendar and even special highlighting of a feast did not necessarily result in an individualised office. The question of precisely how communities celebrated feasts is largely the concern of future work, but the basic issue of whether or not these communities included particular feasts in their calendar, and (if present) in what fashion they were included (in terms of wording, rubrication and date) will begin the process of questioning the function of liturgical commemoration in the construction and maintenance of group identity. The canonisation dates for each saint are given when known, though as will be demonstrated, these dates do not necessarily indicate when regular liturgical commemoration of the saint began.

The feasts of greatest interest to an investigation of Franciscan spirituality in the liturgy are:

Francis, canonised 1228 (*Dies Natalis*: 4 October, Translation: 25 May, *Stigmata*: 17 September)

Anthony of Padua, canonised 1232 (*Dies Natalis*: 13 June, Translation: 15 February, Canonisation: 30 May)

Clare of Assisi, canonised 1255 (*Dies Natalis*: 12 August, Translation: 2 October)

Elisabeth of Hungary, canonised 1235 (*Dies Natalis*: 19 November)

Louis of Toulouse, canonised 1317 (*Dies Natalis*: 19 August)

Louis IX, King of France, canonised 1297 (*Dies Natalis*: 26 August).

Feasts that relate to specific locations are considered, as they indicate the impact of place and inter-city politics on the liturgical landscape of the Order:

Herculanus, bishop (and patron saint) of Perugia, d. 549 (*Dies Natalis*: 1 March, *Passio*: 7 November)

Ubaldo, bishop, confessor and patron saint of Gubbio, d. 1160 (*Dies Natalis*: 16 May).

For similar reasons, feasts relating to other religious groups are also of interest, as they can highlight the socio-political hierarchy governing decisions about feasts:

Dominic OP, canonised 1234 (*Dies natalis*: 5 August, Translation: 24 May)

Peter Martyr (of Verona) OP, canonised 1253 (*Dies natalis*: 29 April)

Augustine of Hippo, d. 430 (*Dies natalis*: 28 August)

Bernard of Clairvaux, canonised 1174 (*Dies natalis*: 20 August).

The feasts of the Virgin are also of interest to this study, as they provide an indication of the Order's adoption of widely celebrated feasts in the Roman calendar:

Purification (2 February)

Visitation (2 July)

Our Lady of the Snow (5 August)

Assumption (15 August) and its Octave (22 August)

Nativity (8 September)

Immaculate Conception (8 December).

As is the case for Franciscan liturgy as a wider subject, van Dijk remains the scholar on whom all others rely regarding the Order's adoption of feasts. Recent scholarship has investigated the textual content of offices for particular feasts and their evolution over time, such as Giovanni Boccali's edition of the texts for the feasts of Clare of Assisi. However, in terms of the timing and speed of diffusion of particular feasts within the Order, it is difficult to critique van Dijk's conclusions, given that no other substantial studies exist. Van Dijk's conclusions are here examined against the evidence of the five selected manuscripts introduced in Chapter Four. While it cannot form broad arguments for the introduction and diffusion of feasts across the entire Order, this study allows for the close examination of the liturgical practices of Franciscan and Augustinian friars in a small area of central Italy during a particular time period (c. 1290–1350). Therefore, while its conclusions are

necessarily tightly focused, the methodology utilised offers a new approach to the study of liturgical calendars more broadly.

5.2 The Feasts in CSP and B–E

5.2.1 Feasts of St Francis

Dies natalis: 4 October (see Figure 18 in Chapter Four)

As one might expect of Umbrian Franciscan missals in the late thirteenth century, the *dies natalis* of Francis is unanimously represented in CSP and B–D. The feast is also recorded in E, the Augustinian missal. The wording and rubrication of this feast are far less consistent, however, across all the missals. It would seem that the wording of the feast was never specified, and nor was there a distinctive norm: Mss. D and E record ‘*francisci confessoris*’, C uses ‘*beati francisci*’, B uses ‘*sancti francisci confessoris*’ and CSP contains the unusual phrasing ‘*francisci qui fuit rector et institutor ordinem fratrum minorum*’. Only B, C and D rubricate the feast.

The history of the feast itself is well established: Pope Gregory IX wrote new prayers for the Collect, Secret and Postcommunion of the canonisation Mass, which took place in 1228. These prayers were then used in the text for the Feast’s office.⁵ The Octave of the Feast does not appear to have been instituted until Haymo’s Ordinal of 1243–1244.⁶ This fact adds weight to the idea that Haymo’s Ordinal was in fact the first official model for Franciscan missals, rather than a correction of the so-called Regula missal (as discussed in Chapter Two). The fact that the *dies natalis* is not included in van Dijk’s reconstructed Regula breviary (issued, he argued, in 1230 – two years after the canonisation of Francis) also adds considerably to doubts about the very existence of this Regula breviary; it seems unthinkable that a Franciscan breviary issued after the canonisation of the founder would not include his major feast.⁷ Innovations and updates to the liturgical celebration of Francis continued throughout the thirteenth century: his name was added to the Confiteor in 1260 at the Chapter of Narbonne, and a weekly votive mass instituted in 1299 at the Chapter of Lyons.⁸

⁵ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 378.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 379.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 338.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 380.

Van Dijk suggests the Cistercians celebrated this Feast immediately after Francis's canonisation, though it was not officially entered into their liturgical calendar until 1259.⁹ This follows a pattern of complicated exchanges amongst the Cistercians, Franciscans and Dominicans regarding the Feasts of their founders, which will be discussed in greater detail in section 5.11 below.

Translation: 25 May (see Figure 13 in Chapter Four)

The first official mention of the translation Feast does not occur until Haymo's Ordinal (1243–1244), which appears to be the first indisputable model for Franciscan missals, as has been discussed in Chapter Two.¹⁰ The Feast's absence from calendars prior to the 1240s further undermines van Dijk's reconstructed Regula books: it seems unlikely an important feast of the founder would have been left out of a formalised Franciscan liturgy, had one existed prior to Haymo's Ordinal. The translation itself had occurred in a somewhat hasty and furtive fashion in 1230, as mentioned previously – Elias subverted the official plans of the Pope and the Order by surreptitiously moving Francis's body (with the assistance of townspeople from Assisi) to the Sacro Convento before the planned official translation. The text used is the same as that for Francis's *dies natalis*. All the Franciscan missals studied here (CSP and B–D) contain the Feast with identical phrasing ('*translatio francisci*'). As with the *dies natalis*, rubrication appears to have been optional: only C contains the translation as a rubric. Unfortunately, the month of May is missing from the calendar of E, so it is impossible to judge from this particular missal what Augustinian practice was regarding the translation of Francis.

Feast of the Stigmata: 17 September (see Figure 17 in Chapter Four)

The Feast of the Stigmata was instituted at the 1340 General Chapter of Assisi. It is therefore unsurprising that it does not appear in the original calendars of CSP and B–D, which were all probably written prior to this date. D (probably used in San Francesco, Cortona) includes the Feast as an addition, underscoring its Franciscan usage through reference to the 'holy stigmata of *our* blessed father Francis' (emphasis mine). While the month of May is missing from the calendar of E, the missal does include an office for the Feast as an addition to its sanctoral cycle, indicating it may

⁹ Ibid., 372.

¹⁰ Ibid., 379.

also have been added to the calendar. It is interesting that this Feast was added to only two of the selected missals, and neither appear to have been used by Franciscans in their original form. E is an Augustinian missal, while D may not have been used by Franciscans originally as its *incipit* names it simply as a missal of the Roman Use. Though the stigmata quickly became a central component of the visual and biographic tradition of Francis, it did not feature in the liturgy until well over a century after Francis's death. Two possible explanations could account for the almost total absence of the Feast of the Stigmata in the selected missals: 1) that the missals fell out of use relatively quickly, and thus were not updated c. 1340; 2) the updating of Franciscan missals was not systematic, and the Feast of the Stigmata was regularly overlooked. While it seems unusual that a feast celebrating one of the definitive aspects of Francis would not have been considered important enough to be routinely added to the calendars, the second option does seem the most likely. Given the other additions to the calendars, B–E do seem to have been in use for a long period of time (CSP must be considered separately, as it contains only two additions, written in the same hand), which excludes the first proposed explanation. In light of the lack of a systematic approach to liturgy within the Order until the mid-thirteenth century (as discussed in Chapter Two), it is reasonable to conjecture that the updating of liturgical manuscripts was similarly inconsistent. This point is borne out by multiple examples, as will be seen below.

5.2.2 Feasts of St Anthony of Padua

Canonisation: 30 May (see Figure 13 in Chapter Four), and *Dies natalis*: 13 June (see Figure 14 in Chapter Four)

The *dies natalis* of Anthony of Padua is consistently represented in the selected missals, with the exception of E (whose month of June is regrettably missing). The wording is largely consistent, though unlike the others, D does not cite Anthony's membership of the Order. The specification of Anthony as a friar is unsurprising – it is clearly to distinguish him from the more famous Anthony (the Great, c. 251–356) whose feast day is 17 January. Van Dijk records that a new church and friary were built at Padua in Anthony's honour immediately following his canonisation in 1232. Despite this early attention to the memory of one of the leading intellectual lights of the Order, there is no consistent tradition of his Feasts until the late thirteenth century:

Anthony is not included in van Dijk's reconstructed editions of the 'Regula' breviary and missal.¹¹ Indeed, van Dijk noted that the 'Regula' books used at the church and friary built in Anthony's honour 'did not even contain his name'.¹² This seems inexplicable at first, but is perhaps further evidence casting doubt on the very existence of the Regula editions. It would appear that official institution of the Feast from within the Order did not occur until 1276, and even at that stage no texts were set for the Feast.¹³ Van Dijk cited numerous examples of differing 'private compilations' of the office for Anthony, in use even after a Mass for the office was circulated.¹⁴ Once again, the inherent variety of Franciscan liturgical activity did not sway van Dijk's opinion of its unified character: however, the discrepancies and vagaries regarding the celebration of Anthony – one of the Order's most significant early figures – appear to provide strong evidence against the concept of a regulated, uniform Franciscan liturgy in the early thirteenth century.

Anthony's *dies natalis* was given an Octave by Haymo's Ordinal in 1243–1244, which theoretically pushed the Feast of St Silverius from 20 June to 21 June. Only CSP includes the Octave for Anthony's *dies natalis*, and it is as an addition (though the hand is similar to the original, and may in fact be the same – a contemporary addition of a feast overlooked in the copying process). Despite the inclusion of the octave, Silverius's Feast is not moved to 21 June in CSP. In this instance, Haymo's Ordinal does not appear to have had widespread effect on the copying of calendars, even in missals written 50 years after its release (such as D).

C includes an unusual entry for Anthony's canonisation on 30 May, as a rubricated addition. This entry records the actual day of Anthony's canonisation by Pope Gregory IX in Spoleto, 1232. It is difficult to ascertain what type of celebration this entry would have prompted: does it indicate the performance of a liturgy in memory of the occasion, or was it merely a note recording a significant event for friars? More research on this entry needs to be undertaken, but the absence of this entry in all other missals studied here suggests it may be difficult to reach any firm conclusions, other than that it is a rare entry. This entry might suggest the potential use for a liturgical calendar as a memorandum book for its community, which recorded information beyond that required for the ritual celebration of proper

¹¹ Ibid., 382.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid., 385

¹⁴ Ibid., 382.

liturgical feasts. If nothing else, it demonstrates the variety between calendars used by Franciscan communities in Umbria in the given period, and the ways in which the personal preference of a scribe or leader could influence the community's calendar.

Translation: 15 February (see Figure 10 in Chapter Four)

Anthony's translation Feast (15 February) is unanimously ignored by CSP and B–E. The translation itself occurred in 1263, and yet it was not formally instituted until the General Chapter at Lyon in 1351, almost a century later.¹⁵ This delay is even more surprising given the nature of Anthony's translation, at which Bonaventure (then Minister General) presided and which included the discovery of Anthony's miraculously incorrupt tongue.¹⁶ Certainly, one explanation for the delay in widespread commemoration of this Feast is the fact that no new office was written for it (rather, the texts from the *dies natalis* were used). As we have seen, however, the texts for the *dies natalis* were themselves highly variable. The Order's general attitude to Anthony's feasts strikes one as prosaic at best and haphazard and careless at worst. The case of Anthony provides a useful example of the unsystematic approach of the Order towards liturgical commemoration in general, which is reflected in the calendars of CSP and B–D.

5.2.3 Feasts of St Clare

Dies natalis: 12 August (see Figure 16 in Chapter Four)

The *dies natalis* feast for Clare of Assisi was an important issue in van Dijk's discussion of the evolution of the Franciscan missal, from his proposed Regula edition to his belief in a revised missal of 1251–1254/57 based on Haymo's Ordinal. Clare died in 1253 and was canonised by Alexander IV in 1255. The same pope composed the liturgical texts and hymns used in her Feast, which was instituted as a duplex.¹⁷ The feast's status was confirmed by the General Chapter of Narbonne in 1260 and Clare's name added to the Lenten Litany, while the 1263 General Chapter of Pisa

¹⁵ Luke Wadding, *Annales minorum seu Trium Ordinum a S. Francisco instutorum*. Firenze: Ad Claras Aquas (Quarrachi), 1931–1964 (3rd edition), viii (1347–1376), 56. See also: Victor Leroquais, *Les bréviaires manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France* (Paris: Macon, Protat frères, 1934).

¹⁶ *Analecta franciscana sive chronica aliique varia documenta*, tomus III, ed. Patribus Collegii S. Bonaventurae (Quarrachi: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1887), 328–329.

¹⁷ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 385.

raised her feast to the rank of major duplex.¹⁸ In 1272, Clare's name was inserted into all litanies at the General Chapter of Lyon, at which time it was also specified that all friaries should possess a copy of her Legend (which van Dijk takes to mean the *vita* believed to have been written by Thomas of Celano shortly after Clare's canonisation).¹⁹ While Clare's *dies natalis* seems to have been viewed as important, the enforcement of its liturgical commemoration was clearly problematic. The 1292 General Chapter of Paris ruled that 'either the existing Office should be accepted throughout the Order, or, if found defective, another be composed'.²⁰ Van Dijk suggested that the 'high grading of the feast probably inspired requests for a more solemn and proper Office', a position which downplays the evident ambivalence towards Clare's Feast and recasts the lack of liturgical unity as a testament to Clare's importance amongst some sections of the Order.²¹ However, it would appear that the discrepancies surrounding Clare's Feast are more accurately viewed as part of the ongoing difficulty within the Order to establish and maintain a unified liturgy.

The variance in liturgical commemoration of Clare is, as van Dijk admits, a serious obstacle to the date he proposed for a revised edition of the Franciscan missal, based on Haymo's Ordinal. No record exists from within the Order of how or with what speed the order of the liturgy contained in Haymo's Ordinal found its way into the missals used by the friars, but van Dijk maintains that a second edition Franciscan missal (that is, a revision of his proposed *Regula* edition of 1230) appeared c. 1251–1254/57; in part, this date is suggested because he believed that this second edition missal was that to which Bonaventure referred in 1260 as the 'more trustworthy exempla' (see Chapter Two).²² However, this proposed second edition Franciscan missal does not contain an office for Clare, canonised in 1255. Van Dijk cannot explain this discrepancy, nor the fact that the breviaries of the period do consistently contain an office for Clare.²³ It is not surprising that Haymo's Ordinal (on which he maintains this second edition missal was based) did not contain any office for Clare, who was, after all, still alive at the time Haymo wrote. However, van Dijk's adherence to the idea that an official second edition of Franciscan missals, based on Haymo's Ordinal, was released prior to 1260 is seriously undermined by this

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 385–386.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 386.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² *Ibid.*, 338.

²³ *Ibid.*

proposed edition's lack of an office for Clare. He concluded that 'St Bonaventure's "more trustworthy models", presented at the chapter of Narbonne, included not a third edition of the missal but copies of the second one with a Mass of St Clare and preceded by up to date kalendars'.²⁴ This suggestion must remain as speculation only, as one of the major difficulties in assessing Franciscan liturgical activity in the 1250s and 1260s is the vague language used by both John of Parma and Bonaventure when discussing their Order's liturgy.

Translation: 2 October (see Figure 18 in Chapter Four)

Van Dijk did not discuss Clare's translation Feast, and there appears to be no other scholarly work to investigate its celebration. It is celebrated on 2 October, when Clare's body was moved from San Damiano to the newly built basilica of Santa Chiara. None of the selected missals include this Feast in the calendars. In the 35 missals and breviaries studied for this dissertation, only five recorded the Feast of Clare's translation (including one breviary believed to be Augustinian in origin); it was clearly never a widely commemorated feast, either inside or outside the Order.²⁵ Given the similar treatment of Anthony of Padua's translation Feast, this is less surprising, and appears to reflect the disorganised nature of Franciscan liturgy rather than the Order's attitude towards Clare.²⁶

5.2.4 Feast of Elisabeth of Hungary

Dies natalis: 19 November (see Figure 19 in Chapter Four)

Canonised in 1235 in Perugia by Gregory IX, the Hungarian princess Elisabeth (wife of Ludwig IV of Hungary) was affiliated to the Third Order of Friars Minor, though she does not appear to have officially joined their ranks. Her *dies natalis* is celebrated in all the selected missals but B. This is unusual, given that the calendar of B is (in all other respects) very similar to CSP in particular, and is unquestionably Franciscan. It

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 339.

²⁵ Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, Ms. 31: Franciscan missal c. 1420; Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 265: a Franciscan breviary c. 1322; Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 272: a late thirteenth-century Franciscan breviary; Assisi, Sacro Convento Ms. 319: a fourteenth-century Franciscan missal; Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 611: a thirteenth-century Augustinian (?) missal.

²⁶ An analysis of the Order's liturgical attitude towards Clare can be found in: Anna Welch, "Presence and Absence: Reading Clare of Assisi in Franciscan Liturgy and Community", in *Gender, Spirituality and Catholicism: Women and the Roman Catholic Church in Britain and Europe 1200–1900*, eds. Carmen M. Mangion and Laurence Lux-Sterritt (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 19–37.

is puzzling that this calendar does not include Elisabeth, whose feast was firmly established in the Order by the late thirteenth century and is even represented in the Augustinian missal (E).

5.2.5 Feast of St Louis of Toulouse

Dies natalis: 19 August (see Figure 16 in Chapter Four)

The presence or absence of the *dies natalis* of Louis of Toulouse is often used as a method of dating Franciscan missals. He joined the Order in 1296 with the assistance of Boniface VIII, renouncing his royal inheritance as surviving son of Charles of Anjou, King of Napoli, and Maria Arpad of Hungary. Louis died at 23 one year after entering the Order, and was canonised in 1317 by John XXII. His Feast was promulgated in 1319, and it is in Franciscan missals dating from this year onwards that scholars expect to find his Feast.²⁷ Van Dijk speculated that it was Louis's affiliation with the Spiritual elements of the Order which lead to the delay in his canonisation.²⁸ CSP, B and E do not contain Louis of Toulouse's Feast, even as an addition. C includes the Feast as an addition: '*lodovici episcopis confessoris*', while in D the feast is included in the original calendar as '*Leoduici*'. That this Feast is only once included as an addition in the selected manuscripts suggests that it was not of major importance to the Umbrian Friars. The sole missal to commemorate Louis's *dies natalis* in its original calendar (D) is dated to the second quarter of the thirteenth century – in part because of this very Feast.

5.2.6 Feast of St Louis IX, King of France

Dies natalis: 26 August (see Figure 16 in Chapter Four)

As we have seen with the example of Louis of Toulouse, the *dies natalis* of Louis IX, King of France, is also frequently used to date Franciscan missals to either before or after 1297, the year of his canonisation by Boniface VIII. Louis IX was in fact not a member of the Order of Friars Minor or the Order of Preachers, though he had strong ties to both. Cecelia Gaposchkin has proposed that the Office for Louis IX was

²⁷ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 270.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

Dominican in origin.²⁹ This suggests what is often observed regarding the two mendicant orders – the Order of Preachers were the more organised when it came to liturgy. We may compare the Order of Preachers’ composition of Louis IX’s office with the Order of Friars Minor’s treatment of Anthony of Padua’s Feasts, for which no texts were set even by the late thirteenth century (some 70 years after his canonisation). The Dominican origin of Louis IX’s office may also explain why the Feast was not routinely added to the selected Franciscan missals: its Dominican authorship may have discouraged Franciscan communities from adding it to their calendars. His Feast is present in only one of the selected missals – C – and is an addition (*‘ludoyci regis francorum’*). However, no corresponding office has been added to the missal’s sanctoral cycle. C is dated by the art historian Marcella Degl’Innocenti Gambuti to 1288 (on the basis of the entry for Easter Sunday in its calendar), and its calendar is extensively updated. Rather than a special interest in Louis IX, the addition suggests both that it remained in use for a long period of time and that its users were unusually conscientious in the maintenance of their liturgical calendar. The ambiguous nature of Louis’s Feast, which was of interest to both the Order of Preachers and the Order of Friars Minor, may have contributed to the widespread absence of the Feast and its office in these selected missals.

5.2.7 Feasts of St Herculanus, bishop of Perugia

Dies natalis: 1 March (see Figure 11 in Chapter Four) and *Passio*: 7 November (see Figure 19 in Chapter Four)

The feasts of Herculanus (d. 549) the martyr bishop of Perugia – his *dies natalis* on 1 March and his *passio* on 7 November – are widely accepted by scholars as characteristic feasts of Perugian liturgical manuscripts, regardless of the particular spirituality of the communities using these manuscripts. Indeed, this is borne out by the selected missals: CSP, B and E (of which CSP and B are of Perugian Franciscan use and the Augustinian E is possibly of Assisian use) include Herculanus’s *dies natalis*, while C and D (missals used in Gubbio and Cortona, possibly by Franciscan communities) do not. CSP and B include Herculanus’s *passio*, while C–E do not. The wording in each case of the *dies natalis* and of the *passio* is identical across all the selected missals, suggesting the common nature of this Feast across communities,

²⁹ Gaposchkin, “Philip the Fair, the Dominicans, and the Liturgical Office for Louis IX”, 33–61.

both Franciscan and non-Franciscan. Only CSP rubricates either of Herculanus's Feasts – the *passio*. It is in fact one of only four rubricated feasts in CSP: even the Feasts of Francis are not rubricated.

