Chapter 1

Researching the History of Rites

Helen Gittos

Preliminaries

Thousands of medieval manuscripts containing materials for use in so-called 'occasional' rites such as baptism, burial and Palm Sunday survive from Western Europe.[1] Yet their value as historical sources has hardly begun to be realized. There are two main reasons for this. The first is the enduring perception that the medieval liturgy was conservative – traditional, slow to change, and therefore not very useful for historians to study. Here, for example, is the end of an essay by John Blair about baptismal fonts in Anglo-Saxon England:

> Encouraged by the materials that they study, liturgists tend to lay great stress on uniformity. From a liturgist's perspective this paper is rather iconoclastic, proposing as it does a high degree of diversity and informality in English local practice during the ninth to eleventh centuries.[2]

Although some previous generations of liturgists did emphasize uniformity, Blair's statement could not be less true of current work in the field. The diversity in early medieval baptismal rites that he proposes on the basis of the archaeological evidence is precisely what one finds in the liturgical sources. Susan Keefe, in her

---

[1] For example, more than 450 manuscripts are listed in Thomas Davies Kozachek, 'The Repertory of Chant for Dedicating Churches in the Middle Ages: Music, Liturgy, and Ritual' (unpub. Harvard University DPhil thesis, 1995), 382–91; and Richard Kay, *Pontificalia: A Repertory of Latin Manuscript Pontificals and Benedictionals* (Lawrence, KA: published online by Digital Publishing Services, University of Kansas Libraries, at http://hdl.handle.net/1808/4406, 2007) lists 1249 pontificals and benedictionals. For the term 'occasional rites' see p. 1 above.

I am immensely grateful to everyone who participated in the *Interpreting Medieval Liturgy* network from whom I learnt so much and without whom I could not have written this. I have benefited from comments on a draft of this chapter from Mette Birkedal Bruun, Louis Hamilton, Sarah Hamilton, Andy Hudson, Christopher A. Jones, Carolyn Marino Malone, Henry Parkes, Fred Paxton, Matthew Salisbury, Carol Symes and Ben Whitworth. Yitzhak Hen kindly sent me some of his unpublished articles. Moira and Brian Gittos provided crucial logistical support.

[2] John Blair, 'The Prehistory of English Fonts', in *Intersections: The Archaeology and History of Christianity in England, 400–1200: Papers in Honour of Martin Biddle and Birthe Kjølbye-Biddle*, ed. Martin Henig and Nigel Ramsay, British Archaeological Reports, British Series 505 (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2010), 149–177, at 177.

work on baptism in the Carolingian Empire repeatedly stresses this: 'one can truly be amazed at the amount of liturgical diversity'; 'diversity … characterized public worship'.[3] It is the degree to which medieval liturgy was diverse, informal, and frequently revised and rewritten that makes it so valuable as historical evidence.

The second reason why liturgical sources are undervalued is that they are perceived as being difficult to use:

> Liturgical history is pure scholarship: painstakingly detailed, extremely technical, highly esoteric … Its practitioners, like the initiates of an ancient mystery cult, pour the fruits of their researches into learned journals with splendidly arcane titles like *Ephemerides Liturgicae* and *Sacris Erudiri*. It is hard for a mere layman to penetrate these mysteries ….[4]

In fact liturgical sources present only the same kinds of problems as other types of medieval texts such as charters, writs or law codes. Just as with other sources, in order to be able to use liturgical manuscripts one needs to familiarize oneself with the conventions of the genre but they are far from being impenetrable and arcane. In this chapter I will discuss the potential of liturgical rites as sources, some practical ways in which one can work with this material, some problems that are likely to be encountered, and some possible directions for future research. My focus is on how one can go about doing such work rather than providing a survey of the historiography.

Potential: What are Rites Evidence For?

Medieval liturgical sources for rites such as Palm Sunday, baptism and penance are of immense value for many reasons. One of these has already been mentioned: these rituals were repeatedly revised and never standardized – it is rare to find

[3] Susan A. Keefe, *Water and the Word: Baptism and the Education of the Clergy in the Carolingian Empire*, 2 vols. (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), 1:137 (this whole volume is relevant but see especially 42, 67, 131–37, 152). For further discussion about liturgical diversity see the papers by Hen, McKitterick and Cubitt in R.N. Swanson, ed., *Unity and Diversity in the Church: Papers Read at the 1994 Summer Meeting and the 1995 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*, Studies in Church History 32 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1996); and Richard E. Sullivan, 'The Carolingian Age: Reflections on Its Place in the History of the Middle Ages', *Speculum* 64, no. 2 (1989): 267–306, esp. 293–94, 295.