5.2.8 Feast of Ubaldo, patron saint of Gubbio

Dies natalis: 16 May (see Figure 13 in Chapter Four)

Ubaldo, the bishop and patron saint of Gubbio, is commemorated only in C, which was made for use in that town. His inclusion in C and absence from the other selected missals is unsurprising but still of interest: while Ubaldo is celebrated in the calendar of C, there is no corresponding office in the Proper of the Saints. Ubaldo is thus treated in a manner similar to Herculanus: the lack of an office for the patron saint of a town appears to be common. This calls into question scholars' interpretation of the connection between a patron saint and his/her community, given that the commemoration of such a saint was frequently of a generic nature.

5.2.9 Feast of St Dominic

Dies natalis: 5 August (see Figure 16 in Chapter Four), and Translation: 24 May (see Figure 13 in Chapter Four)

The presence of Dominican feasts in Franciscan liturgical books is particularly interesting, given the two mendicant Orders' close relationship and perceived rivalry. All the selected missals include the Feast of Dominic on 5 August, largely citing him simply as '*confessoris*'; C is the exception in specifying Dominic as a member of the Order of Preachers. Only the Augustinian E rubricates the Feast, but this would appear to be in keeping with the general style of its calendar, which is more highly rubricated than the four Franciscan examples. Dominic's *dies natalis* was adopted by the Cistercians in 1235, at which time the Dominicans adopted the Feast of Bernard of Clairvaux in return.³⁰ The Franciscans appear to have followed suit regarding both Dominic and Bernard, entering into a complicated arrangement between the three Orders regarding the commemoration of their founders (discussed below).

³⁰ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 372.

5.2.10 Feast of St Peter Martyr (of Verona)

Dies natalis: 29 April (see Figure 12 in Chapter Four)

The Dominican friar Peter of Verona (also known as Peter Martyr) was killed in 1252 by Carino di Balsamo (an assassin hired by the Milanese Cathars) and canonised by Innocent IV in 1253; his *dies natalis* was celebrated on 29 April. Though van Dijk asserts that the Cistercians incorporated Peter's Feast into their calendar in 1235 (when they added the feast of Dominic), this is an error, as Peter was alive in 1235.³¹ The date when his feast actually entered the Cistercians' calendar is therefore not yet known. There does not appear to have been a consistent attitude from within the Order of Friars Minor regarding Peter: only two of the five selected manuscripts include his Feast. In B (probably of Perugian origin) the Feast is recorded as '*sancti petri martyris de ordine praedicatorum*' while in D (from San Francesco, Cortona) it is simply '*petri martyris*'. The Augustinian missal (E) does not record the Feast, which together with its inconsistent representation in the Franciscan missals, suggests that the Feast was not of high importance outside the Order of Preachers. The Feast of Dominic remained the only Dominican feast regularly included in Franciscan missals.

5.2.11 Feast of Augustine of Hippo

Dies natalis: 28 August (see Figure 16 in Chapter Four)

The Feast of Augustine of Hippo (354–430), the Church Father considered the founder of the Augustinian mendicant Order, is consistently included in the selected missals, both Franciscan and (naturally) Augustinian. The Feast (28 August) is rubricated in E (the Augustinian missal), but as has been observed regarding other feasts, this is consistent with that missal's high number of rubricated feasts and therefore is not solely due to the missal's use by Augustinian friars. Augustine is consistently cited as bishop and confessor, though no reference is made to his association with the Augustinian friars.

³¹ Ibid., 372.

5.2.12 Feast of St Bernard of Clairvaux

Dies natalis: 20 August (see Figure 16 in Chapter Four)

The *dies natalis* of Bernard of Clairvaux is an interesting indicator of the Order's inconsistent use of Haymo's Ordinal. The feast (20 August) was added to the friars' calendar in 1260 at the General Chapter of Narbonne, in defiance of Haymo's ruling that all feasts between the Assumption (15 August) and its Octave (22 August) should be pushed back outside the Octave. Haymo's Ordinal placed Bernard's Feast on 22 August, and yet by 1260 this was ignored and Bernard's Feast placed on its correct day, in return for the Cistercians' addition of Francis to their calendar.³² In 1272 at the General Chapter of Lyon, this decision was reversed and Bernard's Feast moved to 22 August.³³ However, the decision of 1272 seems not to have had any effect on the calendars of late-thirteenth- and early-fourteenth-century calendars. CSP and B–E all include Bernard's Feast on its correct day, 20 August. E rubricates the Feast.

5.2.13 Feasts of the Virgin

Purification: 2 February (see Figure 10 in Chapter Four)

The Feast of the Purification was celebrated in the ancient Church, but was not consistently present in the calendars of the Western Church until the ninth century.³⁴ It is unanimously celebrated in the calendars of the selected missals (one can assume its inclusion in E, though the month of February is missing), and is rubricated in three (B, C and D). Van Dijk does not discuss this Feast's history within the Order's liturgical activity, at least in part (one assumes) because of its common nature – as a major feast of the Virgin, it is unsurprising that it is included in calendars from missals used by all Orders and by the secular clergy.

Visitation: 2 July (see Figure 15 in Chapter Four)

An error by Luke Wadding, the eminent sixteenth-century Franciscan historian, initiated the belief that the Order of Friars Minor were responsible for the introduction and spread of the Feast of the Visitation in 1263. The feast was in fact not instituted

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Frederick Holweck, "Candlemas", in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1908), <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03245b.htm>, accessed 12/05/2009.

until 1389 by Urban VI, and was instituted by the Order in its calendar at the General Chapter of Assisi in 1390.³⁵ Despite van Dijk's correction of Wadding's error in 1960, the Visitation continues to be associated with the Order. CSP and B–E bear out van Dijk's correction: none contain the feast in their original calendars, and only CSP includes the Feast as an addition (in a fourteenth-century hand).

Our Lady of the Snow: 5 August (see Figure 16 in Chapter Four)

The Feast of Our Lady of the Snow (5 August) is Roman in origin, celebrating the legend of a miraculous snow during the restoration and renaming of Santa Maria Maggiore by Pope Sixtus III (432–440). The story of the snow (attributed to the intervention of the Virgin) did not begin circulating until some two hundred years after the church's restoration, and was not mentioned by Sixtus himself, suggesting it was not an historical event. Initially the Feast was celebrated only in Santa Maria Maggiore itself, but by the fourteenth century it was celebrated in all Roman churches, and was raised to a universal feast by Pope Pius V (1504–1572). Despite its Roman origin, the Feast does not appear in papal liturgical books until the 1220s, according to van Dijk.³⁶ The Order first acknowledged the Feast in 1269, when it was ruled that Dominic's Feast (which fell on the same day) should be celebrated the day after Our Lady of the Snow, unless it fell on a Sunday.³⁷ Van Dijk suggested that the Feast must have held some popularity in order to receive such special consideration, and yet acknowledges the 'unanimous silence' of Franciscan calendars regarding the Feast in the late thirteenth century.³⁸ Indeed, only one of the selected missals includes this Feast (C), and it does so as an addition, and the placement of Dominic's Feast is not altered. It would appear that even when extended to the universal Church, this Feast was not popular enough to warrant routine addition to existing calendars.

Assumption: 15 August (see Figure 16 in Chapter Four)

The Feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary is unanimously included in the selected missals' calendars, as one would expect of a feast celebrated throughout the Eastern and Western Churches (from before 500 CE and at least the sixth century,

³⁵ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 376.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 377.

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ *Ibid.*

respectively). The feast is rubricated in all but CSP (though this is unsurprising given that its calendar has very few rubrics).

Octave of Assumption: 22 August (see Figure 16 in Chapter Four)

The Octave of the Assumption (22 August) was added to the Church's calendar by Pope Leo IV in 847, though it was not celebrated uniformly throughout the Western Church until the Reformation.³⁹ Haymo's Ordinal of 1243–1244 raised the Octave to a major feast, so that those feasts falling within it (except that of Lawrence on 17 August) were moved to after the 22nd (as has been discussed regarding Bernard of Clairvaux's Feast, above).⁴⁰ However, this prescription does not appear to have had any effect on the calendars of the selected missals: all include the feasts between the Assumption and its Octave on their correct days, suggesting that Haymo's ruling was not widely embraced by all communities within the Order. Only E includes the Octave as a rubric, in keeping with its overall tendency to rubricate important feasts.

Nativity: 8 September (see Figure 17 in Chapter Four)

The Feast of the Nativity of the Virgin (8 September) is unanimously celebrated in the calendars of the selected missals, and its Octave on 15 September is included by all but D. The Nativity is rubricated by all except CSP and B, which are the least rubricated calendars overall. The Feast's Octave is rubricated only by E, which tends to rubricate its feasts more frequently than CSP and B–D. The Octave of the Nativity was not established as a major feast (equal to the Octave of the Assumption) until the 1245 Council of Lyons. Feasts occurring during the Octave were henceforth to be celebrated only as Commemorations (a lesser form of ritual celebration).⁴¹

Immaculate Conception: 8 December (see Figure 20 in Chapter Four)

The Feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary is included in only one of the selected missals (D) and then as an addition. This absence bears out van Dijk's claim that there is 'no consistent manuscript tradition of its adoption by the Franciscans in the thirteenth century.'⁴² Van Dijk corrected Wadding's erroneous argument that the Order had been observing the Feast since 1263, and his claim that the Feast was not

³⁹ Frederick Holweck, "Feast of the Assumption", in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (1907), <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02006b.htm> (accessed 8/2/2009).

⁴⁰ Van Dijk and Walker, *Origins*, 371.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 373.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 376.

common in the Order until the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is confirmed by its absence from the 35 calendars studied in the initial research for this dissertation. Amongst these liturgical manuscripts, only two Franciscan thirteenth-century calendars included the Feast, and it was not found as an addition to any thirteenth-century calendars.⁴³ Only one fourteenth-century Franciscan calendar included it, while three had added the Feast.⁴⁴ In contrast, amongst the non-Franciscan thirteenth-century calendars studied, four included the Feast in their original calendars and two added it.⁴⁵ Amongst non-Franciscan fourteenth-century calendars two included the Feast, while none added it.⁴⁶ It was found in one fifteenth-century Franciscan calendar. While celebrated in the Eastern Church from the seventh century and attested in England in the eleventh century, its introduction into France in the twelfth century provoked theological criticism from Bernard of Clairvaux, Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas. Although (the Franciscan) Duns Scotus supported the doctrine of the belief in Mary's freedom from original sin, the feast was not officially affirmed as doctrine in the Western Church until the Council of Basle (1431–1449).⁴⁷ The evidence from the selected calendars bears out van Dijk's understanding of the slow pace of Franciscan adoption of the Feast (as distinct from theological support for the doctrine, given by Duns Scotus and his Franciscan followers). Further investigation of the Feast's adoption by the Order and by the Western Church more broadly is needed before any more conclusions can be reached, but it is safe to observe that as with other feasts discussed here, Franciscan calendars do not demonstrate a unified

⁴³ They are: Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 262 (an Umbrian Franciscan missal) and Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 271 (a Franciscan breviary from either Perugia or Assisi) included the feast in their original calendars.

⁴⁴ The calendar which included the feast as an original entry is: Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 14 (a Roman missal, possibly used by the Franciscans at San Francesco, Cortona). Those calendars which featured the feast as an addition were: Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 8 (missal, possibly used by the Franciscans at Santa Maria del Verzaro, Perugia); Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 263 (Umbrian Franciscan missal); Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 319 (Assisian Franciscan missal).

⁴⁵ Those which included the feast as an original entry are: Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Ms. Med. Palat. 4 (Roman missal); Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 5 (missal, possibly French in origin); Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 611 (Augustinian breviary); Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 602 (breviary, possibly English in origin). Those which included the feast as an addition are: Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 30 (Roman breviary, used in Perugia); Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 599 (Augustinian breviary, English).

⁴⁶ Those which included the feast in their original calendars are: Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale, Magl. 36, Cod. 14 (breviary, provenance unknown); Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Ms. Edili 107 (missal used at Santa Maria del Fiore, Firenze).

⁴⁷ For further discussion of this feast, see: Le Bachelet, "Immaculée Conception", in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, ed. Alfred Vacant and Eugène Mangenot (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1908) vol. 7, column 987. See also Rona Goffen, *Piety and Patronage in Renaissance Venice: Bellini, Titian and the Franciscans* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986), 76–77.

attitude. It seems that in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, adoption of the Feast of the Immaculate Conception was contingent upon piety and individual communities' choices rather than on centralised rulings.

5.3. Categories of Interpretation

The evidence from the calendars of these selected missals provides sufficient information for an assessment of the role of liturgical commemoration in the formation of Franciscan identity during the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries in central Italy. However, it must be emphasised that these are initial conclusions, open to further debate. Observations from the preceding analysis of these calendars are best grouped under the following seven headings: 1) Rubrication, 2) Wording of entries, 3) Inclusion/exclusion of localised feasts, 4) Inclusion/exclusion of feasts from other Orders, 5) Relationship to the calendar of the Roman Curia, 6) Additions and absences, and 7) Adherence to Haymo's Ordinal. At this stage, it is appropriate to reserve broader observations for the final conclusion, which follows this chapter.

5.3.1 Rubrication

Rubrication of particular feasts is often taken to be an indication of the feast's level of importance to a community, as rubrics are by their nature highlighted text, and it seems logical that a highlighted feast is of greater importance than one written in standard black ink.⁴⁸ Despite scholarly consensus regarding the effect/meaning of rubrication, the calendars of CSP and B–E reflect great diversity in the rubrication of their feasts: it is fair to say that E is a highly rubricated calendar compared to CSP, for example. What is at first surprising is that the Augustinian E rubricates Franciscan feasts that the Franciscan CSP does not, such as the Feast for Francis himself. In fact, three of the five missals studied rubricate Francis's *dies natalis* (B, C and E), and only one of these (B) is unambiguously Franciscan (that is, named as such in its *incipit*). Similarly, the *dies natalis* of Anthony of Padua is a rubric in only two of the selected

⁴⁸ This is self-evident in a sense, since the use of red ink rather than black can have no other effect. For one discussion of rubrics, see: Christopher de Hamel, *The British Library Guide to Manuscript Illumination: History and Technique* (London: British Library, 2001), 17. As stated earlier, the understanding of rubrics employed in this dissertation's discussion is limited to feasts written in red ink in calendars, rather than including the more broad definition of the term as referring to instructions or non-spoken text in a liturgical book. Cf. footnote 49, 20.

missals (C and D), neither of which is named as a Franciscan missal in its incipit. Clare's *dies natalis* is not rubricated in any of the missals, while Elisabeth of Hungary's Feast is a rubric only in the Augustinian missal, E. In terms of feasts from outside the Order, a similar diversity of rubrication is found. The *passio* of Herculanius (patron saint of Perugia) is a rubric only in CSP and is in fact only included in two of the missals at all (CSP and B). His *dies natalis* is not rubricated in any of the missals. Dominic, Augustine of Hippo and Bernard of Clairvaux are rubricated only in E, which (as noted) is the most frequently rubricated calendar in this selection. The Feasts of the Virgin are frequently rubricated in B–E, while the Octaves of these Feasts are rarely rubricated, despite their importance to the Roman Curia's calendar.

This variation in the use of rubrics indicates that the rubrication of a feast was not necessarily an indication of its importance. It would seem that it was more a matter of personal taste on the part of the scribe: hence, the highly rubricated calendar of E. Whether rubrication can be taken as a reliable indicator of the importance of a particular commemoration is therefore called into question, suggesting a more nuanced approach to the interpretation of such scribal practice is necessary to the comprehension of the liturgical performances based on these calendars.

5.3.2 *Wording of the entries*

As in the case of rubrication, the wording of some feasts varies widely in the selected missals. The *dies natalis* of Francis is again a good example of this observation: while '*francisci confessoris*' is the most popular wording (found in B, D and E), he is also listed as '*beati francisci*' (C) and, most unusually, '*francisci qui fuit rector et institutor ordinem fratrum minorum*' (CSP). Anthony of Padua is most often recorded with reference to his membership of the Order ('*antonii confessoris de ordinis fratrum minorum*'). This was no doubt done for a pragmatic reason: to avoid confusion with the other (more famous) Anthony – St Anthony the hermit (c. 251–356), Church Father and founder of the monastic way of life. Similarly, Peter of Verona is entered as '*sancti petri de ordine praedicatorum*' in B, to distinguish him from the other major saint of the same name. Clare is only once cited as a member of the Order, in C ('*clare virginis prime de ordine dominarum*'); in all other cases she is listed simply as '*virginis*'. (In E Clare is missing altogether – this absence will be

discussed below in section 5.3.6.) The wording for entries for all other feasts considered in this chapter is standardised – there is little variation for feasts of other orders, local or Roman feasts.

The evidence collated here suggests that the wording of feasts was, as in the case of rubrication, a matter of discretion for the scribe. For feasts of other orders, local and Roman feasts, standard wording prevailed, but for feasts of great importance to the Franciscans, variation is found. This variation is sometimes attributable to pragmatic considerations (such as distinguishing saints of the same name), but it also suggests a level of personal preference on behalf of the scribe, as in the cases of entries for Francis and Clare. In a sense, one would almost expect feasts such as those for Francis and Clare to be more strictly standardised than feasts of lesser importance to the specific spiritual identity of the Order, such as local or Roman feasts. The fact that this is not the case suggests that the expression of specifically Franciscan spiritual identity in the liturgical commemoration of Franciscan saints was flexible: the formula of expression does not necessarily reflect the feast's significance or meaning to a community.

5.3.3 Inclusion/exclusion of localised feasts in a) calendar and b) Proper of the Saints

Two local feasts are represented in the calendars of the selected missals – Ubaldo (Gubbio) and Herculanus (Perugia). The *dies natalis* of Herculanus is celebrated by both Perugian Franciscan calendars (CSP and B) and also by the Assisian Augustinian calendar (E), while his *passio* feast occurs only in the Perugian Franciscan calendars, suggesting it is an even more localised feast than the *dies natalis*. The Feast of Ubaldo occurs only in C, which was made for use in Gubbio, suggesting Ubaldo was a more localised figure than Herculanus (whose feast is included in the missal used in Assisi as well as those used in Perugia).

While it is unsurprising that these feasts are absent from missals used in other areas (such as D, used in Cortona), the surprising fact remains that even the missals which include these local patron saints in their calendars do not feature a corresponding office in their sanctoral cycles. Although the relationship between calendars and sanctoral cycles is not a primary concern here (as discussed above), it is necessary to consider this discordance in the cases of Herculanus and Ubaldo in terms of the impact the absence of offices had on the construction of communal identity

through liturgical commemoration of saints. Of the 35 missals studied in the initial stages of research for this dissertation, none included an office for Ubaldo in its Proper, and only one included an office for Herculanus: Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 8.⁴⁹ The original parts of this Franciscan missal, probably used at Santa Maria del Verzaro in Perugia, date to the fourteenth century while its many additions (which include the office of Herculanus) range from the fourteenth to the fifteenth centuries. It is not possible to ascertain a date for the composition of the office from this one missal, but it would seem that even once an office was available, it was not widely copied into Perugian missals.

One presumes that in the absence of specific offices, the standard office for a martyr bishop was recited for both Herculanus and Ubaldo. But what does the use of a standard office imply about the commemoration of locally significant figures? Can we still construe specific local identity from a communal commemoration which used a standardised Roman office? Does the inclusion of the feast alone signify its importance to the social and political identity of the community using the calendar, or does the form and content of the office play a separate role to that of the calendar entry in the maintenance of such identity? These questions require further consideration and research before any firm conclusions can be reached, but at this stage it would seem sufficient to recognise that the inclusion of a feast in a calendar, even one of such localised significance as Herculanus or Ubaldo, does not necessarily mean that distinctive localised social and political identity is invested in the feast's communal commemoration.

5.3.4 Inclusion/exclusion of feasts from other orders (i.e. Dominicans and Cistercians)

The evidence from the selected missals suggests that mendicant communities did frequently include the feasts of the other major mendicant orders in their calendars; however this usually affected only the primary feasts of the other order. For example, Dominic was regularly included in the selected missals (appearing in CSP and B–E) but Peter of Verona was less frequently entered into these non-Dominican calendars (included only in B and D). Though Dominic's translation Feast was instituted in 1233, it does not feature in any of the selected calendars, suggesting that only the

⁴⁹ Its most recent catalogue entry is in Magionami, *I Manoscritti del Capitolo di San Lorenzo*, 53–55.

primary feast for the major saints of other orders were considered for inclusion. Augustine of Hippo remains a slightly unusual case, given that he is both a Church Father and the founder of the Augustinian mendicant Order. His inclusion in all the selected calendars is no doubt due more to the former reason than the latter. Bernard of Clairvaux is recorded in all the calendars as *'abbatis'*. His consistent representation is recognition of the important precedent set for the mendicant Orders by the Cistercians, the reformers of the Benedictine Order.

The politics involved in the inclusion of one order's feasts by another order must underpin all interpretation of this phenomenon in the selected calendars. As van Dijk noted, in 1235 the Dominicans and Cistercians formed a reciprocal arrangement regarding the commemoration of each other's major saints: the Cistercians included Dominic in their calendar, and in return the Dominicans included Bernard of Clairvaux. The Franciscans appear to have followed this move by the Dominicans, though van Dijk offers no date for when such a legislative ruling may have been made by the Order. The reciprocal arrangement between these three major orders regarding liturgical commemorations suggests the competition between the newer mendicant orders to inherit the mantle and authority of one of the great monastic traditions. The idea of such spiritual inheritance necessarily affects scholarly understanding of the self-image of these mendicant orders. As will be discussed below in section 5.3.7, observing each other's feasts on the correct day came at a price in some instances: the Franciscans appear to have been willing to disregard their own ordinal to facilitate the commemoration of Bernard of Clairvaux on its correct day. Was the mutual commemoration of saints by the Franciscans and Dominicans mere lip service in the race to inherit the spiritual tradition and authority of the Cistercians, or does it indicate a deeper, sympathetic relationship between the Orders' spiritualities and self-images? Further research about the relationship between Franciscan, Dominican and Cistercian calendars would be required to satisfactorily answer this question, which would also raise issues regarding the function of communal ritual celebration in the construction of distinctive communal identity.