[4] Jeffrey Richards, *Consul of God: The Life and Times of Gregory the Great* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980), 119. This quotation was drawn to my attention by John F. Romano's *MedievalLiturgy.com* website: http://medievalliturgy.com/introduction_bibliography.html.

any version of a ritual that is identical to any other. One of the recurring features of manuscript-based studies of such rites is that their authors remark on the comparative diversity of whatever ritual they are considering. Susan Keefe's previously cited characterization of baptismal rites in the Carolingian period is particularly emphatic but essentially typical; similar statements have been made about the diversity of Anglo-Saxon rites for blessing holy oils, liturgies for excommunication and the consecration of churches from the central Middle Ages, blessings of pilgrims and crusaders in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and rites for public penance in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century France.[5] Contemporaries were aware of this. Walahfrid Strabo, abbot of Reichenau (Germany), writing in c. 840–42 discusses at length the 'great diversity in the liturgy' in his own time and mentions the different versions of the psalms used, and the many variations in baptismal practices. He was tolerant of these differences and, for example, willing to accept the validity of triple or single immersion or effusion.[6] He was aware that much of the liturgical material available in his day had been written only recently and was content that 'new compositions … are not to be rejected' so long as they were doctrinally orthodox.[7] Later on, in the eleventh century, Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury (1070–89), was involved in various disagreements with John, archbishop of Rouen, about vestments. In a surviving letter he draws on his own experience: 'I have often watched various bishops of different provinces dedicating churches, and I have observed most

5 Christopher A. Jones, 'The Chrism Mass in Later Anglo-Saxon England', in *The Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield, HBS Subsidia 5 (London: HBS, 2005), 105–42, esp. 130; Christopher A. Jones, 'The Origins of the "Sarum" Chrism Mass at Eleventh-Century Christ Church, Canterbury', *Mediaeval Studies* 67 (2005): 219–315, esp. 231–32; Chapters 6 and 8 below; M.C. Gaposchkin, 'Origins and Development of the Pilgrimage and Cross Blessings in the Roman Pontificals of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries', *Mediaeval Studies* 73 (2011): 261–86, esp. 262; Mary C. Mansfield, *The Humiliation of Sinners: Public Penance in Thirteenth-Century France* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995), esp. 16, 161, 189–90. Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, 2nd. edn. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), esp. 191, emphasizes the diversity of liturgical practice in the early Church up to the fourth century. For the Carolingian period see also F.S. Paxton, *Christianizing Death: The Creation of a Ritual Process in Early Medieval Europe* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), esp. ch. 5 and 207–9.

6 Alice L. Harting-Corrêa, *Walahfrid Strabo's* Libellus de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum*: A Translation and Liturgical Commentary*, Mittellateinische Studien Und Texte 19 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 1 (for the date), 162–63 (for the quote 'tanta … in ipsis diversitas officiis'), 168–81 (psalms and baptism).

7 '… noviter componi, quae non sint, … abicienda', in ibid., 160–61, and see 136–37, 172–73.

scrupulously all that they did. In some respects their practice differed'.[8] In relation to a detail in the rite for ordaining a subdeacon, he talks about the different rubrics found in 'our own books of episcopal *ordines*, of which we have many from different parts of the world'.[9] This letter is fascinating because it provides evidence for an interest in liturgical minutiae, the importance of witnessed precedents ('I was present when St Leo himself, supreme bishop of the Roman see, dedicated the church of Remiremont …'), and for the academic study of liturgical books.[10] Even in the late Middle Ages, diversity had not disappeared: a late fifteenth-century scribe somewhat exasperatedly introduced the rite for dedicating a church in a manuscript from Besançon by saying: 'Concerning the dedication or consecration of churches there is so much variety among various rites, that not only do they not agree in many things, but they can even contradict one another'.[11] It is not yet clear when liturgies became more stable because less work has been done on the rites of the later Middle Ages than those of earlier periods. However, it has been suggested that this only happened once texts intended to be authoritative and official began to be printed by Pope Pius V in the 1560s.[12]

The extent of diversity is such that where one does, occasionally, find evidence for a group of texts that are substantially similar, this is notable.[13] The

---

8 'Diuersos enim diuersarum prouinciarum praesules aecclesias dedicare sepe conspexi, omnibusque quae ab eis acta sunt quantam potui curam adhibui. Qui etsi in nonnullis dissimilia egerunt'; Helen Clover and Margaret Gibson, eds., *The Letters of Lanfranc Archbishop of Canterbury* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 84–85.

9 'In nostris episcopalis ordinis codicibus, quos ex diuersis regionibus multos habemus'; ibid., 86–87 (translation adapted).

10 'Denique sanctus Leo Romanae sedis summus antistes Romericensem me praesente aecclesiam dedicauit'; ibid., 84–85.

11 'Circa dedicacionem sive consecracionem ecclesiarum apud varios est varietas tanta, ut non solum in multis non conveniant, sed eciam sibi contradicunt'; Besançon, Bibliothèque Municipale, Mss 115-116-117, fol. 90, transcribed in Leroquais, *Pontificaux*, 1: 77, and translated and discussed in Kozachek, 'Repertory', 1–2, and see also Louis Hamilton, this book, 178–79. Keefe, *Water and the Word*, 1:128, for earlier, ninth-century, evidence that bishops were aware of liturgical diversity.

12 John F. Romano, 'Joy in Waiting?: The History of Gaudete Sunday', *Mediaeval Studies* 72 (2010): 75–124, at 107–8; Natalia Nowakowska, 'From Strassburg to Trent: Bishops, Printing and Liturgical Reform in the Fifteenth Century', *Past and Present* 213 (2011): 3–39; Matthew Cheung Salisbury, *The Secular Liturgical Office in Late Medieval England* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015), introduction.