5.3.5 Relationship to Roman Curia's calendar

Generally speaking, the major feasts of the Roman calendar were included in all the selected missals analysed here, such as the feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary

(Nativity, Assumption, Purification, etc.). The Octaves of these feasts were also included in most of the selected missals, though there is no indication that the feasts falling between a feast of the Virgin and its octave were reduced to Commemorations, as Roman legislation had decreed. Feasts that were more particular to the city of Rome itself, such as the Feast of Our Lady of the Snow, were less likely to be included in Umbrian calendars. Only one of the selected missals includes this Feast on 5 August (C), and interestingly the inclusion of this feast did not cause a shift in the placement of Dominic's Feast, as Roman liturgical legislation had ruled. Both these observations (that feasts between a feast of the Virgin and its octave were not necessarily lowered to commemorations, and that especially localised Roman feasts were not generally included in these Umbrian calendars) suggest a flexibility about Roman feasts in these Umbrian calendars which raises interesting reflections regarding their status as missals of the Roman Use. It would seem that a missal could still be considered Roman without special emphasis on distinctively Roman feasts in its calendar: the Roman nature of a missal was dependent more on the liturgical form of its Eucharistic rite than on the celebration of particular saints. The Order's close ties to the liturgy of the Papal Curia were not necessarily expressed through celebration of a similar liturgical calendar, an observation which prompts reflection about the broader issue of liturgy as a vehicle for communal identity.

5.3.6 Additions and absences

The complete list of additions to the calendars of CSP and B–E could stimulate a dissertation in its own right, given the fascinating insight such additions offer into the maintenance and revision of liturgical calendars in these five communities. The obituaries recorded by some calendars also make for fascinating study, as does the absence of particular feasts in some calendars. However, only some summary remarks about the selected feasts analysed in this chapter can be offered here. The five feasts of most interest as additions or absences are those of Louis IX, Louis of Toulouse, the Stigmata of Francis, Clare and the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

One of the most striking conclusions to be drawn from this chapter's analysis of the selected Umbrian calendars is that despite the claims of Franciscan liturgical unity from liturgical historians such as van Dijk, it seems that Umbrian communities of Franciscans were not concerned with maintaining a uniform and up-to-date

liturgical calendar. The Feasts of Louis IX and Louis of Toulouse are often used to date Franciscan missals, as has been discussed above. However, it would seem that they were irregularly added to missals written before their canonisation. While D included the Feast of Louis of Toulouse in its original calendar, of the other four missals (written before the 1319 promulgation of Louis's feast) only C included the Feast as addition. C is also the only missal to include the Feast of Louis IX, as an addition. This suggests that the community using C was unusually conscientious in updating its calendar, and more broadly it suggests that the Feasts of these two saints were not uniformly added to or included in Umbrian Franciscan or Augustinian calendars, despite the fact that their Feasts are routinely relied upon by both liturgical and art historians to date Franciscan manuscripts of the period.

Similar considerations arise in relation to the Stigmata of St Francis, which was not instituted as a liturgical feast until 1340 (incidentally, when Anthony of Padua's translation was also added to the Franciscan liturgical calendar). As has been suggested above in the discussion of this Feast, it would appear that it was not regularly added to calendars written before this date: only one of the selected missals added the Feast (D). This suggests a discordance between the liturgical and non-liturgical representations of Francis from within his Order: while the stigmata were a central element of the visual and written sources about the founder throughout the thirteenth century, liturgical commemoration of the event did not occur until over a century after Francis's canonisation. Indeed, even when it was established as a feast, the Stigmata of Francis was not added regularly to Franciscan calendars, and appears to have been just as likely to be added to an Augustinian calendar as a Franciscan one. Its widespread absence from the Franciscan calendars analysed in this dissertation could either be because the calendars of the late thirteenth century fell out of use before 1340, or because updating liturgical calendars in a uniform fashion was not a priority for Umbrian Franciscan communities, even when it concerned feasts of their founding saint. If the first possibility is correct, it is in itself a topic for further research: given the debate about ownership and production of books for the Order, it is surprising that serviceable liturgical books were not regularly updated and maintained for ongoing use.

A combination of these two possibilities is in fact the most satisfactory explanation for the rarely updated calendars of the selected missals. Updating liturgical calendars appears to have been at the discretion of the individual

community: for example the community in Gubbio using C were more conscientious in this regard than the community using B (probably in Perugia). In itself, this suggests the lack of centralised organisation of liturgy within the Order: while there may have been directives issued about the inclusion of particular feasts, there was no guarantee individual communities would obey them, and thus no way of ensuring the Order as a whole was celebrating the same liturgical calendar, even within Umbria. Such an observation is not confined to Franciscan feasts alone, but also applies to feasts of broader significance to the Church: the same irregularity is evident in commemoration of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, for example, which was instituted by the Order in 1390 but appears in only one of the selected missals as an addition (CSP, in which it is one of only two additions).

5.3.7 Adherence to Haymo's Ordinal

As noted in Chapter Two, it is not certain that Haymo was the Ordinal's author, nor is it known to what extent the Ordinal was implemented (i.e. used in the copying of new liturgical books for the Order after 1243–1244, when the Ordinal was written). Despite this ambiguity, van Dijk championed both the authorship of Haymo and the widespread implementation of the Ordinal, which he saw as the instigator of the second edition of the so-called *Regula* missal and breviary, copied and used uniformly throughout the Order in the mid to late thirteenth century. The evidence from the selected missals presented in Chapter Four and analysed in this chapter adds considerable weight to the doubts raised in Chapter Two regarding van Dijk's interpretation of the implementation of Haymo's Ordinal. As observed above, there is considerable discrepancy in the additions to the selected missals regarding both Franciscan and Roman feasts. The updating of liturgical calendars appears to have been a matter of preference rather than imperative: Haymo's Ordinal does not seem to have had a unifying effect. Disregard for provisions in Haymo's Ordinal is evident throughout the missals analysed in this chapter. For example, Haymo's Ordinal had ruled that Bernard of Clairvaux's Feast be celebrated after the Octave of the Assumption, altering the previous agreement between the Franciscan and Cistercian orders regarding the mutual celebration of their founder saints. However, in all the selected missals, Bernard of Clairvaux's feast is found on its correct day – 20 August – inside the Octave of the Assumption. All these missals were written at least 40 years

after the Ordinal, and yet its rulings were not followed. Similarly, the Ordinal ruled that the Feast of Silverius (20 June) should be moved to 21 June, to allow for the Octave of the Feast of Anthony of Padua to be celebrated on 20 June. Only one of the selected missals even includes this Octave (CSP), and even then, the Feast of Silverius remains on the same day.

That the scribes of the selected missals were aware of Haymo's Ordinal is clear: the Feast for the translation of Francis was added by the Ordinal, and appears in four of the five selected missals (the month of May is missing in the fifth – the Augustinian missal). Despite this, it appears that many of the decisions made by Haymo's Ordinal were never effected in the selected missals. This disregard for the Ordinal reflects the ongoing confusion within the Order regarding their liturgy: as Chapter Two discussed, throughout the leaderships of John of Parma (1247–1257) and Bonaventure (1257–1274), references made to the struggle for a consistent, unifying liturgy did not even specify the Ordinal as the source of such liturgy. Van Dijk's argument for the widespread use of the Ordinal requires reassessment in the light of manuscript evidence such as is analysed here, which suggests a greater level of variety than has previously been recognised regarding the inclusion and observation even of distinctively Franciscan feasts within the calendars of Franciscan communities in thirteenth and fourteenth century Umbria.

Conclusions and Directions for Future Research

The Codex Sancti Paschalis from the Thirteenth to the Twenty-first Centuries

This dissertation has investigated the development and meaning of liturgy within the Order of Friars Minor through the case study of missals used by late-thirteenth- and early-fourteenth-century Umbrian communities of friars. This exploration has involved questions of interpretation as much as historical evidence, primarily in terms of a re-examination of the foundational work of Stephen J.P. van Dijk OFM, an assessment of the methodology employed by art historians who have discussed the Codex Sancti Paschalis and its related manuscripts, and this dissertation's use of an holistic methodology for the study of such illuminated manuscripts. The starting point for the entire discussion has been the CSP, a missal which has the distinction of being one of the oldest Western Christian liturgical manuscripts in Australia, but which, despite this distinction, has been the subject of limited study. In these concluding remarks, the major theses from the preceding chapters will be drawn together to suggest a new reading of the function and meaning of liturgy for the Order of Friars Minor in its early centuries, which places the evidence drawn from the five selected missals into a broader context. The underlying theme throughout this study has been the concept of communal memory and the ritual activity that such memory stimulates. It is fitting, therefore, to offer some reflections on the changing role of the CSP as a site of communal cultural memory for the Order of Friars Minor across the centuries.

Reflections on the Liturgy's Role in the Construction of Communal Identity amongst the Medieval Order of Friars Minor

Previous scholarship to discuss the CSP and its cognate manuscripts has been primarily within the discipline of art history. Lack of conceptual clarity characterises much of this scholarship, which has concentrated on enlarging the list of manuscripts

attributed to particular masters (such as the Maestro di Deruta-Salerno and Venturella di Pietro) at the expense of establishing firm criteria for the attribution of manuscripts to these masters and discussing the production networks and relationships which must necessarily have existed between such commercial artists and the Order of Friars Minor. Indeed, scholarly discussion of the Order's production of books has been limited; instead, much has been made of the Order's attitude to the ownership of books, and its organisational procedures for the housing and use of books. Some scholars, such as Cesare Cenci, Bert Roest and Neslihan Senoçak, have discussed the Order's production of theological texts within the context of the growing influence and importance of the friars in Europe's major universities. In this context, there has been interesting research regarding the existence of friar-scribes, which is mirrored by the discussion of friar-artists by scholars such as Louise Bourdua. However, studies which have considered the scribal and artistic activity of the friars have largely ignored liturgical books, concentrating instead on theological and devotional texts. Scholars seeking to establish the Order's formal procedures regarding the writing and decorating of books (and other artistic endeavours) are hampered by the almost total lack of documentary evidence from within the Order. While the absence of such material creates difficulties for the researcher, it is surprising that no substantial research to date considers the complete production process of liturgical books within the Order, given their ambiguous status for the friars as both necessary and expensive. The production of such books provokes questions which touch on central areas of interest to scholars of the medieval Order, particularly the issue of communal poverty.

An holistic study of the production of liturgical books within the Order, as modelled by scholars such as Nigel Morgan, James Boyce and Els Rose, has been adopted here. Without being able to provide a definite structure for the relationships between the Order and commercial miniaturists, it has been possible to collect evidence for an informed understanding of the book production industry in Perugia and the Order's theoretical framework regarding the production and use of books. While scribal and artistic work appear to fit into Francis's conception of the permissible 'godly work' to be undertaken by friars, it is apparent that no centralised organisational framework existed within the Order to monitor and manage friars' activity in this regard – hence the frequent examples of friars accepting money for their scribal work, as discussed in Chapter Three. There appears to have been some discrepancy between the Order's ideal and the real practice of friars working as

scribes and artists, which is hardly surprising in the context of the fragmentation of the Order throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Indeed, the absence of clear internal guidelines for book production must necessarily have affected the distribution of liturgical books within the Order, though this practical aspect was inadequately discussed by the major scholar to have undertaken research in the area, Stephen J.P. van Dijk.

Van Dijk's thesis regarding the development of liturgy within the Order of Friars Minor has been subject to a detailed examination. His basic conception of this development was linear in structure: he proposed the Order began with a unified liturgy (with the distribution of the *Regula* edition of missals and breviaries in 1230), weathered disintegration (under the leadership of Elias of Cortona and his promotion of lay brothers over clerics), and was finally reunified through the leadership of Haymo of Faversham, particularly through Haymo's Ordinal of 1243–1244. There are problems with this conceptualisation of liturgical development within the Order, not the least being that there is in fact no manuscript evidence for a Franciscan missal before the 1240s, at which time the *Expositio Regulae Quatuor Magistrorum* by the Four Masters acknowledged the urgent need for just such a unified liturgy for the Order. In disparaging Elias and praising Haymo, van Dijk set the tone for subsequent scholarship that has largely viewed Haymo's liturgical reforms as both necessary to and definitive of the fundamental character of the Order in the mid- to late-thirteenth century, and perhaps most importantly, which has assumed that Haymo's Ordinal was widely used in the copying of Franciscan liturgical books. This representation of Haymo as a second founder of the Order is problematic, for it suggests a teleological approach to the history of the Order in the thirteenth century: Haymo can only be considered a second founder if the subsequent clericalisation of the Order under his leadership is taken to be the inevitable and correct course for the Order's development. If one considers Elias's privileging of lay brothers as the 'correct' direction for the Order (a position perhaps justifiable through an analysis of Francis's wishes for his Order's character, evident in documents like the *Testament*), then Haymo becomes the reactionary. Indeed, it is notable that Haymo was the first non-Italian minister general of the Order, a man whose life experience was of an entirely different character to that of Francis, his early companions, and the earlier ministers general. Van Dijk's privileging of Haymo and the increasingly institutionalised nature

of the Order under his direction involves a conceptual leap which has not yet been subject to an appropriate critique by historians referencing his work.

Van Dijk's thesis regarding the development of Franciscan liturgy hinges on two basic conceptions, which are unique to him: a willingness to accept a high level of variety in the manuscript tradition as unproblematic in the reconstruction of a distinctively Franciscan liturgy, and the lack of a distinction between missals *used* by the early friars and missals which are *named* as Franciscan. While van Dijk repeatedly acknowledged the variety of form, content and structure within those manuscripts he proposed were accurate copies of the 'lost' Regula missal, he did not see such variety as problematic to the reconstruction of a unified liturgical tradition within the Order. The logic in play was circular: the reconstructed missal and breviary were taken by van Dijk as both evidence *for* and evidenced *by* another 'lost prototype', that of the Papal missal of Honorius III. Indeed, van Dijk's overriding interest was in the development of Franciscan liturgy as contingent on the development and spread of the Papal Curia's liturgy, and the desire to see the friars as missionaries of this Papal liturgy colours much of van Dijk's argument. It is clear from the *incipit* statements of the selected Franciscan missals analysed here that the Order exhibited respect for the Papal Curia's liturgy, and even that it strove to follow that liturgical Use. However, the diversity present within the Franciscan liturgical calendars analysed here indicates that scholars must be careful when describing the Order's relationship with the Papal Curia's liturgy: respect did not necessarily equal uniform practice.

The nature of a distinctive Franciscan liturgy is not clearly delineated in van Dijk's detailed analysis – there appears to be no acknowledgment of the difference between missals used by the early friars (which, as has been argued, would most likely have been donated by other orders and by the Archdiocese of Assisi, which itself followed the Papal Curia's liturgy) and missals written either by or specifically for the Order. This analysis of specific feasts within the selected missals of the Perugian Liturgical Group has made it clear that Franciscan missals did not slavishly follow the calendar of the Papal Curia: Feasts such as Our Lady of the Snow (5 August) almost never appear in Umbrian Franciscan calendars, despite their importance to the Papal Curia. More broadly speaking, it is difficult to ascertain from van Dijk's analysis precisely what constituted a distinctively Franciscan liturgy; as Michael Bihl pointed out in 1926, it is difficult to conceive of a Franciscan breviary which lacked an office for Francis, but this is precisely what van Dijk's chronology

implied (he proposed the *Regula breviary* was published in 1230, but the earliest office for Francis – that by Julian of Speyer – was not written until 1232/35).

Even if we are to disregard the proposed edition of *Regula missals* and *breviaries*, it is not clear that Haymo's *Ordinal* of 1243–1244 was as widely used as van Dijk suggested. The analysis of the selected liturgical calendars offered in Chapter Five has demonstrated that on key points, Franciscan calendars directly contravened Haymo's rulings in order to maintain relationships with other orders: this is most clearly demonstrated by the refusal to move Bernard of Clairvaux's Feast to outside the Octave of the Assumption, as Haymo had decreed. The fact that ministers general subsequent to Haymo, notably John of Parma and Bonaventure, repeatedly called for liturgical unity without specifying the source of such a liturgy indicates the general state of confusion within the Order regarding liturgy. In the light of this discussion of the disorganised nature of book production within the Order, the lack of liturgical unity is less surprising: without clear structures for copying, decorating and distributing liturgical books, it is no wonder that the ministers general found it difficult to enforce a unified liturgical use or calendar on the Order as a whole as it rapidly expanded across Europe and Asia Minor throughout the thirteenth century. It would appear that the Order of Friars Minor, unlike the Order of Preachers in the same period, did not create organisational or financial structures to provide for the copying of liturgical books. The selection of manuscripts analysed has focused on only one small geographic area – four cities in Umbria – and even within such confines has not been able to demonstrate liturgical unity amongst the calendars used in these communities.

It has been argued that while there was respect for following the Papal Curia's rite, a unified, centralised liturgy was neither effectively sought nor achieved by the Order of Friars Minor. This argument counters the prevailing view of the development of Franciscan liturgy as both unified and unifying – a structure used by the Order (as by other religious groups) to unite and distinguish its members. The observations collected in Chapter Five provoke serious reflection about the function of communal liturgical commemoration in the construction and maintenance of communal identity. If the commemoration of saints can be interpreted as indicative of a community's interests, preoccupations and concerns (as is usually assumed), what does the manuscript evidence analysed here say about the Order of Friars Minor? The discussion in Chapter Three refuted the concept of a specifically Franciscan style of

decoration that in some way mirrored the simplicity perceived as characteristic of Franciscan spirituality. This reductive understanding of the relationship between image and meaning is even more questionable given that it relies on a conceptualisation of a single, uniform and simplistic Franciscan ‘spirituality’: Francis’s personal humility was not simplistic in character, and nor were the complicated fragmentations of his Order throughout the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries suggestive of a uniform, simplistic spiritual identity. It was proposed that in terms of decoration, the selected missals from the Perugian Liturgical Group did not exhibit a uniform style based on a monolithic Franciscan ‘spirituality’, but rather reflected the diverse aims of their miniaturists, whose styles are distinctive by virtue of their local community rather than ideology.

In light of the discussion of the decoration of the selected missals, Chapter Five set out to investigate whether the liturgical calendars of these five selected Umbrian missals exhibited a lack of distinctive uniform Franciscan spirituality (like their decorative programmes), or whether separate communities of Franciscans in Umbria did use their liturgical calendars as a way of establishing a shared communal identity, through the uniform ritual commemoration of particular feasts. Before this research was undertaken, it was anticipated that the selected calendars would demonstrate some measure of uniform Franciscan identity. However, the conclusions drawn from this analysis turned this idea around, and indicated that rather than being a *means of establishing* unified identity, liturgy was in fact a *mirror* of the diversity and plurality of Franciscan identities in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. This analysis has essentially been both a micro-history of Franciscan liturgy in several Umbrian communities and a test case for the proposed challenges to van Dijk’s theory of Franciscan liturgical unity. It was concluded that, contrary to the prevailing view of liturgical calendars as reliable indicators of *unified* identity, the calendars from the selected missals instead indicate potential for plurality and diversity present within the ritual communal activity of some Umbrian Franciscan communities. The use of certain feasts to date manuscripts, such as those of Louis IX and Louis of Toulouse, is not always reliable: not all Franciscan communities celebrated these Feasts, regardless of when their missal was written (i.e. this is true even of missals written after the canonisations of these saints). These findings complement those of Els Rose in her study of the Gallican Rite and underscore Rose’s challenge to the broader attitude of scholars towards liturgy in general, which has

been to seek unity in the manuscript tradition rather than to acknowledge diversity. It is a human trait to seek patterns where none are immediately evident. In the context of liturgical history, it is misleading to assume a level of control amongst medieval religious groups comparable to that of modern organisations: the methods for establishing and distributing a unified liturgy were subject to many practical and political difficulties, particularly in the spiritually and organisationally fragmented Order of Friars Minor.

If, as has been demonstrated through manuscript analysis, liturgy was not the primary means by which the Order sought to establish a unified communal identity, what was? It is suggested that for the Order of Friars Minor, as a whole and as a collective of smaller differentiated groups, the image of the founder was the most contentious and important element around which communal identity was forged. The divisions which fragmented the Order throughout the thirteenth century and which resulted in its formal division in the fourteenth century were primarily stimulated by competing understandings of Francis, the charismatic centre of the Order. The dynamic between these different understandings played out in divisions between different groups throughout the thirteenth century, though these groups used no formalised differentiated nomenclature until the fourteenth century. That these competing understandings of Franciscan identity all focused on Francis himself is indicative of both his charisma and of his Order's distinctive interest in the founding figure. The Order of Preachers demonstrate no such obsession with Dominic, for instance, who is depicted as the exemplar of an ideal Friar Preacher more frequently than he is as founder of an order.¹ Francis, however, was far more than a model Friar Minor:

¹ This depiction of Dominic can be found in many key early Dominican texts, such as Jordan of Saxony's *Libellus de Principiis Ordinis Praedicatorum* (c. 1236). A discussion of the treatment of founders within the Order of Friars Minor and the Order of Preachers can be found in: Anne Holloway and Anna Welch, "The Founder as *alter Christus*: Communal Identities in the Thirteenth- and Fourteenth-century Order of Friars Minor and Order of Preachers", in *Interpreting Francis and Clare of Assisi: From the Middle Ages to the Present*, ed. Constant Mews and Claire Renkin (Melbourne: Broughton Publishing, 2010), 75–91.

Saint Francis was wrapped in a mantle decorated with very beautiful stars. His five stigmata were like five brightly glittering stars, which gleamed with such light that the whole city seemed to be illuminated by their rays.²

This image of the founder from the fourteenth-century text *The Deeds of Blessed Francis and His Companions* underscores Francis's communal importance: the influence of the charismatic individual radiates over the wider community, and is a source of self-definition (for the entire city, in this case). In a sense this is true of all who were elevated to the rank of sainthood in the urban communities of thirteenth century Europe: their extraordinary lives and spiritualities distinguished them from the wider community, and from these individuals, whole communities drew inspiration and identity.

The influence of Francis on the city of Assisi is a topic large enough to require its own dedicated study, and indeed the centrality of his person to the Order of Friars Minor's conception(s) of itself has been the subject of increasing scholarly attention over the past fifty years.³ The issue is of major importance to this dissertation's conceptualisation of the Order's attitudes to liturgy and liturgical books. Francis's identity was positioned by his Order as definitive of its communal identity: to be a Franciscan was to imitate Francis, as he imitated Christ. Yet it was not precisely Francis whom they imitated, but rather competing images of him – images which were subject to evolution and editing. To choose this model of constructing communal identity was inherently problematic, ironically because of the founder's attractive charisma: his spiritual identity was perhaps too unique and his conception of the Order's mission too demanding to be emulated or even agreed upon. Even Francis's earliest companions could not agree on his intentions for the Order, as we see from the fate of Elias, cast as the Judas to Francis's Christ, a man who though chosen by Francis to lead the Order, failed to convince the majority of friars of his loyalty to Francis's ideals and was deposed as Minister General twice in the decade following Francis's death in 1226.

After his death, there was evident concern amongst the friars to find not only the authentic Francis, but also the authentic Francis *upon which all could agree*. Official calls throughout the mid-thirteenth century for the friars' personal memories

² Ugolino Boniscambi di Montegiorgio, "The Deeds of the Blessed Francis and his Companions", in *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents. Vol. 3: The Prophet*, ed. Regis J. Armstrong OFM Cap., J.A. Wayne Hellmann OFM Conv. and William J. Short OFM (New York: New York City Press, 2001), 499.

³ See Introduction, note 2.

of Francis resulted in texts such as *The Legend of the Three Companions* (1241–1247) and *The Assisi Compilation* (1244–1260), which exist in uneasy dialogue with the official *vitae* of Thomas of Celano. Various different Francises come to light in these texts: the humble nature-loving *poverello*, the fiery radical preacher, the favoured papal servant and supporter of the institutionalised Church, and perhaps most importantly the stigmatised *alter Christus*. The proliferation of texts about Francis suggests there were almost as many understandings of Francis as there were Franciscans, and alongside this variety came tension. In the fourteenth century, the multiple interpretations of Francis and his intentions for the Order resulted in a formal separation of the Spiritual and Conventual factions. As David Burr has shown, it would be anachronistic to speak of the Spiritual friars as a distinct group in the mid-thirteenth century – rather Burr suggests there were a variety of expressions of Franciscan spirituality which coexisted, however uneasily.⁴ The Order's formal split cannot be reduced to a single cause, but Pope Gregory IX's 1230 papal bull *Quo elongati* is frequently seen as a watershed moment in the Order's development. It is merely common sense to acknowledge that the lifestyle of the first small group of friars could not be expected to work for the international establishment that the Order so quickly became: by the mid-thirteenth century, it has been estimated that there were around 30,000 friars across Europe.⁵ *Quo elongati* dispensed the Order from considering Francis's *Testament*, which emphasised the friars' duty to avoid all commerce and property, to be legally binding. This pragmatic step may have facilitated the growing influence of the Order in university and court spheres, but it also sowed the seeds of division. An image of Francis continued to be sought as the foundation of the Order's identity, even while his actual desires for the Order were sidelined, and disagreements over the Order's development manifested themselves in the plurality of images of Francis that the Order created through the mid-thirteenth century.

It is not possible to ascertain precisely which groups of friars used each of the Franciscan missals analysed here, but in any case an understanding of Franciscan identities must go beyond the level of the community: we can speculate that each member of these communities likely had a different personal understanding of the identity 'Franciscan', influenced by factors such as family heritage, political loyalties

⁴ Burr, *The Spiritual Franciscans*, 12.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 4.

and civic identity. Indeed, it is more accurate to speak of identities than identity: while it is convenient to speak of the Order as a whole, it is inaccurate as far as the ritual activity of groups is concerned – different communities celebrated different liturgical calendars, seemingly without reference to a standardised norm (even if such a thing existed). The concept of identity as constructed and maintained through ritual requires a more nuanced appraisal than has previously been afforded it: though we may assume a stability of self-identity amongst the Franciscan individuals and communities who used the selected missals, the evidence of the calendars studied suggests multiple levels of identity operating within the one individual and/or ritual community. These multiple identities were not necessarily in competition, either within the community or within its individual members: as recent work in the sociological field of Identity Theory has discussed, individuals continuously formulate ways of negotiating their different identities:

. . . multiple identities are organized within the self into a salience hierarchy reflecting the likelihood that each identity would be activated. The concept of salience provides another way in which individual identities differ. Members of the same social movement, for example, each have an identity formed around their position in the movement. And, even though they may occupy very similar positions, the impact of their identities may be quite different because for one person their movement identity is much more salient than the other's – much more likely to be invoked or called up across a variety of situations.⁶

This understanding of the hierarchy of identities negotiated by individuals can also be applied to communities: in the case of the Order of Friars Minor in the thirteenth century, there appear to have been a variety of ways in which communities acted as 'Franciscan' – hence the ongoing controversy between groups with different understandings of precisely what was 'Franciscan'. Historians of medieval culture and spirituality could benefit from the application of the constructs of Identity Theory to interpretations of fragmented groups such as the Order of Friars Minor.

⁶ Peter J. Burke, "Introduction", in *Advances in Identity Theory and Research*, ed. Peter J. Burke, Timothy J. Owens, Richard T. Serpe and Peggy A. Thoits (New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 2003), 3.

The Codex Sancti Paschalis as a Site of Communal Memory

It has been argued here that the Order of Friars Minor, as a collective of groups with differing concepts of the meaning of Franciscan identity, in fact demonstrated that there was no such thing in the singular form – rather, there was a plurality of Franciscan identities, stemming from multiple interpretations of the charismatic founder. This plurality is represented in the liturgical calendars analysed here, which demonstrate the competition of different identities played out within the ritual life of a community. In this sense, it is argued that liturgy was not the primary means of establishing (or attempting to establish) a common identity within the Order: the real battlefield was the textual and visual image of the founder, rather than the ritual performance of liturgy. However, this conclusion does not negate the importance of liturgy in constructing a scholarly understanding of the fragmentation of Franciscan identities: in a sense, liturgy remains a vital symbol of this very fragmentation. Eliade characterised the symbol as that which ‘translates a human situation into cosmological terms; and reciprocally, more precisely, it discloses the interdependence between the structures of human existence and cosmic structures.’⁷ In this sense, the missals studied in this dissertation are the perfect symbols of Franciscan identities: they represent both the spiritual ritual activity of the communities which used them, while simultaneously underscoring the plurality of ritual activity that characterises the fragmented nature of the Order as a whole. These missals remain sites of cultural memory for the Order, albeit not a unified singular memory, but rather the competing memories of communities which were themselves characterised by a plurality of identities.

In this sense, a study such as this one evokes the tension between memory and the discipline of history as characterised by Pierre Nora.⁸ Objects such as the CSP function as *les lieux de mémoire* for the Order precisely because they embody continuity with memories of a collective past without necessarily engaging in the critical act of organising these memories, but even such categorisation of missals as *les lieux de mémoire* is inherently problematic, according to Nora’s critique of history and of historians who use the concept of *les lieux de mémoire* ‘in the effort to

⁷ Eliade, *Symbolism, the Sacred and the Arts*, 13.

⁸ Pierre Nora, “Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*”, trans. Marc Roudebush, *Representations* 26 (Spring 1989): 7–24. See also Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, ed. and trans. Lewis A. Coser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), especially 84–119.

establish critically a “true” memory.’⁹ Holger Petersen’s conceptualisation of the ‘polyphonic web of narratives’ which can be woven from historical reconstructions of the past addresses Nora’s concern about the modern historian’s quest for singular historical ‘truths’, rehabilitating the possibility of valid and valuable historical research. The present study of liturgical calendars highlights the value of Holger Petersen’s approach: these five calendars represent (in a literal sense) the memories of a liturgical year in five different communities, and stimulate both historical reconstructions of the identities which both shaped and were shaped by these communal memories and an awareness of the polyphonic nature of such reconstructions.

This study has been concerned with the production, use and meaning of missals within certain Umbrian communities of the Order of Friars Minor in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. In the context of such specific chronological parameters, it is also appropriate to remember that the manuscripts studied continue to be sites of communal memory for the Order of Friars Minor. This is a particularly appropriate consideration given the specific type of manuscripts analysed here: the performance of liturgy is an atemporal activity, which removes the participants from earthly time into a liminal space. These missals point towards a ritual which (in many respects) is performed by friars today much as it was in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Any Franciscan priest opening the CSP today will find its text relatively familiar – it represents an unbroken tradition. Indeed, Fr Vincent Long, the Guardian of St Paschal Friary in Box Hill in 1949 (when the CSP first arrived in Australia) was immediately able to recognise the intrinsic connection between his community and the missal, and to desire a ‘reunion’ of sorts: ‘What a wonderful thing it would be if it found its way home again to the Friars – at St Paschal’s College! What an inspiration it would be to our present students and the students for generations to come.’¹⁰ The Australian friars felt the CSP would be ‘at home’ in their community, despite its distant origins in thirteenth-century Perugia and its changed function from a used book to a preserved object. This change in function stimulates a valid and necessary reflection for the scholar regarding the cultural meaning(s) of such a change. That the Australian friars should desire to own a preserved, non-functional manuscript is indicative of its current function: it is a site of shared cultural memory. The CSP is not

⁹ Ibid., 9.

¹⁰ Kelly, “Codex Sti Paschalis”, 90.

just a beautiful medieval manuscript, worthy of conservation and admiration: it embodies an intimate connection to the spiritual heritage of all Franciscans. In a sense, it could be argued that the CSP is now a more reliable indicator of Franciscan identities than it was when made and used in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. As the analysis undertaken here has suggested, textual and visual images of the founder were the primary means by which the Order sought (ultimately unsuccessfully) to establish a unified identity, rather than through the enforcement of a unified liturgy. As a used book, the CSP represented the ritual activity and interests of one Franciscan community, rather than of the Order more broadly; as a preserved item of recognised historic significance, it transcends such limitations and can function as a symbol of the shared Franciscan heritage which reaches from thirteenth century Umbria to twenty-first century Australia.

Bibliography

1. Primary

- Arnald of Sarrant. “Chronica XXIV Generalium Ordinis Fratrum Minorum.” In *Analecta Franciscana ad Historiam Fratrum Minorum Spectantia*. Tomus III. Edita a Patribus Collegii S. Bonaventurae. Ad Claras Aquas (Quaracchi): prope Florentiam, 1897. English translation by Noel Muscat OFM. Malta: Tau Edition, 2009. http://www.i-tau.org/wp/?page_id=91 (accessed October 2009).
- Bonaventure of Bagnoregio. *Opera Omnia*. Tomus VIII. Iussu et auctoritate Rmi. P. Aloysii Lauer. Edita Studio et cura PP Collegii A S. Bonaventura. Ad Claras Aquas (Quaracchi): Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1898.
- Bonaventure of Bagnoregio. “Statum saec. XIII pro scribendis libris choralibus cum notis quadratis ad usum Fratrum Minorum”. Ed. Benvenuto Bughetti, *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 21 (1928): 402–412.
- Expositio Quatuor Magistrorum super Regulam Fratrum Minorum (1241–1242)*. Ed. P. Livarius Oligier OFM. Roma: Edizioni di “Storia e Letteratura”, 1950.
- Francis of Assisi. “The Earlier Rule.” In *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents: Volume 1: the Saint*. Ed. Regis J. Armstrong OFM Cap., J. A. Wayne Hellmann OFM. Conv. and William J. Short OFM. New York: New York City Press, 1999, 63–86.
- Francis of Assisi. “The Later Rule.” In *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents, Volume 1: The Saint*. Ed. Regis J. Armstrong OFM Cap., J. A. Wayne Hellmann OFM Conv. and William J. Short OFM. New York: New York City Press, 1999, 99–106.

Francis of Assisi. "Testament." In *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents, Volume 1: The Saint*. Ed. Regis J. Armstrong OFM Cap., J. A. Wayne Hellmann OFM Conv. and William J. Short OFM. New York: New York City Press, 1999, 124–126.

Jordan of Giano. *Chronica Fratris*. Analecta Franciscana II. Ed. Nicolaus Glassberger. Ad claras aquas (Quaracchi): Ex Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1887.

Jordan of Giano. *Chronica Fratris Jordani*. Collection d'études et de documents sur l'histoire religieuse et littéraire du moyen âge 6. Ed. H. Boehmer. Paris, 1908.

Ugolino Boniscambi di Montegiorgio. "The Deeds of the Blessed Francis and his Companions." In *Francis of Assisi: Early Documents. Volume 3: The Prophet*. Ed. Regis J. Armstrong OFM Cap., J.A. Wayne Hellmann OFM Conv. and William J. Short OFM. New York: New York City Press, 2001, 435–565.

1.1 Manuscripts consulted

Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 2 (Franciscan gradual, used in Assisi, late-thirteenth-century).

Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 262 ("Messale Sancte Elisabeth". Franciscan missal, 1280–1290).

Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 263 (Franciscan missal, fourteenth-century, decorated by Venturella di Pietro).

Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 265 (Franciscan breviary, c. 1322).

Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 267 (Augustinian missal, early-fourteenth-century).

Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 268 (Franciscan missal, late-thirteenth-century).

Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 269 (Franciscan missal, early-fourteenth-century).

Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 271 (Franciscan breviary, Umbria, late-thirteenth–early fourteenth-century).

Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 272 (Franciscan breviary, late-thirteenth-century).

Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 319 (Franciscan missal, used in Assisi, fourteenth-century).

- Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 599 (Augustinian breviary, possibly English, late-thirteenth-century).
- Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 602 (Breviary, possibly used in England or Germany, late-thirteenth–early-fourteenth-century).
- Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 611 (Augustinian breviary, possibly used in Assisi, late-thirteenth-century).
- Assisi, Sacro Convento, Ms. 614 (Franciscan missal, Umbria, fifteenth-century).
- Cambridge, Fitzwilliam Museum, Ms. 31 (Franciscan missal, c. 1420).
- Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 13 (Missal, possibly Franciscan, used in Gubbio, c. 1280).
- Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, Ms. 14 (Missal, possibly Franciscan, possibly used at San Francesco in Cortona, early-fourteenth-century. Scribal note names Venturella di Pietro as the miniaturist).
- Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Ms. Conv. Soppr. 233 (Missal, Firenze, c. 1275).
- Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Ms. Edili 107 (Missal, used at Santa Maria del Fiore, early-fourteenth-century. Decorated by Maestro Daddesco).
- Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Ms. Gaddi 7 (Franciscan missal, Umbria, late-thirteenth-century).
- Firenze, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Ms. Med. Palat. 4 (Missal, Use of Rome, thirteenth-century).
- Firenze, Biblioteca Nazionale, Ms. Magl. 36, Cod. 14 (Office of the BVM with calendar, after 1319).
- Oxford, Bodleian Library, Ms. Canon. Liturg. 370. Psalter, made for use in Padua, c. 1266.
- Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, Ms. 426 (Franciscan missal, 1254–1261).
- Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, Ms. 427 (Franciscan missal, early-fourteenth-century).
- Perugia, Biblioteca Augusta, Ms. 47 (Franciscan missal, Umbria, thirteenth-century).

- Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 4 (Cistercian missal, made for use in Maastricht, thirteenth-century).
- Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 5 (Missal, possibly French, mid-thirteenth-century – c. 1239–1250).
- Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 6 (Missal, possibly used at San Giovanni d’Acri, thirteenth-century.)
- Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 8 (Franciscan missal, possibly used at Santa Maria del Verzaro in Perugia, fourteenth- to fifteenth-century).
- Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 16 (Gradual, possibly Franciscan, late-thirteenth-century).
- Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 30 (Breviary, Use of Rome, used in Perugia, thirteenth-century).
- Perugia, Capitolo di San Lorenzo, Ms. 38 (Breviary, Use of Rome, possibly used in San Lorenzo, fourteenth-century).
- Todi, Biblioteca Comunale, Ms. 13 (Franciscan missal, used at San Fortunato in Todi, fourteenth-century).

2. Secondary

- Alessandri, L and F. Pennacchi. *Inventari della Sacrista del Sacro Convento di Assisi, compilati nel 1338, contenuti nel codice 337 della Comunale di Assisi*. Quaracchi: 1914.
- Analecta Franciscana sive Chronica alique Varia Documenta*. Tomus III. Ed. Patribus Collegii S. Bonaventurae. Quarrachi: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1887.
- Arasse, Daniel. “Fonctions de l’image religieuse au XV siècle.” In *Faire Croire: Modalités de la diffusion et de la reception des messages religieux di XIIIe au XVIe siècle*. Collection de L’école Francais de Rome 51. Rome: Ecole francaise de Rome, 1981, 132–146.
- Armstrong, Regis J. (OFM Cap.), J.A. Wayne Hellmann OFM Conv. and William J. Short OFM. “Introduction to the Liturgical Texts 1230–1234.” In *Francis of*

- Assisi: Early Documents, Volume 2: The Founder*. New York: New York City Press, 1999, 311–318.
- Assirelli, Marco and Emanuela Sesti, eds., “La Biblioteca del Sacro Convento di Assisi: ipotesi per uno ‘scriptorium’.” In *La Biblioteca del Sacro Convento di Assisi. II. I libri miniati del XIII e del XIV secolo*. Assisi: Sacro Convento, Casa Editrice Franciscana, 1990, 63–70.
- Avril, François and M.-T. Gousset, *Manuscrits enluminés d’origine italienne*, 2 vols. Paris: Bibliothèque nationale de France, 1984.
- Bandini, A.M. *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Medicae Laurentianae*. Vol. II. Firenze: 1792.
- Belting Hans. *The Image and its Public in the Middle Ages: Form and Function of Early Paintings of the Passion*. Trans. Mark Bartusis and Raymond Meyer. New Rochelle, NY: A.D. Caratzas, 1990.
- Belting, Hans. *Die Oberkirche von San Francesco in Assisi*. Berlin: Mann, 1977.
- Bennett, Jill. “Stigmata and Sense Memory: St Francis and the affective image.” *Art History* 24, no. 1 (2001): 1–16.
- Bihl, Michael (OFM). “De S. Francisci Legenda ad usum chori auctore Fr. Thoma Celansensi iuxta novum codicem Senensem.” *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 26 (1933): 343–389.
- Binski, Paul. “The Angel Choir at Lincoln and the Poetics of the Gothic smile”. *Art History* 20 (1997): 350-374.
- Birkedal Bruun, Mette and S. Glaser, eds. *Negotiating Heritage: Memories of the Middle Ages*. Ritus et Artes 4. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.
- Boccali, Giovanni (OFM). “Testi liturgici antichi per la festa si santa Chiara.” *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 99, nos. 1–2 (2006): 3–32; 99, nos. 3–4 (2006): 417–466; 100, nos. 1–2 (2007): 149–220.
- Bodleian Library Record*, 1, no. 11, Oct. 1940, 177–178.
- Bologna, Fernando. *La Pittura italiana delle origini*. Rome: Editori Riuniti, 1962.
- Bordua, Louise. “The 13th- and 14th-century Italian Mendicant Orders and Art.” In *Economia e Arte sec. XIII–XVIII. Atti della “Trentatreesima Settimana di*

- Studi*”, 30 aprile – 4 maggio 2000. A cura di Simonetta Cavaciocchi. Firenze: Le Monnier, 2002, 473–488.
- Bourdua, Louise. *The Franciscans and Art Patronage in Late Medieval Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Boyce, James. *Carmelite Liturgy and Spiritual Identity: the Choir Books of Kraków*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.
- Brooke, Rosalind B. *Early Franciscan Government: Elias to Bonaventure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Brooke, Rosalind B. *The Image of Francis: Responses to Sainthood in the Thirteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Brown, Peter. *The Cult of the Saints*. London: SCM Press, 1981.
- Bruning, Eliseus. “De vroegere mis-formulieren op de feesten van Sint Franciscus vóór het jaar 1570.” *Collectanea Franciscana Neerlandica* I (1927): 87–126.
- Burke, Peter J., T.J. Owens, R.T. Serpe et al., eds. *Advances in Identity Theory and Research*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 2003.
- Burr, David. *The Spiritual Franciscans: from Protest to Persecution in the Century after Saint Francis*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State Press, 2001.
- Caleca, Antonino. *Miniature in Umbria: I – La Biblioteca Capitolare di Perugia*. Firenze: Marchi & Bertolli 1969.
- Cannon, Joanna and A. Vauchez. *Margherita of Cortona and the Lorenzetti: Sienese Art and the Cult of a Holy Woman in Medieval Tuscany*. University Park, Pa: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999.
- Cappelli, Adriano. *Dizionario di Abbreviature Latine ed Italiane*. Milano: Ulrico Hoepli, Editore-Librario Della Real Casa, 1929.
- Carney, Margaret (OSF). *The First Franciscan Woman: Clare of Assisi & Her Form of Life*. Quincy, Illinois: Franciscan Press, 1993.
- Carruthers, Mary. *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

- Cenci, Cesare (OFM). *Bibliotheca manuscripta ad Sacrum conventum Assisiensem*. 2 vols. Assisi Regione dell'Umbria – Sacro Convento di Assisi: Casa Editrice Francescana, 1981.
- Ciardi Dupré dal Poggetto, Maria Grazia. “La miniatura del Duecento in Italia centrale.” In *La Miniatura in Italia: Dal tardoantico al Trecento con riferimenti al Medio Oriente e all'Occidente europeo*. A cura di Antonella Putaturo Donati Murano e Alessandra Perriccioli Saggese. Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 2005, 194–205.
- Ciardi Dupré dal Poggetto, Maria Grazia. “La miniatura del Trecento in Italia centrale.” In *La Miniatura in Italia: Dal tardoantico al Trecento con riferimenti al Medio Oriente e all'Occidente europeo*. A cura di Antonella Putaturo Donati Murano e Alessandra Perriccioli Saggese. Napoli: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 2005, 206–225.
- Ciardi Dupré dal Poggetto, Maria Grazia. “La miniatura nei libri francescani.” In *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi, Codici e Biblioteche, Miniature*, ed. Carlo Pirovano. Milano: Electra, 1982, 323.
- Ciardi Dupré Dal Poggetto, Maria Grazia. “Il primo papa francescano, Niccolò IV (1288–1293), e il suo influsso sulla miniature umbra.” In *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature*. Ed. Carlo Pirovano. Milano: Electa, 1982, 358.
- Condon, Veronica. *MS. Douce 313: A Fourteenth century Franciscan Missal in the Bodleian Library, Oxford*. PhD. dissertation, University of Melbourne. Melbourne: Spectrum, 1977.
- Costa, Francesco. “La liturgia francescana.” In *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature*. Ed. Carlo Pirovano. Milano: Electa, 1982, 298–303.
- D'Avray, D.L. *The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons diffused from Paris before 1300*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Dalarun, Jacques. *Francis of Assisi and the Feminine*. St Bonaventure, New York: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2006.