13 Some rites seem to have become 'petrified', apparently through disuse: Mansfield, *Humiliation of Sinners*, 160–61, 245–46. Sometimes when one finds identical *ordines* in several manuscripts it is because the rite is brand new; see for example Helen Gittos, *Liturgy, Architecture, and Sacred Places in Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 113–15 (a ceremony for Candlemas). In some cases rites which have been considered to be 'rather static'

eleventh-century customaries associated with the monastery of Cluny (France) are one example and are discussed in Chapter 9. In this case it appears that their homogeneity reflects the authority that Cluny had. Sometimes Cluniac monks used a written customary as part of the process of reforming another monastery.[14] More often, though, the Cluniac customaries were not used as practical documents to guide daily life but as 'inspirational texts' which 'offered their readers the opportunity to learn about admirable monastic lives'.[15] These customaries sometimes offered models of how to live a good life rather than rules for how to do so. Most of the time, though, medieval rites were 'living' texts that were regularly tinkered with and therefore provide evidence for current ideas and concerns.[16]

The extent of diversity results from many different causes. Sometimes one can uncover the precise historical contexts in which these changes were made. It is clear, for example, that rites were repeatedly revised by liturgists at Canterbury Cathedral throughout the later tenth and eleventh centuries, and enough manuscripts survive that one can see in some detail the successive changes that were made.[17] In some cases these can be associated with particular individuals, such as Archbishop Dunstan's (959–88) interest in the Candlemas ceremony, or the changes to the Palm Sunday service made by Lanfranc (1070–89).[18] In other cases they can be related to particular circumstances, such as the monasticization of the cathedral, or the desire to control the proliferation of newly constructed local churches.[19] Many other examples could be cited. We have, for example,

---

actually were not as S. Hamilton argues in the case of excommunication rites (Chapter 6, this quote on 134).

14 Isabelle Cochelin, 'Customaries as Inspirational Sources', in *Consuetudines et regulae: Sources for Monastic Life in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period*, ed. Carolyn Marino Malone and Clark Maines, Disciplina monastica 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), 27–72, at 27–28 and n. 5. I am grateful to Carolyn Marino Malone for this reference.

15 Ibid., 32.

16 This metaphor has frequently been deployed: see, for example, Keefe, *Water and the Word*, 1:154; Bradshaw, *Origins of Christian Worship*, 5; Jones, 'Chrism Mass', esp. 130–38; Sharon L. McMillan, *Episcopal Ordination and Ecclesial Consensus* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2005), 3; Parkes, this book, 77 below.

17 Jones, 'Chrism Mass'; Jones, 'Origins'; Gittos, *Liturgy*, 45–50, 113–21, 124–28, 220–30; Helen Gittos, 'Sources for the Liturgy of Canterbury Cathedral in the Central Middle Ages', in *Medieval Art, Architecture and Archaeology at Canterbury*, ed. Alixe Bovey (Leeds: British Archaeological Association, 2013), 41–58.

18 Gittos, *Liturgy*, 113–15; Gittos, 'Sources for the Liturgy of Canterbury Cathedral', 47–48. For another example of a rite written by an identifiable person see Paxton, this book, 47.

19 Monasticization: *The Canterbury Benedictional (British Museum, Harl. Ms. 2892)*, ed. R.M. Woolley, HBS 51 (London: HBS, 1917), produced in the second quarter of the eleventh century, is an intriguing manuscript which deserves further study. Its compiler revised several rites to make them accord better with the directions in the *Regularis concordia*. Both complete

evidence for the rite written by Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims (845–82), for the coronation of Charles the Bald as king of Lotharingia in 869.[20] We can read the new liturgies created by Goscelin of Saint-Bertin for the saints of St Augustine's abbey, Canterbury in preparation for their move into the rebuilt church at the end of the eleventh century.[21] One can trace the creation of new rites for consecrating cemeteries in the tenth century as bishops tried to control popular enthusiasm, or for blessing crusaders in the twelfth century, or the revival of interest in celebrating Gaudete Sunday as part of an attempt by Pope Innocent II (1130–43) to establish himself in Rome.[22] When it is possible to identify the circumstances in which particular rites were created their value as evidence increases substantially.

This is especially true when texts and the manuscripts in which they are found can be associated with particular people. Although liturgical books were usually compiled anonymously, they were often personal books, commissioned by particular individuals for their own use, even if these persons are not named. Amongst the best sources for occasional rites are pontificals and manuals, books containing rites to be conducted by bishops and priests respectively. There is evidence that these were often treated as personal books and sometimes subsequently preserved as memorials of the people for whom they were made. We seem to have the pontificals made for Dunstan and Anselm, archbishops of Canterbury (959–88 and 1093–1109), Hugues de Salins, archbishop of Besançon (1031–66), Gundekar, bishop of Eichstätt (1057–75), David de Bernham, bishop of St Andrews (1240–53), and the benedictional (a book containing episcopal blessings for use in the mass) of Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester (963–84) amongst many others.[23] Sometimes there may be good

---

surviving copies of the *Regularis concordia* were made in Canterbury in the mid-eleventh century so it seems likely that the interest in the text at that time was associated with a reform of the community to make it a totally Benedictine house. On the difficulty of telling precisely when this happened see Nicholas Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066* (London: Leicester University Press, 1984), 255–60. This is a topic I hope to examine in more detail in future. Control of local churches: Jones, 'Chrism Mass', esp. 130–38; Helen Gittos, 'Introduction', in *Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Gittos and Bedingfield (London: 2005), 1–11, at 9–10.