- Dalarun, Jacques. *The Misadventure of Francis of Assisi: Toward a Historical Use of the Legends*. Trans. E. Hagman (OFM Cap.). New York: The Franciscan Institute, St Bonaventure University, 2002.
- Dalarun, Jacques. *Uno sguardo oltre: donne, letterate e sante nel movimento dell'Osservanza francescana: atti della I Giornata di studio sull'Osservanza francescana e femminile*, 11 novembre 2006, Monastero Clarisse S. Lucia, Foligno. Assisi (Perugia): Porziuncola, 2007.
- De la Mare, A.C. and J.J.G. Alexander. *Italian Manuscripts in the Library of Major J. R. Abbey*. London: Faber, 1969.
- Degl'Innocenti Gambuti, Marcella. *I codici miniati medievali della Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca di Cortona*. Firenze: SPES, 1977.
- Delooz, Pierre. "Pour une étude sociologique de la sainteté canonisée dans l'Eglise catholique." *Archives de sociologie des religions* 13 (1962): 17–43. Published in English as "Towards a sociological study of canonized sainthood in the Catholic Church." In *Saints and their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology, Folklore and History*, trans. Jane Hodgkin, ed. Stephen Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983, 189–216.
- Derbes, Anne. *Picturing the Passion in Late Medieval Italy: Narrative Painting, Franciscan Ideologies and the Levant*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- De Hamel, Christopher. *The British Library Guide to Manuscript Illumination: History and Technique*. London: British Library, 2001.
- De Hamel, Christopher. *Scribes and Illuminators*. London: British Museum, 1992.
- Dimier, M.-A. "FOSSANOVA, ancien abbaye cistercienne d'Italie." In *Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques*. Ed. R. Aubert. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1971, vol. XVII, columns 1208–1211.
- Dowling, Fr Kristopher G. (trans. and ed.). *Celtic Missal: The Liturgy and Diverse Services from the Lorrha ("Stowe") Missal, Used by the Churches of Ireland, Scotland, Britain, France, Germany, Switzerland, and northern Italy*. Akron, OH: Ascension Western Rite Orthodox Church, 1995.

- Dreves, Guido Maria and Clemens Blume. *Analecta hymnica medii aevi*. 55 vols. Leipzig: Fues, 1886–1922.
- Durkheim, Émile. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. New York: Free Press, 1915.
- Ebner, A. *Missale Romanum in Mittelalter. Iter Italicum*. Freiburg: B. Herder, 1896.
- Eliade, Mircea. *Symbolism, the Sacred and the Arts*. New York: the Crossroads Publishing Company, 1986.
- Fleming, J. *An Introduction to the Franciscan Literature of the Middle Ages*. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1977.
- Foley, Edward. “Franciscan Liturgical Prayer.” In *Franciscans at Prayer*. Ed. Timothy Johnson. Leiden: Brill, 2007, 385–412.
- Frugoni, Chiara. *Francis of Assisi: A Life*. London: SCM Press, 1998.
- Galletti, Anna Imelde. “Insediamento e primo sviluppo dei frati minori a Perugia.” In *Francescanesimo e societa cittadina*. Ed. Ugolino Nicolini. Perugia: Centro per il Collegamento degli Studi Medievali e Umanistici nell'Università di Perugia, 1979, 21–23.
- Gaposchkin, Cecilia. *The Making of St Louis: Kingship, Sanctity and Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008.
- Gaposchkin, Cecilia. “Philip the Fair, the Dominicans, and the Liturgical Office for Louis IX: New Perspectives on *Ludovicus Decus Regnantium*.” *Plainsong and Medieval Chant* 13, no. 1 (2004): 33–61.
- Garrison, Edward B. “Post-war discoveries: Early Italian Paintings – II.” *Burlington Magazine* 89, no. 533 (August 1947): 210–217.
- Goffen, Rona. *Piety and Patronage in Renaissance Venice: Bellini, Titian and the Franciscans*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.
- Goffen, Rona. *Spirituality in Conflict: Saint Francis and Giotto's Bardi Chapel*. University Park PA: the Pennsylvania State University Press, 1988.
- Goodich, Michael. “The politics of canonization in the thirteenth century: lay and mendicant saints.” In *Saints and their Cults: Studies in Religious Sociology*,

- Folklore and History*, ed. Stephen Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983, 169–188.
- Goodich, Michael. *Vita Perfecta: The Ideal of Sainthood in the Thirteenth Century*. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1982.
- Gnoli, Umberto. *Pittore e miniatori nell'Umbria*. Spoleto: C. Argentieri, 1923.
- Gullotta, Giuseppe. *Gli antichi cataloghi e i codici della Abbazia di Nonantola*. Studi e Testi 182. Città del Vaticano, 1955.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Ed. and trans. Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Hamburger, Jeffrey F. “The Place of Theology in Medieval Art History: Problems, Positions, Possibilities”. In *The Mind's Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages*. Ed. Jeffrey F. Hamburger and Anne-Marie Bouché. Department of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University: Princeton University Press, 2006, 11-31.
- Hamilton, Sarah. “The *Rituale*: the Evolution of a New Liturgical Book.” In *The Church and the Book: Papers Read at the 2000 Summer Meeting and the 2001 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*. Ed. R.N. Swanson. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2004, 74–86.
- Harthan, John. *Books of Hours and their Owners*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1977.
- Heffernan, Thomas. *Sacred biography: Saints and their Biographers in the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Hen, Yitzak and Rob Meens, eds. *The Bobbio Missal: Liturgy and Religious Culture in Merovingian Gaul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Hinnebusch, William A. *The History of the Dominican Order*. 2 vols. Staten Island NY: Alba House, 1966.
- Ho, Cynthia, Beth A. Mulvaney and John K. Downey. *Finding St Francis in Literature and Art*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Holger Petersen, Nils. “Introduction”. In *Genre and Ritual: The Cultural Heritage of Medieval Rituals*. Ed. Eyolf Ostrem et al. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, University of Copenhagen, 2005, 9-26.

- Holger Petersen, Nils, N. Bell and C. Clüver, eds. *Signs of Change: Transformations of Christian Traditions and Their Representation in the Arts, 1000–2000*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004.
- Holger Petersen, Nils, M. Birkedal Bruun, J. Llewellyn and E. Østrem, eds. *The Appearances of Medieval Rituals: The Play of Construction and Modification*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2004.
- Holloway, Anne and Anna Welch. “The Founder as *alter Christus*: Communal Identities amongst the Thirteenth- and Fourteenth-century Order of Friars Minor and Order of Preachers.” In *Interpreting Francis and Clare of Assisi: From the Middle Ages to the Present*. Ed. Constant Mews and Claire Renkin. Melbourne: Broughton Publishing 2010, 75–91.
- Humphreys, Kenneth W. “Le biblioteche francescane in Italia nei secoli XIII e XIV.” In *Francesco d’Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature*, ed. Carlo Pirovano. Milano: Electa, 1982, 135–142.
- Johnson, Timothy J., ed. *Franciscans at Prayer*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Kelly, Celsus (OFM). “The Codex Sti Paschalis.” *The Provincial Chronicle of the Holy Ghost Province, Australia–New Zealand* 3/2 (1949): 74–94.
- Kelly, Celsus (OFM). “Franciscan Scholarship in the Middle Ages.” *The Catholic Review* 5 (1949:3): 136–213.
- Kennedy, V.L. (CSB). “The Franciscan *Ordo Missae* in the Thirteenth Century.” *Mediaeval Studies* 2 (1940): 204–222.
- Kennedy, V.L. (CSB). “The Lateran Missal and Some Allied Documents.” *Mediaeval Studies* XIV (1952): 61–78.
- Knox, Lezlie. *Creating Clare of Assisi: Female Franciscan Identities in Late Medieval Italy*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Lampen, W. “Manoscritti liturgici francescani.” *Studi francescani* 21 (1924): 69–77.
- Langeli, Attilio Bartoli. “Libraries, Books and Writing in the Orders of Friars Minor.” Trans. Edward Hagman OFM Cap. *Greyfriars Review* 17, no. 2 (2003): 135–159.

- Le Bachelet. “Immaculée Conception.” In *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*. Ed. Alfred Vacant and Eugène Mangenot. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1908, vol. 7, column 987.
- LeGoff, Jacques. “La sainteté de Saint Louis: Sa place dans la typologie et l’évolution chronologique des Roi Saints.” In *Fonctions de saints dans le monde occidental (IIIe–XIIIe siècle): actes du colloques*. Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 1991, 285–293.
- Leroquais, Victor. *Les livres d’heures manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale*. Paris: Mâcon, Protat frères, 1927.
- Leroquais, Victor. *Les pontificaux manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, 4 vols. Paris, 1937.
- Leroquais, Victor. *Les psautiers manuscrits latins des bibliothèques publiques de France*, 2 vols. Paris: Mâcon, Protat frères, 1940–1941.
- Leroquais, Victor. *Les sacramentaires et les missels manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des France*, 3 vols. Paris, 1924.
- L’Estrange, Elizabeth. *Holy Motherhood: Gender, Dynasty and Visual Culture in the Later Middle Ages*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2008.
- Libri, biblioteche e letture dei frati mendicanti (secoli XIII–XIV): atti del XXXII Convegno internazionale, Assisi, 7–9 ottobre 2004*. Atti dei convegni della Società internazionale di studi francescani e del Centro interuniversitario di studi francescani – nuova ser., 15. Ed. Società internazionale di studi francescani, Centro interuniversitario di studi francescani. Spoleto: Fondazione Centro italiano di studi sull’alto Medioevo, 2005.
- Little, A.G. “Description of a Franciscan Manuscript formerly in the Phillipps Library now in the Possession of A.G. Little.” *Publications of the British Society of Franciscan Studies* V (1914): 9–14.
- Lunghi, Elvio. “Altri ‘scriptoria’ nella prima metà del Trecento a Perugia.” In *Francesco d’Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature*. Ed. Carlo Pirovano. Milano: Electa, 1982, 253–254.
- Lunghi, Elvio. “Le Miniature dei Manoscritti Italiani.” In *Una città e la sua cattedrale: il Duomo di Perugia. Convegno di studio, Perugia, 26–29*

- settembre 1988. Ed. Maria Cianini Pierotti. Perugia: Edizioni Chiesa S. Severo a Porta Sole, 1992, 249–276.
- Lunghi, Elvio. “Venturella di Pietro.” In *Dizionario Bibliografico dei Miniatori Italiani secoli IX–XVI*, ed. Milvia Bollati. Milano: Edizioni Sylvestre Bonnard, 2004, 988.
- Magionami, Leonardo. *I Manoscritti del Capitolo di San Lorenzo di Perugia*. Roma: Jouvence, 2006.
- Mancini, Girolamo. *I manoscritti della Libreria del Comune e dell’Accademia Etrusca di Cortona*. Cortona, 1884.
- Manion, Margaret and Bernard Muir. *The Art of the Book: Its Place in Medieval Worship*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 1998.
- Manion, Margaret. “The Codex Sancti Paschalis.” *La Trobe Library Journal* 13:51–52 (1993): 11–23.
- Manion, Margaret and Anna Welch. “Missal [Codex Sancti Paschalis].” In *The Medieval Imagination: Illuminated Manuscripts from Cambridge, Australia and New Zealand*, ed. Bronwyn Stocks and Nigel Morgan. Melbourne: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, 56–57.
- Manion, Margaret and Bernard Muir, eds. *Medieval Texts and Images: Studies of Manuscripts from the Middle Ages*. Chur: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1991.
- Manion, Margaret and Vera Vines. *Medieval and Renaissance Illuminated Manuscripts*. Melbourne: Thames & Hudson, 1984, 28–39, no. 4, pl. 4, figs. 12–23.
- Mews, Constant J. “Remembering St Thomas in the Fourteenth Century: Between Theory and Practice.” *Przegląd Tomistyczny* XV (2009): 71–91.
- Mooney, Catherine M., ed. *Gendered Voices: Medieval Saints and their Interpreters*. Philadelphia PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999.
- Moorman, John R.H. *Medieval Franciscan Houses*. Franciscan Institute Publications, History Series no. 4. Ed. George Marcil OFM. St Bonaventure, NY: The Franciscan Institute, St Bonaventure University, 1983.

- Moorman, John R.H. *Richest of Poor Men: The Spirituality of St Francis of Assisi*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1982.
- Morgan, Nigel. "Gendered Devotions and Social Rituals: The Aspremont Psalter – 'Hours' and the Image of the Patron in Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth-Century France." *Melbourne Art Journal* 6 (2003), 5–24.
- Morgan, Nigel. "The Introduction of the Sarum Calendar into the Dioceses of England in the Thirteenth Century." In *Thirteenth Century England VIII: Proceedings of the Durham Conference 1999*, ed. M. Prestwich, R. Britnell and R. Frame. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001, 179–206.
- Morgan, Nigel. "Texts and Images of Marian Devotion in English Twelfth Century Monasticism." In *Monasticism and Society: Proceedings of the 1994 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. B. Thompson, Harlaxton Medieval Studies VI, Stamford: P. Watkins, 1999, 117–136.
- Muessig, Caroline. "Sermon, Preacher and Society in the Middle Ages." *Journal of Medieval History* 28 (2002): 73-91.
- Muir, Bernard and M. Manion, eds. *Reading Texts and Images: Essays on Medieval and Renaissance Art and Patronage in Honour of Margaret Manion*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2002.
- Mulvaney, Beth. "The Beholder as Witness: The 'Crib at Greccio' from the Upper Church of San Francesco, Assisi and Franciscan Influence on Late Medieval Art in Italy." In *The Art of the Franciscan Order in Italy*, ed. William R. Cook. Leiden: Brill, 2005, 169–188.
- Munby, A.N.L. *Phillipps Studies no. 4: The Formation of the Phillipps Library from 1841 to 1872*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.
- Museo Provinciale di Torcello: Guida alla visita*, Elena Culos (cura redazionale). Provincia di Venezia: Assessorato alla Cultura e al Patrimonio Culturale Museale, 2008, 23.
- Muzzioli, Giovanni and Mario Salmi. *Mostra storica nazionale della miniatura, Palazzo di Venezia, Roma. Catalogo*. Firenze: Sansoni, 1953, 253–254.
- Neff, Amy. "'Palma dabit palmam': Franciscan Themes in a Devotional Manuscript." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 65 (2002): 22–66.

- Nessi, Silvestro. "Documenti sull'arte umbra. Pittori perugini del Duecento e del primo Trecento." *Bollettino della Deputazione di Storia Patria per l'Umbria* 85 (1988): 101–156.
- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*". Trans. Marc Roudebush. *Representations* 26 (Spring 1989): 7–24.
- Østrem, Eyolf, J. Fleischer and N. Holger Petersen, eds. *The Arts and the Cultural Heritage of Martin Luther*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanums Press, 2002.
- Østrem, Eyolf, M. Birkedal Bruun, N. Holger Petersen and J. Fleischer, eds. *Genre and Ritual: The Cultural Heritage of Medieval Rituals: Special issue of Transfiguration: Nordic Journal for Christianity and the Arts*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanums Press, 2005.
- Østrem, Eyolf and N. Holger Petersen. *Medieval Ritual and Early Modern Music: The Devotional Practice of Lauda Singing in Late-Renaissance Italy*. Ritus et Artes 1. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.
- Pächt, Otto and J.J.G. Alexander. *Illuminated Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Oxford* 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973, no. 461.
- Palazzo, Eric. *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. Madeleine Beaumont. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Pasquinelli, Barbara. *Il gesto e l'espressione. I Dizionari dell'Arte*. A cura di Steffano Zuffi. Milano: Electa, 2005.
- Pattenden, Miles. 'The Canonisation of Clare of Assisi and Early Franciscan History', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 59:2 (2008): 208-226.
- Pearson, Andrea G. *Envisioning Gender in Burgundian Devotional Art, 1350-1530: Experience, Authority, Resistance*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2005.
- Petrucci, Armando. Trans. and ed. Charles M. Radding. *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy: Studies in the History of Written Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Pfaff, Richard. *The Liturgy in Medieval England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

- The Phillipps Manuscripts. Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum in Bibliotheca D. Thomae Phillipps, BT. Impressum Tupis medio-montanis 1837–1871*, with an introduction by A.N.L. Munby. London: The Holland Press, 1968.
- Pirovano, Carlo, ed. “48. Rituale.” In *Francesco d’Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature*. Milano: Electa, 1982, 256.
- Pirovano, Carlo, ed. “112. Messale francescano.” In *Francesco d’Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature*. Milano: Electa, 1982, 363.
- Pirovano, Carlo, ed. “113. Messale francescano.” In *Francesco d’Assisi: Documenti e Archivi, Codici e Biblioteche, Miniature*. Milano: Electa, 1982, 365.
- Pirovano, Carlo, ed. “120. Messale francescano.” In *Francesco d’Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature*. Milano: Electa, 1982, 374.
- Pirovano, Carlo, ed. “127. Messale romano.” In *Francesco d’Assisi: Documenti e Archivi, Codici e Biblioteche, Miniature*. Milano: Electa, 1982, 378.
- Pirovano, Carlo, ed. “128. Messale agostiniano.” In *Francesco d’Assisi: Documenti e Archivi, Codici e Biblioteche, Miniature*. Milano: Electa, 1982, 378–379.
- Rampazzo, Fulvio. “Fundamental Elements of Franciscan Liturgy: Inquiry on the Development of the Franciscan Calendar of Saints.” *Greyfriars Review* 14:3 (2000): 277–294.
- Rigon, Antonio. “Fratelli minori e società locali.” In *Francesco d’Assisi e il primo secolo di storia francescana*. Ed. Maria Pia Alberzoni et al. Turin: Einaudi, 1997, 259–281.
- Robson, Michael (OFM Conv.). *Francis of Assisi: the Legend and the Life*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 2007.
- Robson, Michael (OFM Conv.). *The Franciscans in the Middle Ages*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006.
- Roest, Bert. *A History of Franciscan Education (c. 1210–1517)*. Boston: Brill, 2000.
- Roncetti, Marco. “Per buono stato de la citade.” *Le Matricole delle Arti di Perugia. Palazzo della Penna, 20 giugno – 15 settembre 2001*. Perugia: Comune di Perugia – Volumnia Editrice, 2001.

- Rose, Els. "Liturgical Commemoration of the Saints in the *Missale Gothicum* (Vat.Reg.Lat. 317). New Approaches to the Liturgy of Early Medieval Gaul." *Vigiliae Christianae* 58, no. 1 (2004): 75–97.
- Rossi, A. "Nota all'articolo: L'arte dei miniatori a Perugia." *Giornale di erudizione artistica* II (1873), 350.
- Rouse, R. & M. Cartolai, *Illuminators and Printers in 15th Century Italy: the Evidence of the Ripoli Press*. Los Angeles: Department of Special Collections, University Research Library, University of California, 1988.
- Rouse, R. & M. *Manuscripts and their Makers. Commercial Book Producers in Medieval Paris 1200–1500*. 2 vols. Turnhout: Harvey Miller, 2000.
- Rubin, Miri. *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Rubin Blanshei, Sarah. "Perugia, 1260–1340: Conflict and Change in a Medieval Italian Urban Society." *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series* 66:2 (1976): 1–128.
- Rubin Blanshei, Sarah. "Population, Wealth and Patronage in Medieval and Renaissance Perugia." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 9:4 (1979): 597–619.
- Rune Havsteen, Sven, N. Holger Petersen, H.W. Schwab and E. Østrem, eds. *Creations: Medieval Rituals, the Arts, and the Concept of Creation*. Ritus et Artes 2. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.
- Ruysschaert, José. *Les manuscrits de l'abbaye de Nonantola. Studi e Testi bis 182*. Città del Vaticano, 1955.
- Sabatier, Paul. *The Life of St Francis of Assisi*. Trans. L. Seymour Houghton. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1894.
- Salmi, Mario. *Italian Miniatures*. Trans. Elisabeth V. Borghese. London: Collins, 1957.
- Schiller, Gertrud. *Iconography of Christian Art – Volume 2: The Passion of Christ*. Trans. Janet Seligman. Greenwich: New York Graphic Society Ltd., 1972.
- Sellar, W.C. and R.J. Yeatman. *1066 And All That*. London: Methuen & Co., 1930.