[20] Jinty Nelson, 'Coronation Rituals and Related Materials', in *Understanding Medieval Primary Sources: Using Historical Sources to Discover Medieval Europe*, ed. Joel T. Rosenthal (London: Routledge, 2012), 114–30, at 117–21.

[21] Richard Sharpe, 'Goscelin's St Augustine and St Mildreth: Hagiography and Liturgy in Context', *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 41, no. 2 (1990): 502–16.

[22] Gittos, *Liturgy*, 39–54; Gaposchkin, 'Pilgrimage and Cross Blessings'; Romano, 'Gaudete Sunday', 90–102, 120–21.

[23] Gittos, 'Sources for the Liturgy of Canterbury Cathedral'; Sarah Hamilton, 'The Early Pontificals: The Anglo-Saxon Evidence Reconsidered from a Continental Perspective', in *England*

reason to think the commissioners of these books were the deans and precentors who were really in charge of the liturgy, rather than often-absent figureheads, but even so they remain useful evidence for the state of the liturgy in those cathedrals at that time, perhaps for the process of negotiation undertaken with an incoming incumbent: a book may have been produced by a cathedral to try to persuade a new bishop that these were the local customs he should follow.[24] Although we rarely know the names of the priests for whom manuals were written, the surviving manuscripts, which tend to be small, workaday books, are precious evidence for the decisions of their owners, and historians are increasingly paying attention to them. We have, for example, the liturgical manuscripts of a priest ministering in south-eastern Gaul probably in the late seventh century, another belonging to someone working near Liège, Belgium c. 800, and a third from a priest associated with Sherborne Cathedral, Dorset c. 1060; there are many more that deserve study.[25] Even when they are anonymous, it is possible to recover a great deal of information about the authors and compilers of specific liturgies and particular manuscripts.

---

and the Continent in the Tenth Century: Studies in Honour of Wilhelm Levison (1876–1947), ed. David Rollason, Conrad Leyser and Hannah Williams, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 37 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 411–28; *Pontificale ecclesiæ S. Andreæ: The Pontifical Offices Used by David de Bernham, Bishop of S. Andrews*, ed. C. Wordsworth (Edinburgh: Pitsligo Press, 1885).

[24] For the last point see Hamilton, 'Early Pontificals', 427–28.

[25] Yitzhak Hen and Rob Meens, eds., *The Bobbio Missal: Liturgy and Religious Culture in Merovingian Gaul*, Cambridge Studies in Palaeography and Codicology 11 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), esp. editors' conclusion 219–22; Yitzhak Hen, 'A Liturgical Handbook for the Use of a Rural Priest (Brussels, Br 10127–10144)', in *Organising the Written Word: Scripts, Manuscripts, and Texts*, ed. Marco Mostert (Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming); Yitzhak Hen, 'Knowledge of Canon Law among Rural Priests: The Evidence of Two Carolingian Manuscripts from around 800', *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 50, no. 1 (1999): 117–34; Christopher Hohler, 'The Red Book of Darley', in *Nordiskt Kollokvium II: I Latinsk Liturgiforskning 12–13 Maj 1972, Hässelby Slott* (Stockholm: Institutionen för Klassiska Språk vid Stockholms Universitet [1972]): 39–47; Helen Gittos, 'Is There Any Evidence for the Liturgy of Parish Churches in Late Anglo-Saxon England? The Red Book of Darley and the Status of Old English', in *Pastoral Care in Late Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Francesca Tinti, Anglo-Saxon Studies 6 (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2005), 63–83. See also Frederick S. Paxton, '*Bonus Liber*: A Late Carolingian Clerical Manual from Lorsch (Bibliotheca Vaticana Ms Pal. lat. 485)', in *The Two Laws: Studies in Medieval Legal History Dedicated to Stephan Kuttner*, ed. Laurent Mayali and Stephanie A. J. Tibbetts, Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Canon Law 1 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1990), 1–30; Carine van Rhijn, 'The Local Church, Priests' Handbooks and Pastoral Care in the Carolingian Period', in *Chiese locali e chiese regionali nell'alto medioevo*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 61, 2 vols. (Spoleto: Fondazione Centro Italiano di Studi Sull'alto Medioevo, 2014), 2: 689–710; Yitzhak Hen, 'Priests and Books in the Merovingian Period', in *Early Medieval Priests*, ed. Yitzhak Hen and Rob Meens (Hilversum: Verloren, forthcoming).