- Senoçak, Neslihan. "Book Acquisition in the Medieval Franciscan Order." *Journal of Religious History* 27:1 (2003): 14–28.
- Senoçak, Neslihan. "Circulation of Books in the Medieval Franciscan Order: Attitude, Methods, and Critics." *Journal of Religious History* 28:2 (2004): 146–161.
- Sesti, Emanuela. "Aspetti della miniatura umbra nei secoli XIII e XIV in rapporto all'Ordine francescano". In *Francesco d'Assisi: Documenti e Archivi; Codici e Biblioteche; Miniature*. Ed. Carlo Pirovano. Milano: Electa, 1982, 366-369.
- Short, William J. (OFM). "The Changing Face of Christian Spirituality: the Franciscan Tradition." *Spiritus: A Journal of Christian Spirituality* 8 (2008:2): 128–134.
- Sinclair, Keith Val. *Descriptive Catalogue of Medieval and Renaissance Western Manuscripts in Australia*. Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1969.
- Sinclair, Keith Val. "Manuscrits médiévaux d'origine franciscaine en Australie." *Archivium Franciscanum Historicum* 57 (1964): 367–377.
- Sinclair, Keith Val. "Phillipps Manuscripts in Australia." *The Book Collector* 2 (1962): 332–337.
- Smith, Kathryn A. *Art, Identity and Devotion in Fourteenth Century England: Three Women and their Books of Hours*. London: British Library and University of Toronto Press, 2003.
- Smith, Leslie and Jane H.M. Taylor, eds. *Women and the Book: Assessing the Visual Evidence*. London: British Library, 1997.
- Sorbelli, A. *Inventari dei Manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia* vol. XVIII. Firenze: L.S. Olschki, 1912.
- Sponsler, Clare. *Drama and Resistance: Bodies, Goods and Theatricality in Medieval England*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- Strachey, Lytton. "Gibbon." In *Portraits in Miniature and Other Essays*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1962, 152–165.
- Stocks, Bronwyn Clare. *Text and Image in the Early Italian Book of Hours*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Melbourne, 1998.

- Subbioni, Marina. *La Miniatura Perugina del Trecento: Contributo alla storia della pittura in Umbria nel quattordicesimo secolo*. Perugia: Guerra Edizioni, 2003.
- Suydam, Mary and J.E. Ziegler, eds. *Performance and Transformation: New Approaches to Late Medieval Spirituality*. New York: St Martin's Press, 1999.
- Toynbee, Margaret R. *S. Louis of Toulouse and the Process of Canonisation in the Fourteenth Century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1929.
- Turner, Victor. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- van Dijk, Stephen J.P. (OFM). *Handlist of the Latin Liturgical Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library Oxford*, 7 vols., 1957–1960 (unpublished typescript), I, 138.
- van Dijk, Stephen J.P. (OFM) and J. Hazelden Walker. *The Myth of the Aumbry: Notes on Medieval Reservation Practice and Eucharistic Devotion*. London: Burns and Oates, 1957.
- van Dijk, Stephen J.P. (OFM). "Notae quaedam de liturgia Franciscana mediante saeculo XIII." *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 54 (1940): 121–164. (The issue was published in 1942.)
- van Dijk, Stephen J.P. (OFM). *The Ordinal of the Papal Court from Innocent III to Boniface VIII and Related Documents*. (Completed by Joan Hazelden Walker.) Fribourg: The University Press, 1975.
- van Dijk, Stephen J.P. (OFM) and J. Hazelden Walker. *The Origins of the Modern Roman Liturgy*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1960.
- van Dijk, Stephen J.P. (OFM). "Some Manuscripts of the Earliest Franciscan Liturgy," *Franciscan Studies* 16 (1956): 60–67.
- van Dijk, Stephen J.P. (OFM) and J. Hazelden Walker. *Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy: The Ordinals by Haymo of Faversham and Related Documents (1243–1307)*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Vauchez, André, R.B. Dobson, M. Lapidge, eds. *Encyclopedia of the Middle Ages*. 2 vols. Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 2000.

- Vauchez, André. *The Laity in the Middle Ages: Religious Beliefs and Devotional Practices*. Trans. Margery J. Schneider. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.
- Vauchez, André. *Sainthood in the Later Middle Ages*. Trans. Jean Birrell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Vauchez, André. *The Spirituality of the Medieval West: From the Eighth to the Twelfth Century*. Trans. Colette Friedlander. Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 1993.
- Viladesau, Richard. *The Beauty of the Cross: The Passion of Christ in Theology and the Arts From the Catacombs to the Eve of the Renaissance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Vogel, Cyrille. *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*. Trans. and revised by William Storey and Niels Rasmussen. Washington DC: The Pastoral Press, 1996.
- Wadding, Luke (OFM). *Annales minorum seu Trium Ordinum a S. Francisco instutorum*. Firenze: Ad Claras Aquas (Quarrachi), 1931–1964 (3rd edition), VIII (1347–1376).
- Walker Bynum, Caroline. “Franciscan Spirituality: Two Approaches.” In *Medievalia et Humanistica 7 (New Series), Medieval Poetics: Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Culture*. Ed. Paul M. Clogan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976, 195–197.
- Walker Bynum, Caroline. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: the Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1987.
- Watson, A.G. *Catalogue of Dated and Datable Manuscripts c.435–1600 in Oxford Libraries*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Welch, Anna. “Presence and Absence: Reading Clare of Assisi in Franciscan Liturgy.” In *Gender, Catholicism and Spirituality: Women and the Roman Catholic Church in Britain and Europe 1200–1900*. Ed. Carmen M. Mangion and Laurence Lux-Sterritt. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011, 19–37.
- Wood, Jeryldene. “Perceptions of Holiness in Thirteenth-Century Italian Painting: Clare of Assisi.” *Art History* 14 (1991): 301–328.

Wood, Jeryldene. *Women, Art and Spirituality: The Poor Clares of Early Modern Italy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Young, Karl. *The Drama of the Medieval Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

Appendix

Liturgical Contents of the Codex Sancti Paschalis

Calendar

f. 1r/p.3	January
f. 1v/p.4	February
f. 2r/p.5	March ¹
f. 2v/p.6	April
f. 3r/p.7	May
f. 3v/p.8	June
f. 4r/p.9	July
f. 4v/p.10	August
f. 5r/p.11	September
f. 5v/p.12	October
f. 6r/p.13	November
f. 6v/p.14	December

Advent and Christmastide

f. 7r ^a /p.15	<u>Incipit of missal</u> – ‘Incipit ordo missalis fratrum minor[um] sec[un]d[u]m consuetudine[m] romane curie.’
--------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

¹ In the binding completed by George Bretherton for Sir Thomas Phillipps in 1849, the folio of March and April was swapped with that of October and September. This error was corrected by the recent rebinding undertaken by the State Library of Victoria (2007–2008), as the error was not considered to be of historical significance.

- f. 7r^b/p.15 First Sunday of Advent, Station at St Mary Major – ‘Dominica prima de adventu. Statio ad s[an]c[t]a[m] maria[m] maiore[m].’
- f. 8r^b/p.17 Second Sunday of Advent, Station at the Holy Cross – ‘Dominica. ii. de adue[n]tu. St[a]t[i]o ad s[an]c[t]am cruce[m].’
- f. 9v^a/p.20 Third Sunday of Advent, Station at St Peter’s – ‘Do[mini]c[a] in de adue[n]tu. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m petrum.’
- f. 10v^a/p.22 Wednesday in Ember week in Advent, Station at St Mary Major – ‘Feria. iii. tpm[−]. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]am maria[m] maiore[m]’
- f. 12r^b/p.25 Friday in Ember week in Advent, Station at the Twelve Apostles – ‘F[e]r[i]a. vi. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]os. xii. ap[osto]los.’
- f. 13r^a/p.27 Saturday in Ember week in Advent, Station at St Peter’s – ‘Sabbata. St[ati]o ad sanctu[m] petrum.’
- f. 16v^a/p.34 Fourth Sunday of Advent, Station at the Twelve Apostles – ‘Dom[in]ica. iii. de adue[n]tu. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]os duodecim ap[osto]los.’
- f. 17r^b/p.35 Vigil of the Nativity of our Lord, Station at St Mary Major – ‘uigilia nati[uitatis] dom[in]i. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]am maria[m] maiorem.’
- f. 18r^a/p.37 Christmas, First Mass at Midnight, Station at St Mary Major at the Altar of the crib – ‘In natiuitate do[mini]. in p[ri]ma missa. Statio ad s[an]c[t]am maria[m] maiore[m] ad presepe.’
- f. 19v^a/p.40 Christmas, Second Mass at Dawn, Station at St Anastasia’s – ‘In sec[un]da missa. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]am anastasi[am]’
- f. 20v^b/p.42 Christmas, Third Mass during the Day, Station at St Mary Major – ‘ad missa[m] maiore[m] St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]a[m] maria[m] maiore[m]’
- f. 22r^b/p.45 Mass for St Stephen, First Martyr, Station at St Stephen’s on the Coelian Hill – ‘In sancti steph[an]i p[r]oto m[arty]ris. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m steph[anu]m in celio mo[n]te.’
- f. 23v^a/p.48 Mass for St John, Apostle and Evangelist, Station at St Mary Major – ‘In festo sancti ioh[an]is ap[osto]li eua[n]g[eliste]. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]am maria[m] maiore[m]’

- f. 24v^a/p.50 Mass for the Holy Innocents, Station at St Paul's – 'In festo s[an]c[t]orum innoce[n]t[i]i. St[at]io ad s[an]c[tu]m paulu[m].'
- f. 25v^b/p.52 Mass for St Thomas, Archbishop and Martyr – 'In festo s[an]c[t]i thome a[r]chiepi[scopos] [et] m[artyris].'
- f. 26v^b/p.54 The Sunday before the Octave of the Nativity – 'Do[mini]c[a] infra oct[au]am natiuitatis d[omi]ni.'
- f. 27v^b/p.56 Mass for St Sylvester, Pope and Confessor – 'In s[an]c[t]i silu[est]ri pape [et] conf[essoris].'
- f. 28r^b/p.57 Octave of the Nativity, Station at St Mary's Beyond the Tiber – 'In octaua natiuitatis do[mino]. St[at]io ad sa[n]ctam maria[m] tra[n]s tyberi[m].'
- f. 29r^a/p.59 Mass for the Octave of St John – 'I[n] oct[au]a sancti joh[ann]is . . .'
Mass for the Octave of St Innocent – 'I[n] oct[au]a s[an]c[t]o[rum] innoce[n]tum
The Vigil of the Epiphany – 'I[n] uigilia epyph[an]ie'
- f. 29v^a/p.60 Epiphany of our Lord, Station at St Peter's – 'In eph[iph]ania. St[at]io ad s[an]c[tu]m petru[m]'
- f. 31r^a/p.63 Sunday after the Epiphany – 'Do[mini]ca in fra octa[ua]m. Epyph[an]ie'
- f. 32v^b/p.66 Second Sunday after the Epiphany – 'Do[mini]ca. ii. po[st] epyph[an]iam.'
- f. 34r^a/p.69 Third Sunday after the Epiphany – 'Do[mini]c[a] iii. po[st] epyph[an]iam.'
- f. 35r^b/p.71 Fourth Sunday after the Epiphany – 'Do[mini]c[a]. iiii. p[ost] epyph[an]iam'
- f. 35v^b/p.72 Fifth Sunday after the Epiphany – 'Do[mini]c[a]. v. po[st] epyph[an]iam'

- f. 36v^a/p.74 Septuagesima Sunday, Station at St Laurence Outside the Walls – ‘Do[mini]c[a] in septuagesima. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m laurentiu[m] extra mures’
- f. 38r^a/p.77 Sexagesima Sunday, Station at St Paul’s – ‘Do[mini]ca in lx. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tum] paulum.’
- f. 40r^a/p.81 Quinquagesima Sunday, Station at St Peter’s – ‘Do[mini]c[a] i[n] qu[in]quagesima. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m petru[m].’
- f. 41v^a/p.84 Ash Wednesday Blessing of the Ashes – ‘F[e]r[ia]. iiii cinerum’
- f. 43r^a/p.87 Ash Wednesday Mass, Station at St Sabina’s – ‘deinde d[icitu]r missa. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]am sabina[m]’
- f. 44v^a/p.90 Thursday after Ash Wednesday, Station at St George’s – ‘F[e]r[ia]. V. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tum] georgiu[m]’
- f. 45v^b/p.92 Friday after Ash Wednesday, Station at SS John and Paul – ‘F[e]r[ia]. vi St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]os ioh[anne]m [et] paulu[m]’
- f. 47r^a/p.95 Saturday after Ash Wednesday, Station at St Tryphon’s – ‘Sabb[at]o. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m triphone[m]’

Lent and Eastertide

- f. 48r^b/p.97 First Sunday in Lent, Station at St John Lateran – ‘D[omi]nica in quadragesima. St[atio] ad s[an]c[tu]m ioh[ane]m in laterano’
- f. 49v^b/p.100 Monday of the First Week in Lent, Station at St Peter’s Chains – ‘Feria ii. St[ati]o ad sanctu[m] petru[m] ad uincula’
- f. 51r^b/p.103 Tuesday of the First Week in Lent, Station at St Anastasia’s – ‘F[e]r[ia]. iii. St[atio] ad s[an]c[t]am Anastasia[m]’
- f. 52r^b/p.105 Wednesday of the First Week in Lent, Station at St Mary Major – ‘F[e]r[ia].iiii. iii. t[em]p[oru]m. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]am mariam maiore[m]’
- f. 54r^b/p.109 Thursday of the First Week in Lent, Station at St Laurence’s in Panisperna – ‘F[e]r[ia]. v. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m lavre[n]tiu[m] palisp[er]ne’

- f. 55v^a/p.112 Friday of Ember Week in Lent, Station at the Church of the Twelve Apostles – ‘F[e]r[ia] v. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]os xii ap[osto]los’
- f. 57r^a/p.115 Saturday of Ember Week in Lent, Station at St Peter’s – ‘Sabb[at]o. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m petrum’
- f. 59v^b/p.120 Second Sunday in Lent, Station at St Mary’s in Domnica – ‘Do[mini]ca. ii. in quadrage[s]i[m]a. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]am maria[m] in d[om]nicam’
- f. 60v^a/p.122 Monday of the Second Week in Lent, Station at St Clement’s – ‘F[e]r[ia]. ii. St[ati]o ad sa[n]c[tu]m clementem’
- f. 61v^b/p.124 Tuesday of the Second Week in Lent, Station at St Balbina’s – ‘F[e]r[ia]. iii St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]am balbinam’
- f. 63r^a/p.127 Wednesday of the Second Week in Lent, Station at St Cecilia’s – ‘F[e]r[ia]. iiiii. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]a[m] cecilia[m]’
- f. 64r^b/p.129 Thursday of the Second Week in Lent, Station at St Mary’s Beyond the Tiber – ‘F[e]r[ia]. v. St[ati]o ad sancta[m] maria[m] transtiberim’
- f. 65v^b/p.132 Friday of the Second Week in Lent, Station at St Vitalis’s – ‘F[e]r[ia] vi. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m uitale[m]’
- f. 67v^a/p.136 Saturday of the Second Week in Lent, Station at SS Marcellinus and Peter’s – ‘Sabb[at]o St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]os marcellu[m] [et] petru[m]’
- f. 70v^a/p.142 Third Sunday in Lent, Station at St Laurence’s Outside the Walls – ‘Do[mini]ca. iii. iiixl. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m laure[n]tium foris murum’
- f. 72r^a/p.145 Monday of the Third Week in Lent, Station at St Mark’s – ‘F[e]r[ia] ii. St[ati]o ad sa[n]c[tu]m marcum’
- f. 73v^b/p.148 Tuesday of the Third Week in Lent, Station at St Pudentiana’s – ‘F[e]r[ia]. iii. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]am pote[n]tiana[m]’
- f. 75r^a/p.151 Wednesday of the Third Week in Lent, Station at St Sixtus’s – ‘F[e]r[ia] iiiii. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m sixtu[m]’
- f. 76v^a/p.154 Thursday of the Third Week in Lent, Station at SS Cosmas and Damian – ‘F[e]r[ia]. v. St[ati]o ad sanctu[m] cosma[m] et damiani’

- f. 77^v/p.156 Friday of the Third Week in Lent, Station at St Laurence's in Lucina –
 'F[e]r[ia]. vi. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m laure[n]tium in lucina'
- f. 80^r/p.161 Saturday of the Third Week in Lent, Station at St Susanna's –
 'Sabb[at]o. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]a[m] susa[n]nam.'
- f. 83^r/p.167 Fourth Sunday in Lent, Station at the Basilica of the Holy Cross in
 Jerusalem – 'D[omi]nica. iiiii. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]am ier[oso]l[y]m'
- f. 84^v/p.170 Monday of the Fourth Week in Lent, Station at the Four Holy Crowned
 Martyrs – 'F[e]ria. ii. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]os iiiii coronatos'
- f. 86^a/p.174 Tuesday of the Fourth Week in Lent, Station at St Laurence's –
 'F[e]r[ia] iii. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m laure[n]tium'
- f. 88^r/p.177 Wednesday of the Fourth Week in Lent, Station at St Paul's –
 'F[e]r[ia]. iiiii. S[tatio] ad s[an]c[tu]m paulu[m]'
- f. 90^v/p.182 Thursday of the Fourth Week in Lent, Station at St Sylvester's –
 'F[e]r[ia] v. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m siluestru[m]'
- f. 92^r/p.185 Friday of the Fourth Week in Lent, Station at St Eusebius's –
 'F[e]r[ia]. vi. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m eusebiu[m]'
- f. 95^r/p.191 Saturday of the Fourth Week in Lent, Station at St Nicholas's in
 Carcere – 'Sabb[at]o. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m nicolau[m] de carce[re]'
- f. 96^r/p.193 First Passion Sunday, Station at St Peter's – 'Do[mini]c[a] de
 passio[n]e. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m petru[m]'
- f. 97^v/p.196 Monday in Passion Week, Station at St Chrysogonus's – 'F[e]r[ia]. ii.
 St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m g[r]isochonum'
- f. 99^r/p.199 Tuesday in Passion Week, Station at St Cyriacus's – 'F[e]r[ia]. iii.
 St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m cyriacu[m]'
- f. 100^v/p.202 Wednesday in Passion Week, Station at St Marcellus's – 'F[e]r[ia]. iiiii.
 St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m marcellu[m]'
- f. 102^r/p.205 Thursday in Passion Week, Station at St Apollinaris's – 'F[e]r[ia]. v.
 St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m apolinarem'

- f. 103v^b/p.208 Friday in Passion Week, Station at St Stephen's on Mount Coelius – 'F[e]r[ia]. vi. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m steph[anu]m i[n] celio mo[n]te'
- f. 104v^b–105r^a/p.210–211 Saturday in Passion Week, Station at St John's Before the Latin Gate – 'Sabbato St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]em ioh[ann]em ante porta[m] latina[m]
- f. 106v^b/p.214 Second Passion Sunday (Palm Sunday): Blessing, Distribution and Procession of Palms – 'In die palmaru[m] completa te[r]tia et aspersione . . .'
- f. 112v^a/p.226 Second Passion Sunday (Palm Sunday): Mass, Station at St John Lateran – 'Ad missa[m] St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]im ioh[anne]m i[n] lateranum'
- f. 119v^b/p.240 Monday in Holy Week, Station at St Praxedes's – 'F[e]r[ia] ii. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]am praxedem'
- f. 120v^b/p.242 Tuesday in Holy Week, Station at St Prisca's – 'F[e]r[ia] iii. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]am prisca[m]'
- f. 126r^b/p.253 Wednesday in Holy Week, Station at St Mary Major – 'F[e]r[ia] iiiii. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]a[m] maria[m] maiore[m]'
- f. 132v^b/p.266 Holy Thursday, Station at St John Lateran: Commemoration of the Last Supper – 'F[e]r[ia]. v. in cena d[omin]i St[atio] ad s[an]c[tu]m ioh[anne]m i[n] lateranv[m]'
- f. 136v^b/p.274 Good Friday: First Part, the Lessons – 'F[e]r[ia] vi. in pasceue hora sexta fr[at]res . . .'
- f. 142r^b/p.285 Good Friday: Second Part, the Solemn Collects – 'Deinde sacerdos dicit . . .'
- f. 144v^a/p.290 Good Friday: Third Part, the Solemn Veneration of the Cross – 'Completis orationib[us]: sacerdos deposita . . .'
- f. 146v^b/p.294 Good Friday: Fourth Part, the Communion – 'Dum supra . . .'
- f. 148r^a/p.297 Easter Vigil: First Part, the Message of Easter – 'Sabbato s[an]c[t]o hora'

f. 154r/p.309 Easter Vigil: Second Part, the Baptismal Regeneration – ‘Completa benedictio[n]e cerei’

f. 167v^a/p.336 Eastertide begins, Mass of Easter Night – ‘Incip[it] solemnit[erne] . . .’

Ordinary of the Mass

f. 171r^b/p.343 Ordinary of the Mass, Preparation – ‘Paratus sacerdos cum i[n]trat ad altare’

f. 171v^b/p.344 Ordinary of the Mass, First Part: Before the Sacrifice – ‘D[omi]n[u]s uob[is]cum’

Introit, Kyrie, Collect, Epistle, Gradual & Alleluia or Tract, Munda Cor, Gospel, Creed.

f. 172r^a/p.345 Ordinary of the Mass, First Part: Before the Sacrifice – ‘Suscipe sancte pat[er]’

Offertory Antiphon, Offering of the Bread and Wine, Incensing, Prayer to the Holy Trinity, Orate Fratres, Secret (concluded in song)

f. 173v/p.348 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice: Common Preface – ‘Vere dignu[m] et iustu[m] est’ (sung)

f. 174r^a/p.349 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice: Communicantes – ‘Communica[n]tes et dicem[us] uel . . .’