Sometimes one can use rites to make inferences about the decisions taken by individuals but more often they enable one to examine changes in political, theological or social ideas. This is partly because rites tended to be created and altered by making use of material that already existed:

> One of the advantages for the historian in studying any ritual is the potential it can offer for observing processes within a defined matrix, rather than simply apprehending a single event or series of events caught in a particular moment … ritual provides a structural framework in which … relationships … can be understood over a long period.[26]

The existence of diversity within common forms means such sources are ideal for making comparisons between periods and regions. They offer 'spyholes through which we could look to pinpoint elements of a social reality' of the kind advocated by Chris Wickham for the purposes of writing comparative history.[27] Because liturgy was so diverse, because people did have considerable freedom in how it was celebrated, because there was so little aspiration to uniformity, the surviving written sources are richly informative. As Susan Keefe says – and the other chapters in this book repeatedly emphasize – such texts 'tell of resistance and cooperation, borrowing and independence, conformity and non-conformity, local sensitivities, preferences, needs'.[28]

Historians cannot, however, assume that these differences had much, if anything, to do with how the liturgy was practised.[29] It is clear that liturgical manuscripts were created for many more reasons than was appreciated by earlier generations of scholars.[30] Given the oral nature of the transmission of liturgy in the Middle Ages it is even more important than ever to ask: Why were texts written down?[31] Sometimes it was for a practical purpose: in order to manage long and complex services, for use when out in the field, to note

---

[26] Andrew Jotischky, 'Holy Fire and Holy Sepulchre: Ritual and Space in Jerusalem from the Ninth to the Fourteenth Centuries', in *Ritual and Space in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of the 2009 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. Frances Andrews, Harlaxton Medieval Studies 21 (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2011), 44–60, at 45.

[27] Chris Wickham, 'Problems in Doing Comparative History', in *Challenging the Boundaries of Medieval History: The Legacy of Timothy Reuter*, ed. Patricia Skinner, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 22 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2009), 5–28, at 12.

[28] Keefe, *Water and the Word*, 1:154.

[29] On the last point see below Chapter 8, esp. 183 and Chapter 10.

[30] For the 'variety of intellectual contexts in which a single text could potentially reside' see Parkes, this book, 92.

[31] Thanks to Sarah Hamilton for repeatedly demonstrating to me how useful it is to ask this question; for further discussion of this issue see her chapter in this book, esp. 128. On oral transmission see Symes, this book, 247–49; Cochelin, 'Customaries', 27–28 and n. 5; Steven

down recently encountered texts and chant, to try to ensure revisions were carried out as anticipated, to mitigate the problems caused by a rapid turnover of people, to establish definitive texts.[32] But there were other reasons too. It has been argued that liturgies could be written down in order to control, suppress, limit or fossilize particular practices.[33] In particular, written rituals may have been intended to try to curtail improvisation. This was certainly something that worried Walahfrid Strabo in the ninth century who made a clear distinction between what was written and what was improvised: 'and we see that even today readings and collects and different kinds of praises are being added to an almost superabundance of things … But we must consider, as blessed Augustine says, "that we should sing what is written but what is not written we should not sing".'[34] Another reason for writing liturgies down was to deliberately obscure regional differences in order to emphasize unity. The *Regularis concordia*, a Benedictine customary promulgated at Winchester c. 966, is an example of a text that was probably intended to do several of these things: to suppress some contemporary liturgical practices (in which attempt it was unsuccessful), and to make a statement about unity in the context of the newly created kingdom of the English.[35] This makes it an extremely valuable source – but as evidence for the ideals of King Edgar and Bishop Æthelwold and only at best indirectly for the state of the liturgy in Anglo-Saxon England at the time. Whilst in the past it has been assumed that customaries such as this were compiled as guides to the rules by which a community should live, it is becoming increasingly clear that it is not safe to assume this. One example of this has already been cited: the evidence that many early medieval customaries,

---

Vanderputten, ed., *Understanding Monastic Practices of Oral Communication (Western Europe, Tenth–Thirteenth Centuries)*, Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 21 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011).

32 I have borrowed the last phrase from Carol Symes, 'The Medieval Archive and the History of Theatre: Assessing the Written and Unwritten Evidence for Premodern Performance', *Theatre Survey* 52, no. 1 (2011): 29–58, at 50. For a rite written down in detail because of its novelty, see Romano, 'Gaudete Sunday', 96; for attempts to control doctrine see Bradshaw, *Origins of Christian Worship*, 225. For an example of a reason why a text was written down see Paxton, this book, 52.

33 See this book, Chapters 8 and 10.

34 '… cum videamus usque hodie et lectiones et collectas et diversas laudum species iam paene abundantibus omnibus superaddi … Sed videndum est, sicut beatus Augustinus ait, "ut ea cantentur, quae ita scripta sunt, quae autem non ita scripta sunt, non cantentur."' Harting-Corrêa, *Walahfrid Strabo's* Libellus de exordiis, 136–37. On improvisation see Chave-Mahir, this book, 173–74; Symes, this book, 249–50; and for a late Anglo-Saxon reference to improvisation in private prayer see Christopher A. Jones, 'Performing Christianity: Liturgical and Devotional Writing', in *The Cambridge History of Early Medieval English Literature*, ed. Clare A. Lees (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 427–50, at 441.

35 Symes, 'Medieval Archive', 30.

including those of Cluny, were created as inspirational rather than normative documents.[36] These are some examples of the reasons why texts were written down other than simply being for practical use in a particular ceremony.