Communicantes for the Epiphany and its Octave – ‘Seque[n]s prephatio . . . in epiph[an]ie [et] p[ost] octauam’

f. 174v^a/p.350 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice: Communicantes for Palm Sunday – ‘Seque[n]s p[re]ph[at]io . . . ad d[omi]nicam palmarum’

f. 174v^b/p.350 Communicantes for Holy Thursday/Last Supper – ‘F[e]r[i]a. v. in cena d[omin]i’

f. 175r^a/p.351 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice: Proper Preface for Easter Vigil and its Octave – ‘Seque[n]s p[re]phatio . . . a uig[ilia] pasche ad oct[au]am

- f. 175v^a/p.352 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice: Proper Preface and Communicantes for single and double feasts between Easter and Pentecost – ‘Seque[n]s p[re]ph[ati]o . . . inter pasca et pe[n]tecostes’
- f. 176v^b/p.354 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice: Proper Preface and Communicantes for Ascension Day – ‘Seque[n]s p[re]phatio . . . in die asce[n]sionis’
- f. 177r^a/p.355 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice: Proper Preface and Communicantes for the Vigil of Pentecost until its Octave – ‘Seque[n]s p[re]ph[at]io . . . a uig[ilis] pe[n]tec[ostes] ad octa[ua]m’
- f. 177v^b/p.356 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice: Proper Preface for Feasts of the Apostles and Evangelists and their Octaves – ‘Seque[n]s p[re]ph[ati]o . . . in om[n]ib[us] festis ap[osto]lo[rum] et eua[n]g[e]listarum et p[ost] oct[au]am’
- f. 178r^b/p.357 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice: Proper Preface for feasts of the Blessed Virgin Mary (except the Purification and its Octave) – ‘Seque[n]te[s] p[re]ph[ati]o . . . b[ea]te uirgi[n]is excepta purificat[i]o[n]e et i[n]fra oct[au]as’
- f. 178v^a/p.358 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice: Proper Preface of the Holy Cross – ‘Seque[n]s p[re]ph[ati]o . . . sa[n]cte crucis’
- f. 178v^b/p.358 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice: Proper Preface for times when the feast of the Holy Cross occurs on a weekday – ‘I[n] hore s[an]c[t]e c[ru]ci[s] prephatio ferialis’
- f. 179r^b/p.359 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice: Proper Preface of the Most Holy Trinity – ‘Seque[n]tes p[re]ph[at]io . . . in missis uotiu[s] sancte trinitatis’
- f. 180r^a/p.361 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice: Proper Preface for single feasts and weekdays with no proper Preface – ‘Seque[n]s p[re]ph[ati]o. i[n] festis simplicib[us] [et] i[n] dieb[us] ferialib[us] ubi p[ro]pria non habetur’
- f. 180v^b/p.362 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice: Proper Preface for duplex feasts and their octaves, and for semi-duplex feasts and

Sundays which have no proper Preface – ‘Seq[uen]s p[r]eph[ati]o . . .
festis duplicib[us] et p[er] octa[ua]s . . .’

- f. 182r/p.365 Ordinary of the Mass, the Canon – ‘Te igitur . . .’
- f. 184v^b/p.370 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice, the Canon:
Communion – The Lord’s Prayer for use on Duplex and semi-Duplex
days, and on Sundays – ‘in festis duplicibus et semi duplicibus et
dominicus diebus’
- f. 185r^b/p.371 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice, the Canon:
Communion – The Lord’s Prayer for use on minor feasts and weekdays
– ‘Sequens pater noster . . . in minoribus festis et in dieb[us]
ferialib[us]’
- f. 186r^a/p.373 The ‘Libera nos’
- f. 186v^a/p.374 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice, the Canon:
Communion – The Fraction of the Host – ‘Hic cum illa particula . . .’
- f. 187r^a/p.375 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice, the Canon:
Communion – The ‘Agnus Dei’
- f. 187r^b/p.375 Preparation for Communion – ‘Domine ih[esu] xpriste . . .’
- f. 187v^a/p.376 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice, the Canon:
Communion – Holy Communion for celebrant – ‘Hic remota palla . . .
Panem celestum’
- f. 188r^a/p.377 Ordinary of the Mass, Second Part: the Sacrifice, the Canon:
Communion Ablutions – ‘Post qua[m] c[om]municauerit . . . Quod ore
sumpsim[us]’
- Ordinary of the Mass, Concluding Part – ‘Hic dicta . . . Dominus
uob[is]cum’

Eastertide

- f. 189r^a/p.379 Easter Sunday Mass, Station at St Mary Major – ‘D[omi]nica
resurrectio[n]is domini. Statio ad sa[n]ctam maria[m] maiorem.’

- f. 189^v/p.380 Easter Monday, Station at St Peter's – 'Feria secu[n]da. St[ati]o ad sanctum petr[um]'
- f. 191^v/p.384 Easter Tuesday, Station at St Paul's – 'F[e]r[ia]. iii. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m paulum.'
- f. 192^v/p.386 Easter Wednesday, Station at St Laurence's-Outside-the-Walls – 'F[e]r[ia]. iiiii. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m laurentiu[m] ext[ra] muru[m]'
- f. 194^r/p.389 Easter Thursday, Station at the Church of the Twelve Apostles – 'F[e]r[ia] v. Statio ad s[an]c[t]os xii. ap[osto]los.'
- f. 195^v/p.392 Easter Friday, Station at St Mary's of the Martyrs – 'F[e]r[i]a vi. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]am maria[m] rotundam ad m[arty]res.'
- f. 196^v/p.394 Easter Saturday, Station at St John Lateran (the day on which neophytes put off their white garments) – 'Sabb[at]o. I[n] albis. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m ioh[anne]m in laterano.'
- f. 198^r/p.397 Low Sunday (Octave of Easter), Station at St Pancras – 'D[omi]nica i[n] oct[au]a pasche St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m pa[n]cratium.'
- f. 199^r/p.399 Second Sunday after Easter – 'D[omi]nica ii. po[st] pascha.'
- f. 200^r/p.401 Third Sunday after Easter – 'D[omi]nica iii. post pascha.'
- f. 201^r/p.403 Fourth Sunday after Easter – 'Do[mi]nica iiiii. po[st] pascha.'
- f. 202^r/p.405 Fifth Sunday after Easter – 'Do[mi]nica v. po[st] pascha.'
- f. 203^r/p.407 The Greater Litanies, Station at St Peter's – 'In letaniis maiorib[us] St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m petrum.'
- f. 204^v/p.410 The Vigil of the Ascension – 'In uigilia asce[n]sio[n]is'
- f. 205^r/p.411 The Ascension of the Lord – 'In die ascensionis. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m petru[m].'
- f. 206^v/p.414 Sunday after the Ascension (Octave) – 'D[omi]nica infra oct[ava]m asce[n]sio[n]is.'
- f. 208^v/p.418 Vigil of Pentecost – 'Incipit sollempnit[erne]'
- f. 210^r/p.421 Pentecost, Station at St Peter's – 'In die pe[n]tecostes. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m petrum.'

Season after Pentecost

- f. 211^v/p.424 Monday after Pentecost, Station at St Peter's Chains – 'F[e]ria. ii. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m petrum ad uinicula.'
- f. 212^v/p.426 Tuesday after Pentecost, Station at St Anastasia's – 'F[e]r[i]a. iii. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]am anastasiam'
- f. 213^v/p.428 Ember Wednesday after Pentecost, Station at St Mary Major – 'F[e]r[ia]. iii. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]a[m] mariam maiore[m].'
- f. 215^r/p.431 Thursday after Pentecost, Station at St Laurence's – 'F[e]r[ia]. v. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m laure[n]tiu[m]'
- f. 215^v/p.432 Ember Friday after Pentecost, Station at the Church of the Twelve Apostles – 'F[e]r[ia]. vi. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[t]o[s] duodeci[mus] ap[osto]los.'
- f. 216^v/p.434 Ember Saturday after Pentecost, Station at St Peter's – 'Sabb[at]o. St[ati]o ad s[an]c[tu]m petrum.'
- f. 219^r/p.439 First Sunday after Pentecost – 'Do[mini]c[a] prima post pentecoste[n]'
- f. 220^v/p.442 Second Sunday after Pentecost – 'Dominica. ii. p[ost] pe[n]t[e]c[osten]'
- f. 221^v/p.444 Third Sunday after Pentecost – 'D[omi]nica. iii. po[st] pent[e]c[osten].'
- f. 222^v/p.446 Fourth Sunday after Pentecost – 'Dominica. iii. po[st] pe[n]t[e]c[osten]'
- f. 223^v/p.448 Fifth Sunday after Pentecost – 'D[omi]nica. v. post pent[e]c[osten].'
- f. 224^v/p.450 Sixth Sunday after Pentecost – 'D[omi]nica. vi. post pent[e]c[osten]'
- f. 226^r/p.453 Seventh Sunday after Pentecost – 'D[omi]nica. vii. p[ost] pent[e]c[osten]'
- f. 227^r/p.455 Eighth Sunday after Pentecost – 'D[omi]nica. viii. p[ost] pent[e]c[osten]'
- f. 228^r/p.457 Ninth Sunday after Pentecost – 'D[omi]nica. ix. po[st] pent[e]c[osten]'
- f. 229^r/p.459 Tenth Sunday after Pentecost – 'Do[mini]c[a]. x. po[st] pent[e]c[osten]'

- f. 230r^b/p.461 Eleventh Sunday after Pentecost – ‘Do[mini]c[a]. xi. po[st] pent[e]c[osten]’
- f. 231r^b/p.463 Twelfth Sunday after Pentecost – ‘Do[mini]c[a]. xii. post pent[e]c[osten]’
- f. 232v^b/p.466 Thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost – ‘Do[mini]ca. xiii. po[s]t pentecosten’
- f. 233v^b/p.468 Fourteenth Sunday after Pentecost – ‘Do[mini]c[a]. xiiii. post pent[e]c[osten]’
- f. 235r^a/p.471 Fifteenth Sunday after Pentecost – ‘Do[mini]ca. xv. post pent[e]c[osten].’
- f. 236r^a/p.473 Sixteenth Sunday after Pentecost – ‘Do[mini]ca xvi post pent[ecosten].’
- f. 237r^b/p.475 Seventeenth Sunday after Pentecost – ‘Do[mini]c[a] xvii. po[s]t pent[e]c[osten]’
- f. 238r^a/p.477 Ember Wednesday in September, Station at St Mary Major – ‘F[e]ria. iiii.iiii t[em]p[o]rum. mensis septe[m]bris. Statio ad sanctam maria[m] maiorem.’
- f. 240r^a/p.481 Ember Friday in September, Station at the Church of the Twelve Apostles – ‘F[e]r[ia]. vi. St[at]io ad s[an]c[t]os xii. ap[osto]los.’
- f. 240v^b/p.482 Ember Saturday in September, Station at St Peter’s – ‘Sabb[at]o. St[at]io ad s[an]c[tu]m petrum.’
- f. 244r^a/p.489 Eighteenth Sunday after Pentecost – ‘Do[mini]ca xviii post pent[e]c[osten].’
- f. 245r^a/p.491 Nineteenth Sunday after Pentecost – ‘Dominica. xix. p[ost] pent[e]c[osten].’
- f. 246r^a/p.493 Twentieth Sunday after Pentecost – ‘Dominica xx post pent[e]c[osten].’
- f. 247r^a/p.495 Twenty-first Sunday after Pentecost – ‘Dominica xxi. post pent[e]c[osten].’

- f. 248^r/p.497 Twenty-second Sunday after Pentecost – ‘Dominica. xxii. post pent[e]c[osten].’
- f. 249^r/p.499 Twenty-third Sunday after Pentecost – ‘Dominica. xxiii. post pentecosten.’
- f. 250^v/p.502 Twenty-fourth Sunday after Pentecost – ‘Dominica. xxiiii. post pentecosten’

Inserted Addition

- f. 252^r/p.505 Mass of Corpus Christi – ‘In festo corpori[s] xp[rist]i’

Sanctoral – Proper of the Saints

- f. 253^r/p.507 Beginning of the Proper of the Saints: the Vigil of St Andrew the Apostle – ‘Incipit p[ro]prium s[an]c[t]orum de missali. In uigilia sancti andree apostoli.’
- St Saturninus – ‘Deinde p[er] s[an]c[t]o saturni[n]o m[arty]re’
- f. 254^r/p.509 Feast of St Andrew the Apostle – ‘In festo sa[n]c[t]i andree ap[osto]li’
- f. 255^r/p.511 Feast of St Nicholas – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i nicolai epi[scopos] et conf[essoris].’
- Feast of St Damasus – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i damasi pape et conf[essoris]’
- f. 255^v/p.512 Feast of St Lucy – ‘In [festo] sancte lucie v[irginis] et m[arty]ris’
- f. 256^r/p.513 Feast of St Thomas – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i thome ap[osto]li.’
- Vigil of St Thomas – ‘In uig[ilia] uni[us] ap[osto]li’
- f. 256^v/p.514 Feast of St Felix – ‘In [festo] sancti felicis imp̄icis (?) p[re]s[by]teri et m[arty]ris’
- f. 257^r/p.515 Feast of St Marcellus – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i ma[r]celli. p[ap]e [et] m[arty]ris.’
- f. 257^v/p.516 Feast of St Prisca – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]e prisce v[irginis] [et] m[arty]ris.’

- f. 258^r/p.517 Feast of SS Marius, Martha, Audifax and Abachum – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]orum m[arty]r[um] marii. marthe. audifax. et abacii’
- f. 258^r^b/p.517 Feast of SS Fabian and Sebastian – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]oru[m] m[arty]rum fabiani [et] sebastia[n]i’
- f. 258^v^b/p.518 Feast of St Agnes – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]e agnetis v[irginis] [et] m[arty]ris.’
- f. 259^r^b/p.519 Feast of SS Vincent and Anastasius – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]oru[m] m[arty]r[um] ui[n]ce[n]tii [et] anastasii’
- f. 259^v^a/p.520 Feast of Saint Emerentiana – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]e emerentiane uirgini[s] et m[arty]ris . . .’
- f. 259^v^b/p.520 Feast of the Conversion of St Paul – ‘In co[n]uersione sancti pauli ap[osto]li’
- f. 261^v^a/p.524 Feast of St Agnes secundo – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]e ag[ne]tis secundo’
- f. 262^r^a/p.525 Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary (Blessing of Candles, Procession and Mass) – ‘In festo purificatio[n]is finita . . .’
- f. 265^r^a/p.531 Feast of St Agatha – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]e agathe uirginis et m[arty]ris’
- f. 265^v^a/p.532 Feast of St Valentine – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i ualentini p[re]s[by]teri et m[arty]ris’
- f. 266^r^a/p.533 Feast of the Chair of St Peter – ‘In [festo] cathedra s[an]c[t]i pet[ri]’
- f. 266^v^b/p.534 Feast of SS Peter and Paul – ‘In festo ap[osto]loru[m] petri et pauli’
- f. 267^r^a/p.535 Feast of St Matthew – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i mathie ap[osto]li’
- f. 267^v^b/p.546 Feast of SS Perpetua and Felicitas – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]aru[m] m[arty]rum p[er]petue et felicitatis’
- f. 268^r^a/p.537 Feast of the Forty Holy Martyrs – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum]. xl. m[arty]ru[m]’
- Feast of St Gregory the Great – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i gregorii p[ap]e et ma[r]tyris’
- f. 268^v^b/p.538 Feast of St Benedict – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i b[e]n[e]dicti abbatis et c[on]fessoris’

- f. 269^b/p.539 Feast of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary – ‘In [festo] a[n]nu[n]tiat[i]o[n]e b[ea]te marie uirginis’
- f. 270^r^a/p.541 Feast of SS Tiburtius and Valerian – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum] tyburtii [et] ualeria[n]i’
- f. 270^v^a/p.542 Feast of St George – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i georgii m[arty]ris’
- f. 270^v^b/p.542 Feast of St Mark – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i marci euangeliste’
- f. 271^r^b/p.543 Feast of St Vitalis – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i vitalis’
- f. 271^v^a/p.544 Feast of SS Phillip and James – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] ap[osto]loru[m] phylippi [et] iacobi’
- f. 272^v^a/p.546 Feast of the Exultation of the Holy Cross – ‘In [festo] inue[n]tione s[an]c[t]e crucis.’
- f. 273^v^b/p.548 Feast of St John Outside the Latin Gate – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i ioh[anni]s ant[e] porta latina[m]’
- f. 274^r^a/p.549 Feast of SS Gordan and Epimachus – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum] gordiani et epimach[i]’
- f. 274^v^a/p.550 Feast of SS Achilles, Nereus and Pancras – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum] archilei et nereu[at]q[ue] pa[n]cratii.’
- f. 275^r^a/p.551 Feast of St Potentiana – ‘In [festo] sancte potentiane uirg[in]is.’
- f. 275^r^b/p.551 Feast of the Translation of the Blessed Francis – ‘In [festo] translatione b[ea]ti francisci’
- Feast of St Urban – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i urbani p[ap]e et m[arty]ris.’
- f. 275^v^b/p.552 Feast of SS Marcellinus, Peter and Erasmus – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum] marcellini [et] pet[ri] atq[ue] herasmi epi[scopi]’
- f. 276^r^b/p.553 Feast of SS Primus and Felician – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum] primi et feliciai.’
- f. 276^v^a/p.554 Feast of St Barnabas – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i barnabe ap[osto]li.’
- f. 277^r^a/p.555 Feast of SS Basilides, Cyrinus, Nabor and Nazarius – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum] basilidis cyrini naboris et nazarii’

- f. 277^v/p.556 Feast of St Anthony of Padua – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i a[n]tonii conf[essoris]’
- f. 278^v/p.558 Feast of SS Vitus, Modestus and Crescentia – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]orum m[a]r[tyru]m. uiti et modesti atq[ue] cresce[n]tie’
- f. 278^b/p.558 Feast of SS Mark and Marcellian – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]orum m[a]r[tyru]m ma[r]ci et marceliani’
- f. 279^b/p.559 Feast of SS Gervase and Protase – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]orum m[a]r[tyru]m ge[r]uasi et protasii’
- f. 279^b/p.560 Vigil of St John the Baptist – ‘In uig[ilia] s[an]c[t]i ioh[ann]is bap[t]iste’
- f. 281^r/p.563 Feast of the Nativity of St John the Baptist – ‘In [festo] nat[iuitatis] s[an]c[t]i ioh[ann]is bap[t]iste’
- f. 282^b/p.566 Feast of SS John and Paul – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum] ioh[ann]is et pauli’
- f. 283^r/p.567 Feast of St Leo I – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i leonis p[a]p[ae]. [et] co[n]f[essoris]’
- f. 283^v/p.568 Vigil of SS Peter and Paul – ‘In uigilia ap[osto]lorum petri [et] pauli.’
- f. 284^v/p.570 Feast of SS Peter and Paul – ‘In festo apostolorum pet[ri] [et] pauli.’
- f. 286^r/p.573 Feast of the Commemoration of St Paul – ‘In come[m]oratione s[an]c[t]i pauli.’
- f. 287^r/p.575 Feast of SS Processus and Martinian – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[a]r[tyru]m processi [et] martiniani’
- f. 287^b/p.575 Octave of the Feast of SS Peter and Paul – ‘In oct[au]a ap[osto]lorum pet[ri] [et] pauli’
- f. 288^r/p.577 Feast of the Seven Holy Brothers and SS Rufina and Secunda – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]orum. m[artyrum]. vii. fr[atru]m et s[an]c[t]arum rufine [et] s[e]c[un]de uirginis [et] m[artyris]’
- f. 289^v/p.580 Feast of SS Nabor and Felix – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum] nabo[r]is [et] felicitis’

- Feast of St Praxedes – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]e praxedi[s] v[irginis]’
- f. 290^a/p.581 Feast of St Mary Magdalen – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]e ma[r]ie magd[a]lene’
- f. 290^v/p.582 Feast of St Apollinaris – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i appolona[r]is epi[scopos] et m[artyris]’
- f. 291^r^b/p.583 Feast of St James – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i iacobi ap[osto]li’
- f. 291^v^b/p.584 Feast of SS Nazarius, Celsus, Victor and Innocent I – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]oru[m]. m[artyrum]. naçarii [et] celsi. uicto[r]is [e]t i[n]noce[n]tii’
- f. 292^r^a/p.585 Feast of SS Felix, Faustinus and Beatrice – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum] felicis faustini [et] beat[ri]cis’
- f. 292^r^b/p.585 Feast of SS Abdon and Sennen – ‘I[n] [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum] abdon [et] sene[n]’
- f. 292^v^b/p.586 Feast of St Peter in Chains – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i pet[ri] ad ui[n]cvla’
- f. 293^r^b/p.587 Feast of St Stephen – ‘In s[an]c[t]i steph[an]i p[a]p[ae] [et] m[artyris]’
- f. 293^v^b/p.588 Feast of St Dominic – ‘In [festo] sa[n]cti dominici c[on]f[essoris]’
- f. 294^r^a/p.589 Feast of SS Sixtus II, Felicissimus and Agapitus – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum] systi pape felicissimi [et] agapiti m[a]r[tyru]m’
- f. 294^v^a/p.590 Feast of St Donatus – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i donati ep[iscop]i [et] m[artyris]’
- f. 294^v^b/p.590 Feast of SS Cyriacus, Largus and Smaragdus – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[a]r[tyru]m cyriaci la[r]gi [et] smaragdi’
- f. 295^v^a/p.592 Vigil of St Laurence – ‘In uig[ilia] sancti laure[n]tii’
- Feast of St Laurence – ‘In festo s[an]c[t]i laure[n]tii m[artyris]’
- f. 296^v^a/p.594 Feast of SS Tiburtius and Susanna – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum] tyburtii [et] susa[n]ne’
- f. 296^v^b/p.594 Feast of St Clare – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]e clare u[irginis]’