More evidence of the multifarious motivations for the creation of written liturgies comes from research into pontificals. The creation of this new type of liturgical book seems to have been part of a strategy to emphasize the power of bishops in the later ninth and early tenth centuries.[37] In some cases pontificals were associated with attempts by archiepiscopal sees to assert control over bishops within their provinces.[38] It has been suggested that the inclusion of didactic texts in them indicates that they were intended as texts from which to teach priests rather than for use in services.[39] Some functioned, even if they were not originally intended, as repositories of local information.[40] One example is the early tenth-century pontifical of Sens which contains an unusual and detailed rite for crowning a queen. This new rite appears to have been drawn up by Archbishop Walter of Sens c. 888–922 in order to demonstrate the rightful rule of successive West Frankish rulers whom he crowned. It was legitimized by being placed next to an older coronation rite for a king. In the tenth and eleventh centuries, oaths of fidelity of suffragan bishops were entered into this book in several places, including in the margins of the queen's coronation rite, which seems therefore to have been read as testimony of the authority of the archbishops of Sens.[41] Some manuscripts were intended both to memorialize the pontificates of individual bishops and serve as institutional histories. The Litlyngton Missal, a large-scale, deluxe mass book which includes some *ordines*, was produced for Westminster Abbey

---

36 Cochelin, 'Customaries', esp. 32–41 where it is also argued that this changed from the twelfth century onwards, especially in the context of the rise of monastic orders in which different houses were tied together by institutions which could be regulatory, such as general chapters and visitations.

37 Eric Palazzo, 'La liturgie de l'occident médiéval autour de l'an mil: Etat de la question', *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale* 43 (2000): 371–94, at 377–83; Palazzo, *History*, 199; Niels Krogh Rasmussen, with Marcel Haverals, *Les pontificaux du haut moyen âge: Genèse du livre de l'évêque*, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense: Etudes et Documents 49 (Leuven, 1998); S. Hamilton, Chapter 6 in this book for discussion about why early pontificals were created and pp. 126–27 for their use as statements of episcopal authority.

38 Hamilton, 'Early Pontificals', 415–16.

39 Ibid., 420–21; S. Hamilton, this book, 127.

40 Hamilton, 'Early Pontificals', 421–28. For an example, see Yitzhak Hen, ed., *The Sacramentary of Echternach (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. lat. 9433)*, HBS 110 (London: HBS, 1997), 39–40.

41 Shane Bobrycki, 'The Royal Consecration *Ordines* of the Pontifical of Sens from a New Perspective', *Bulletin du centre d'études médiévales d'Auxerre* 13 (2009): 131–42, at 4–6 and 8n29 in the online edition; Hamilton, 'Early Pontificals', 422.

in 1383/84, and was commissioned to enshrine Abbot Nicholas Litlyngton into the history of the institution.[42] This book was so huge it would have been extremely unwieldy to use. It would be foolish to study the rites in such a book as if they were created primarily as texts from which to perform the liturgy.[43] As these examples demonstrate, rites *may* provide clues about how liturgy was performed but they can only be used as such with a great deal of care. Far from limiting their historical value, that makes them valuable for understanding the initiatives of particular individuals, for regional traditions, for institutional history, for ideas and ideals and – sometimes – for practice.

Process: How can Rites be Read?

In order to make sense of any one version of a ritual it needs to be placed within its widest possible context, especially:

- in relation to other versions of the same rite
- in relation to other rituals to which it is related
- within its manuscript context
- within the historical contexts of the place and time when it was written and read.

How can one achieve this? The last two points will be familiar to anyone working with manuscript sources. As far as possible it is desirable to try to answer questions such as: Where and when was the manuscript written? Who was it written and/or commissioned by and for? What else is in the manuscript? For what purposes was it created? Was it used and, if so, is there evidence for how? What else can be discovered about the manuscript's later history?

In terms of the text of a particular rite, in order to be able to interpret it one needs to know what in it is common and what is unusual, what is old and what may be new.[44] It is only possible to do this by adopting a comparative approach and by seeking out comparative material – from earlier and later periods, different regions, sometimes even from different religions depending on the questions one is addressing: 'the comparative perspective heightens the contrasts and makes … some of the different developments … easier to see,

---

[42] Jayne Wackett, 'The Litlyngton Missal: Its Patron, Iconography and Messages' (unpub. PhD thesis, University of Kent, 2015). For a definition of the word '*ordo*' see 4n4 above.

[43] Pfaff, *Liturgy*, 228. See also Parkes, this book, 98–99.

[44] Susan Rankin, *The Music of the Medieval Liturgical Drama in France and England*, 2 vols. (New York: Garland, 1989), 1:3, 7, 73.

perhaps even to explain'.[45] It can be helpful to cast the net widely to begin with before narrowing down the group of materials that are particularly useful, rather like an archaeologist undertaking surveys and opening up trial trenches to get a sense of the terrain and work out where activity should best be focused. You may be lucky to find that someone else has already done the spade-work and written a history of the ritual in question.[46] However, even so, one must be cautious about trusting secondary sources of this kind. There are several reasons for this. Few studies have been founded on extensive manuscript-based research; many more rely on edited canonical texts. This is problematic because of the misleading nature of such editions, which is discussed in Chapters 4 and 5. Also, the pervasiveness of misplaced ideas about the influence of the liturgies of major centres such as Rome and Salisbury has tended to skew interpretation.[47] The labelling of liturgies as 'Gallican', 'Roman' or 'of Sarum Use' in the Middle Ages often seems to have been intended as a mark of orthodoxy, a stamp of approval, rather than a statement that this was how things were done in Gaul or Rome or Salisbury.[48] In the Carolingian period, it appears that any baptismal rite could be called 'Roman' if it included the scrutinies, the preparatory meetings that took place in the week beforehand: '"The Roman ordo of baptism" meant a type of rite, of which there could be numerous legitimate variations'.[49] Additionally, the tendency to elide difference by writing about *ordines* as if they were literary texts (for example, the First and Second English Coronation *ordines*) and regional differences as though there were national rites ('Gallican'/ 'Mozarabic'/ 'Irish') means that the surviving evidence is often misrepresented.[50] In other words, one is likely to find that the manuscript evidence is much more diverse and complex

45 Wickham, 'Problems in Doing Comparative History', 27, talking about a different example of comparative history.

46 For useful bibliographic sources see the references cited in the Introduction, 3n2 above. The introductions to two editions are bibliographic mines, though they lack subject indices: *The Leofric Missal*, ed. Nicholas Orchard, 2 vols., HBS 113–14 (London: HBS, 2002); *The Sacramentary of Ratoldus (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, lat. 12052)*, ed. Nicholas Orchard, HBS 116 (London: HBS, 2005).

47 See this book, Chapter 2, 48, and Chapters 4 and 5; Hen, 'Liturgical Handbook'; Keefe, *Water and the Word*, 1, esp. 98–115, 131–37; Mansfield, *Humiliation of Sinners*, 13.

48 I am grateful to Matthew Salisbury for articulating this point so clearly to me. See this book, Chapter 2, 48, and Chapter 5. Paxton, '*Bonus Liber*', 16 and n.69; Keefe, *Water and the Word*, 1:42, 67–68, 150–53; Matthew Cheung Salisbury, *The Use of York: Characteristics of the Medieval Liturgical Office in York*, Borthwick Paper 113 (York: Borthwick Institute, University of York, 2008), esp. 40.

49 Keefe, *Water and the Word*, 1:67–69, 150–53 (quote on 150).

50 For example: 'the native Gallican rite', Gerald Ellard, *Ordination Anointings in the Western Church before 1000 AD* (Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy of America, 1933), 18; 'the various "national" usages', Cornelius Bouman, *Sacring and Crowning: The Development of the Latin Ritual for the Anointing of Kings and the Coronation of an Emperor before the Eleventh Century*

than one would expect from the way it has been presented in the historiography. Finally, it is often the case that current ideas about the dates and places of origins of key manuscripts have changed considerably since older studies were written and this can have a considerable impact on the conclusions reached. So, while it is always worth seeking out earlier studies of a particular ritual, not least because they are likely to guide you to a core repertory of prayers and a range of sources, their conclusions must be handled cautiously.

It is therefore important to look at as many manuscript witnesses as possible. Printed editions are a quick way of doing this but one needs to be careful when using synthetic editions based on several manuscripts which claim to reconstruct a text that cannot be shown ever to have existed, like the Romano-German Pontifical: this issue is discussed in Chapters 4 and 5.[51] *Ordines* tend to be found in pontificals, manuals and sacramentaries, so these are sensible places to look. Edmond Martène's early eighteenth-century collection of editions of *ordines* remains useful as do the descriptive catalogues produced by Victor Leroquais.[52] Other especially valuable resources are the handlist of pontificals compiled by Richard Kay and the editions produced by the Henry Bradshaw Society.[53] As more manuscripts are digitized it is becoming increasingly easy to look them up directly rather than having to work initially via intermediaries. This is likely to have a radical effect on the whole discipline.[54]

At an early stage it is helpful to identify the core material of a ritual: prayers, chant and readings that were often compiled early in the history of a rite and are commonly found.[55] This is where synthetic editions of texts can be useful. Consulting editions of the early medieval Supplemented Hadrianum, *Ordines Romani*, *PRG*, and later medieval 'Sarum' rite can be a fast way of identifying

(Groningen: J.B. Wolters, 1957), xiii. Bradshaw, *Origins of Christian Worship*, 145, discusses the tendency to emphasize similarities rather than differences, and see Parkes, this volume, 79–80.

51 *PRG*.

52 Edmund Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus*, 2nd edn., 4 vols. (Antwerp: Joannis Baptistae de la Bry, 1736–38). It needs to be used in conjunction with Aimé-Georges Martimort, *La documentation liturgique de Dom Edmond Martène: Etude codicologique*, Studi e Testi 279 (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1978) which identifies the modern shelfmarks of many of the manuscripts; Leroquais, *Pontificaux*; V. Leroquais, *Les sacramentaires et les missels manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, 4 vols. (Paris: n.p., 1924).