- f. 297^r/p.595 Feast of SS Hippolytus and Soter – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum] ypoliti [et] s[otio]rum e[piscop]i’
- f. 297^v/p.596 Vigil of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary – ‘In uig[ilia] asu[m]pt[i]o[n]is b[ea]te uirgi[n]is’
Feast of St Eusebius – ‘Et fit co[m]me[m]oratio de . . . s[an]c[t]o evsebio conf[essoris]’
- f. 298^v/p.598 Feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary – ‘In [festo] asumpt[i]o[n]e b[ea]te marie u[irginis]’
- f. 299^v/p.600 Octave of the Feast of St Laurence – ‘I[n] octaua s[an]c[t]i laure[n]tii’
- f. 300^r/p.601 Feast of St Agapitus – ‘In [festo] sancti agapiti m[arty]ris’
- f. 300^v/p.602 Feast of SS Timothy, Hippolytus and Symphorian – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]orum m[a]r[tyru]m. tymothei. ypoliti. [et] simphoriani’
- f. 300^v/p.602 Feast of St Bartholomew – ‘In [festo] sancti bartholomei ap[osto]li’
- f. 301^r/p.603 Feast of St Augustine – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i agustini ep[iscop]i [et] c[on]f[essoris]’
- f. 301^v/p.604 Feast of Hermit Saints – ‘Dein[de] pro s[an]c[t]o hermete’
- f. 302^r/p.605 Beheading of St John the Baptist – ‘In decollatio[n]e sancti ioh[ann]is baptiste’
Feast of St Sabina – ‘Dein[de] pro s[an]c[t]a sabina’
- f. 303^r/p.607 Feast of SS Felix and Adauctus – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum]. m[artyrum] felicis [et] audacti’
- f. 303^v/p.608 Feast of the Twelve Holy Brothers – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum]. xii fr[atru]m’
Feast of the Blessed Giles – ‘Deinde p[ro] sa[n]cto egidio abb[at]e [et] c[on]f[essoris]’
- f. 303^v/p.608 Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary – ‘In natiuitate b[ea]te u[irginis]’
- f. 304^r/p.609 Feast of St Adrian – ‘Et fit come[m]oratio de s[an]c[t]o adriano m[arty]ris’
- f. 305^r/p.611 Feast of St Gorgonius – ‘In [festo] sancti go[r]gonii m[arty]ris’

- f. 305^v/p.612 Feast of SS Protus and Hyacinth – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]oru[m] m[artyrum] p[ro]t[hi] [et] iacincti’
- f. 305^v^b/p.612 The Exaltation of the Holy Cross – ‘In exaltat[i]o[n]e s[an]c[t]e crucis’
- f. 307^r^a/p.615 Feast of St Nichomedes – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i nichomedis m[arty]ris’
- f. 307^r^b/p.615 Feast of SS Lucy, Geminianus and Euphemia – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[ar]tyru[m] lucie [et] geminiani [et] s[an]c[t]e euphemie’
- f. 307^v^a/p.616 Vigil of St Matthew – ‘In uig[ilia] s[an]c[t]i math[e]i ap[osto]li euang[e]liste’
- f. 308^r^b/p.617 Feast of St Matthew – ‘In [festo] sancti math[e]i ap[osto]li [et] euang[e]l[ist]e’
- f. 309^r^a/p.619 Feast of St Maurice and Companions – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]oru[m] m[ar]tyru[m] mauritii [et] sot[i]o[rum]
- f. 309^r^b/p.619 Feast of SS Cyprian and Justina – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[ar]tyru[m] cypria[n]i et iustine’
- Feast of SS Cosmas and Damian – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[artyrum] cosme et damiani’
- f. 309^v^b/p.620 Feast of the Dedication of St Michael – ‘In [festo] dedicat[i]o[n]e s[an]c[t]i michael[i]’
- f. 311^r^a/p.623 Feast of the Birth of St Francis – ‘In [festo] natale s[an]c[t]i francisci c[on]f[essoris]’
- f. 311^v^b/p.624 Feast of SS Sergius, Bacchus, Marcellus and Apuleius – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[ar]tyru[m] sergii [et] bachi et marcelli [et] apulei’
- f. 312^r^a/p.625 Feast of St Mark – ‘Et fit c[om]m[emorati]o de s[an]c[t]o marco p[ap]e’
- f. 312^r^b/p.625 Feast of SS Dionysus Rusticus and Eleutherius – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]o[rum] m[ar]tyru[m] dionisii rustici et eleutherii’
- f. 312^v^a/p.626 Feast of St Callistus I – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i calixti papa’
- f. 313^r^a/p.627 Feast of St Luke – ‘In [festo] s[an]c[t]i luce eua[n]g[eliste]’

- f. 313^v/p.628 Vigil of SS Simon and Jude – ‘In uig[ilia] ap[osto]lo[rum] sy[m]onis
[et] iude’
- f. 314^r/p.629 Feast of SS Simon and Jude – ‘In festo ap[osto]loru[m] sy[m]onis et
iude’
- f. 314^b/p.629 Vigil of the Feast of All Saints – ‘In uig[ilia] o[mn]iu[m]
s[an]c[t]o[rum]’
- f. 315^b/p.631 Feast of All Saints – ‘In festo o[mn]ium s[an]c[t]oru[m]’
- f. 315^v/p.632 Feast of St Cesario (?) – ‘Dein[de] pro s[an]c[t]o cesario m[artyrum]’
- f. 316^v/p.634 Feast of the Holy Four Crowned Martyrs – ‘In [fest]o s[an]c[t]o[rum]
m[a]r[tyru]m iiii coronato[rum]’
- f. 317^r/p.635 Feast of St Theodore – ‘In [fest]o s[an]c[t]i theodori m[artyris]’
- f. 317^b/p.635 Feast of St Martin – ‘In [fest]o s[an]c[t]i ma[r]tini episcopi [et]
c[on]f[essoris]’
- f. 317^v/p.636 Feast of St Mennas – ‘Dein[de] p[ro] s[an]c[t]o me[n]na m[artyre]’
- f. 317^b/p.636 Feast of St Elizabeth – ‘In [fest]o s[an]c[t]e helysabet’
- f. 318^r/p.637 Feast of St Cecilia – ‘In [fest]o s[an]c[t]e cecilie v[irginis]’
- f. 318^v/p.638 Feast of St Clement I – ‘In [fest]o s[an]c[t]i clem[en]tis p[ap]e et
m[a]r[tyris]’
- f. 318^b/p.638 Feast of St Felicitas – ‘Dei[n]de p[ro] s[an]c[t]a felicitate’
- f. 319^b/p.639 Feast of St Chrysogonus – ‘In [fest]o s[an]c[t]i grisochini m[artyris]’
Feast of St Catherine – ‘In [fest]o s[an]c[t]e catherine v[irginis] [et]
m[artyris]’

Common of the Saints

- f. 319^v/p.640 Beginning of the Common of the Saints. Vigil of an Apostle – ‘Incipit
comune s[an]c[t]orum de missali. In uig[ilia] uni[us] ap[osto]li’
- f. 320^v/p.642 Vigil of several Apostles – ‘In uig[ilia] pl[ur]i[m]orum
ap[osto]lo[rum]’
- f. 322^r/p.645 Masses for several Apostles – ‘I[n] natal[is] ap[osto]lo[rum]’

- f. 325^v^b/p.652 Masses for a Martyr Bishop – ‘In natali uni[us] m[arty]ris
po[n]tif[icis]’
- f. 329^v^b/p.660 Masses for a Martyr but not a Bishop – ‘I[n] natali unius m[arty]ris
n[on] po[n]tif[icis]’
- f. 331^r^b/p.663 Masses for a Saint in Paschaltide up until Pentecost – ‘In natali uni[us]
sancti a pascha us[que] pe[n]t[ec]osten . . .’
- f. 332^r^a/p.665 Masses for several Martyrs in Paschaltide up until Pentecost – ‘In
natiuitate pl[ur]i[m]orum m[arty]r[um] a pascha us[que]
pe[n]t[ec]osten . . .’
- f. 332^v^a/p.666 Masses for several Martyrs – ‘In natali pl[ur]i[m]orum m[arty]r[um]’
- f. 333^v^a/p.668 Masses for several Bishops – ‘Si fuerint utq[ue] pontifex’
- f. 340^v^a/p.682 Masses for a Confessor Bishop – ‘I[n] natiuitate unius c[on]f[essoris]
po[n]tif[icis]’
- f. 347^r^a/p.695 Masses for a Confessor but not a Bishop – ‘In natiuitate unius
c[on]f[essoris] no[n] po[n]tif[icis]’
- f. 348^v^b/p.698 Masses for a Virgin Martyr – ‘I[n] nati[ui]tate uirginu[s] [martyris]’
- f. 349^v^b/p.700 Masses for several Virgin Martyrs – ‘I[n] t[empore] al[iud] oratio si
fuerint plures’
- f. 353^r^b/p.707 Masses for the Dedication of a Church – ‘In ip[s]a die dedicationis
eccl[es]ie totum . . .’
- f. 353^v^b/p.708 Masses for the Anniversary of the Dedication of a Church – ‘In
aniuersario dedicatio[n]is ecc[les]ie’
- f. 354^v^b/p.710 Mass for the Dedication of an Altar – ‘In ip[s]a die dedicationis altaris
totum officium agitur ut supra i[n] anniuersario dedicatio[n]is
eccl[es]ie . . .’
- Mass in Honour of Saints’ Relics – ‘Missa in honore s[an]c[t]orum
quo[rum] corpora h[abea]ntur oratio’

Votive Masses

- f. 355^v^a/p.712 Mass of the Holy Trinity – ‘Missa in honore s[an]c[t]e t[ri]nitatis’

- f. 356^r/p.713 Mass of the Holy Spirit – ‘Mi[s]sa de s[an]c[t]o sp[irit]u’
- f. 357^v/p.716 Mass of the Holy Cross – ‘Missa in honore s[an]c[t]e crucis’
- f. 358^r/p.717 Mass of the Blessed Virgin Mary in Advent – ‘Missa in honore b[ea]te marie uirgi[n]is ab aduentu u[s]q[ue] ad na[ti]uitatem d[omi]ni.’
- f. 359^r/p.719 Mass of the Blessed Virgin Mary from Christmas to the Purification – ‘A natiuitate domini us[que] ad purificat[i]o[n]em d[ic]itur istud officium. In missa b[ea]te u[ir]g[in]is’
- f. 360^r/p.721 Mass of the Blessed Virgin Mary from the Purification until Easter – ‘A p[ur]ificat[i]o[n]e usq[ue] ad pasca dicitur istud officiu[m] in missa b[ea]te uirg[in]is’
- f. 361^v/p.724 Mass for Sinners – ‘Mi[s]sa pro peccatis’
- f. 362^r/p.725 Mass to Obtain the Grace of the Holy Spirit – ‘Missa ad postula[n]dam gra[tia]m s[an]c[t]e sp[irit]us’
- f. 362^v/p.726 Mass of the Holy Angels – ‘Missa in honore angelo[rum]’
- f. 362^v/p.726 Mass of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul – ‘Missa i[n] honore ap[osto]lo[rum] pet[ri] [et] pavli’
- f. 363^r/p.727 Holy Votive Masses – ‘Mi[s]sa ad posce[n]da suffragia s[an]c[t]o[rum]’
- f. 363^r/p.727 Another Holy Votive Mass according to Pope Innocent III – ‘Alia missa ad poscenda suffragia s[an]c[t]o[rum] q[ue] sec[undum] d[omi]n[u]s papa i[n]noce[n]tius t[er]tiv[us]’
- f. 363^v/p.728 Mass for the Persecutors of the Church – ‘M[issa] p[er]secutorib[us] eccl[es]ie’
- f. 364^r/p.729 Mass for a Pope – ‘M[issa] p[ro] papa’
- f. 364^r/p.729 Mass for the Renewal of the World – ‘M[issa] p[ro] itera gentib[us]’
- f. 364^v/p.730 Mass for the Sick – ‘Mi[s]sa pro i[n]firmis’
- f. 364^v/p.730 Mass on the Anniversary of the Election or Consecration of a Bishop – ‘M[issa] in aniu[er]sario po[n]tif[ic]is’
- f. 365^r/p.731 Mass for the Priest himself – ‘Missa p[ro] se ipso sacerdote’

- f. 367^r/p.735 Another Mass for the Priest himself – ‘Alia missa p[ro] se ip[s]o sac[er]dote’
- f. 367^b/p.735 Another Mass for the Priest himself – ‘Alia missa pro se ip[s]o sacerdote’
- f. 367^a/p.736 Mass for all Churches – ‘Missa pro om[n]i gradii ec[clesi]e’
- f. 367^b/p.736 Mass for the (Franciscan) Congregation – ‘M[issa] p[ro] c[on]gregat[i]o[n]e’
- f. 368^a/p.737 Another Mass for the (Franciscan) Congregation – ‘Alia missa p[ro] c[on]gregat[i]o[n]e’
- f. 368^b/p.737 Mass for the (Franciscan) Congregation – ‘M[issa] pro co[n]gregat[i]o[n]e’
- f. 368^b/p.738 Mass against the Temptations of the Flesh – ‘M[issa] pro te[m]ptat[i]o[n]e carnis’
- f. 369^a/p.739 Mass for the Friendship of Brothers – ‘Missa p[ro] c[on]cordia fr[atru]m’
- Mass for the Forgiveness of Sins – ‘M[issa] pro remissio[n]e pecc[at]o[rum]’
- f. 369^b/p.739 Mass for the Rejection of Evil Thoughts – ‘M[issa] ad repellendas malas cogitat[i]o[n]es’
- f. 369^a/p.740 Mass for the Gift of Tears – ‘Missa p[ro] petit[i]o[n]e lacrimaru[m]’
- f. 369^b/p.740 Mass for a Friend – ‘[Missa] pro amico’
- f. 370^a/p.741 Another Mass for a Friend – ‘Al[ia] m[issa] p[ro] amico’
- f. 370^b/p.741 Mass for the Health of Men – ‘M[issa] p[ro] salute uiuo[rum]’
- f. 370^a/p.742 Mass for Faithful Friends – ‘Missa p[ro] deuotis amici[s]’
- f. 370^b/p.742 Mass Asking for Rain – ‘M[issa] ad pluuiam postula[n]dam’
- f. 371^a/p.743 Mass to Obtain Good Weather – ‘M[issa] ad postula[n]dam serenitate[m]’
- f. 371^b/p.743 Mass against Storms – ‘M[issa] ad repelle[n]das te[m]pestates’

General Mass for the Living and the Dead – ‘M[issa] g[e]n[er]alis. pro uiuis et de defunctis’

- f. 371^v/p.744 Another General Mass (for the Living and the Dead) – ‘Alia missa g[e]n[er]al[is]’
- f. 372^r/p.745 Mass for Any Difficulty – ‘M[issa] pro quacu[m]que tribulatio[n]e’
- f. 372^v/p.746 Another Mass for Any Difficulty – ‘Al[ia] missa p[ro] quacu[m]q[ue] t[ri]bulat[i]o[n]e’
- Mass against Pagans – ‘M[issa] c[on]tra paganos’
- f. 372^v/p.746 Mass for an Emperor – ‘M[issa] pro imperatore’
- f. 373^r/p.747 Mass for a King – ‘Missa p[ro] rege’
- f. 373^r/p.747 Mass against Persecutors and Doers of Evil – ‘M[issa] c[on]tra p[er]secutores [et] male age[n]tes’
- f. 373^v/p.748 Mass for Excessive [illegible] – ‘M[issa] pro nimis [illegible]’
- f. 374^r/p.749 Mass in Time of War – ‘M[issa] i[n] t[em]p[or]e belli’
- f. 374^r/p.749 Mass for Any Necessity – ‘Missa p[ro] quacu[m]q[ue] necessitate’
- f. 374^v/p.750 Mass to Obtain Holy Wisdom – ‘M[issa] p[ro] ad postula[n]da[m] s[an]c[t]am sapie[n]tiam’
- Mass to Obtain Faith and Charity – ‘M[issa] ad postula[n]da[m] fide[m] et caritate[m]’
- f. 374^v/p.750 Mass to Obtain Humility – ‘M[issa] ad postulanda[m] humilitate[m]’
- f. 375^r/p.751 Mass to Obtain Charity – ‘Missa ad postula[n]da[m] caritate[m]’
- Mass to Obtain Patience – ‘M[issa] ad postula[n]dam patie[n]tiam’
- f. 375^v/p.752 Mass to Give Stability – ‘M[issa] pro stabilitate loci’
- f. 375^v/p.752 Mass for the Confession of Our Sins – ‘M[issa] p[ro] confite[n]te peccata sua’
- f. 376^r/p.753 Mass for Enemies – ‘M[issa] pro inimicis’
- f. 376^r/p.753 Mass for those Giving us Alms – ‘Missa p[ro] helemosina nob[is] facie[n]tib[us]’

- f. 376^v/p.754 Mass for a Friend who is Placed in Captivity – ‘M[issa] p[ro] amico
i[n] capt[i]o[n]e posito’
- f. 376^b/p.754 Mass for those at Sea – ‘M[issa] p[r]o nauiga[n]tib[us]’
- f. 377^a/p.755 Mass for Barren Land – ‘M[issa] p[ro] sterilitate terre’
- f. 377^b/p.755 Mass for Diseased Animals – ‘M[issa] p[ro] peste a[n]i[m]alium’
- f. 377^v/p.756 Mass for the Mortality of Man – ‘M[issa] p[ro] mortalitate
ho[mi]n[iu]m’
- f. 377^v/p.756 Mass for those Close to Death – ‘M[issa] pro infirmo q[ui] proximv[s]
est mortu[s]’
- f. 378^r/p.757 Mass for the Burial of a Dead Man – ‘I[n] die depositionis defu[n]cti’
- f. 380^v/p.762 Another Mass for the Burial of a Dead Man – ‘Alia missa in die t[er]tio
septimo . . .’
- f. 381^a/p.763 Another Mass on the Day of the Third Week – ‘Alia missa in die
t[er]tio septimo . . .’
- f. 381^r/p.763 Mass for a Dead Bishop – ‘M[issa] p[ro] defuncto ep[iscop]o’
- f. 381^v/p.764 Mass for a Dead Bishop or Priests – ‘M[issa] p[ro] defu[n]ctis
epis[copis] seu sacerdotib[us]’
- f. 381^v/p.764 Mass for Dead Priests – ‘M[issa] pro defu[n]ctos sacerdotib[us]’
Mass for a Dead Person – ‘Missa p[ro] uno d[e]fu[n]cto’
- f. 382^a/p.765 Mass for a Dead Woman – ‘M[issa] pro defu[n]cta femi[n]a’
- f. 382^r/p.765 Mass for Dead Brothers – ‘M[issa] p[r]o defunctis fr[at]rib[us]’
- f. 382^v/p.766 Mass for Those who Rest in the Cemetery – ‘M[issa] p[ro] his qui in
cimiterio req[ui]esc[an]t’
- f. 382^v/p.766 Mass for an Anniversary – ‘Missa in aniuersario’
- f. 383^a/p.767 Mass for a Father and a Mother – ‘M[issa] p[ro] patre et matre’
- f. 383^r/p.767 Mass for all the Dead – ‘Missa [pro] plural[is] defunctis’
- f. 383^v/p.768 General Mass for all the Faithful Dead – ‘M[issa] generalis p[ro]
om[n]ib[us] fidelib[us] defu[n]ctis’

- f. 383^v/p.768 Mass for the Dead – ‘Missa plural[is] p[ro] defu[n]ctis’
- f. 384^r/p.769 Another Mass for the Dead – ‘Alia missa plural[is] p[ro] defu[n]ctis’
- f. 384^b/p.769 Another Mass for the Dead – ‘Alia missa plural[is] p[ro] defu[n]ctis’
- f. 384^v/p.770 Mass for the Death of a Recently Baptised Person – ‘M[issa] p[ro] defuncto nup[er] bapt[is]ato’
- f. 384^v/p.770 Mass for People desiring Penitence – ‘Missa pro desidera[n]tib[us] penite[n]tiam’
- f. 385^r/p.771 Mass for a Wavering Soul – ‘M[issa] pro cuiv[s] a[n]i[m]a dubitatur’
- f. 385^v/p.772 Mass for a Groom and a Bride – ‘Mi[s]sa p[ro] sponso [et] sponsa’

Sacraments

- f. 387^b/p.775 The Sacrament of Baptism, beginning with the Blessing of the Salt and Water – ‘Incip[it] benedictio salis et aq[ue]’
- f. 389^v/p.780 Prayer by the Scribe – ‘Ante conspectu[m] diuine maiestatis . . .’

End of original Missal

Additions

- f. 390^r/p.781 Feast of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary – ‘In festo uisitationis uirginis marie’
- f. 391^b/p.783 Feast of St Louis (of Toulouse) – ‘In festo s[an]c[t]i ludouici ep[iscop]i [et] c[on]f[ess]oris’
- f. 392^b/p.785 Feast of St Louis, once the King of France – ‘In [fest]o s[an]c[t]i ludouici c[on]f[ess]oris quonda[m] regis f[ra]ncie’
- f. 393^r/p.787 Sequence for Easter – ‘In festo s[an]c[t]o pasche. seq[ue]ntia’
- f. 393^v/p.788 Sequence for the Mass of the Holy Spirit – ‘Seque[n]tia s[an]c[t]o spiritu’
- f. 393^v/p.788 Sequence for Corpus Christi Mass – ‘Seq[ue]ntia d[e] corpore x[risti]’
- f. 394^r/p.789 Sequence for the Mass for the Dead – ‘Seque[n]tia mortuo[rum]’

End of Missal's formal text

f. 395v/p.792 Prayer of Blessing – ‘B[e]nedict[i]o ono[rum]. Or[ati]o. Subuentiat
q[uaesumu]s d[omi]ne . . .’

Prayer for Blessing New Fruit – ‘B[e]nedict[i]o nouo[rum] fructuu[m].
Or[ati]o. Bene+dic[tus] d[omi]ne hunc fructu[m] . . .’

Prayer of Blessing – ‘Benedic d[omi]ne hanc creatura[m] . . .’