53 Kay, *Pontificalia*.

54 There is currently an online catalogue of Digitized Medieval Manuscripts at http://digitizedmedievalmanuscripts.org/ and the Digital Image Archive of Medieval Music is also useful: http://www.diamm.ac.uk/. There are substantial collections of microfilms of medieval manuscripts at the Hill Museum and Manuscript Library, St John's University, US, and the Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, France. For examples of digitized texts see the ones discussed in Chapter 6.

55 Rankin, *Music of the Medieval Liturgical Drama*, 1:12–15.

common texts. Such work can be supplemented by the collation tables found at the back of some editions.[56] The identification of a common core of materials is helpful because it makes it easier to spot things that appear to be distinctive to the manuscript(s) in question.

The distinctive material – of whatever kind, whether prayers, rubrics, or ritual actions – can help to identify the 'family' of texts to which the ritual belongs. Occasionally one will find a copy of a text that exists in other manuscripts. More often it will share affinities, more or less closely, with other rites. The word 'family' has been used in several recent studies and is a useful analogy for describing rites that are more or less textually related to one another. People talk about identifying 'tell-tale signs', 'markers', 'signature features', 'symptoms', 'traits' or 'text elements' of one type of rite or another.[57] An example is the 'breviculum' type of rite for blessing holy oils, so-called because of its 'unusual provision that each ampoule shall bear a *breviculum* ("label" or "tag") identifying the oil that it contains'.[58] Often the simplest way of identifying such families is by distilling the rites in question down to their principal constituent parts: the sequence of ritual actions. This usually reveals major differences between families.[59] But other features may help to do so, such as the titles they are given or the musical notation included in them.[60] I have repeatedly found in my own research that patterns are much easier to spot the more evidence one has. If you only look at a few sources it is hard to see what features are worth attending to, so it is important to examine material written over a long time span and from a wide geographical area.

Having cast the net widely, one can then return to the particular text or texts in question with a better sense of their chronological and geographical affinities. Often one will be interested in interrogating them further to ask

---

[56] Some key texts are cited in Chapters 2–5.

[57] Mansfield, *Humiliation of Sinners*, 193–96; Jones, 'Chrism Mass', esp. 114–15; Christopher A. Jones, 'Wulfstan's Liturgical Interests', in *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, ed. Matthew Townend, Studies in the Early Middle Ages 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2004), 325–52, at 344–45; Rankin, *Music of the Medieval Liturgical Drama*, 1:60.

[58] Jones, 'Chrism Mass', 114.

[59] Robert Taft, 'The Structural Analysis of Liturgical Units: An Essay in Methodology', *Worship* 52 (1978): 314–29 for an example in this volume see L. Hamilton, 180–81.

[60] 'Ordines tend to reveal something of their pedigree in their very titles … titles in particular may tell us something about the principal exemplar a scribe had before him' : Kozachek, 'Repertory', 33. On the value of music in this context see Rankin, *Music of the Medieval Liturgical Drama*, 1:13; Kozachek, 'Repertory', esp. 83–84, 319–21 (where he argues that the notation of only a few antiphons in a particular rite suggests this was because the antiphons – and their music – were new), 323–26 (for the suggestion that the sporadic provision of notation in a ritual was for its use on 'a specific occasion'); Chapter 3, 66–67 below.

questions like: How did this rite change over time? Where and when did it originate? Where and when was it revised? This usually involves trying to work out the relationships between texts within a group and attempting to place them in a chronological sequence. This is difficult to do; it is particularly hard to establish hypotheses capable of verification or falsification. This is because only a small proportion of the evidence survives, one is dealing with a textual tradition in which scribes were not aiming to reproduce literary texts faithfully, and there was a great deal of cross-fertilization between families of texts.[61] One also has to remember that the dates when particular rites were compiled may be different from the dates of the manuscripts in which they are found. The appearance of old rites in later books may not necessarily be due to slavish copying: for example it has been suggested that an ancient *ordo* for the blessing of the oils may have been 'rediscovered and proudly adopted in the course of the tenth-century revival' in England.[62] Nonetheless research has to focus on the surviving evidence. People tend to proceed by drawing up tables which summarize the structure and content of each rite as accurately as possible.[63] This allows one to see which rites share most material with one another. Often you can identify prayers or ritual actions added into an earlier rite which subsequently became part of the standard repertory.[64] At times one can glimpse this process in action where, for example, a scribe has several exempla open on the desk and s/he is selecting between them.[65] Sometimes

[61] Rankin, *Music of the Medieval Liturgical Drama*, 1:146; Bradshaw, *Origins of Christian Worship*, 5; Jones, 'Chrism Mass', esp. 128; Mansfield, *Humiliation of Sinners*, 193–94; Pfaff, *Liturgy*, 156, 'the comparative-textual method is irreplaceable but limited, in both scope and accuracy. We cannot operate without it, but it is unlikely ever to reveal a whole story'.

[62] Jones, 'Chrism Mass', 112.

[63] Examples: Sarah Hamilton, 'Rites for Public Penance in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in *Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Gittos and Bedingfield, 93–103; Jones, 'Chrism Mass', 139–40; Jones, 'Origins', 288–315; Helen Gittos, 'Hallowing the Rood: Consecrating Crosses in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies in Honor of George Hardin Brown*, ed. Karen Louise Jolly, Catherine E. Karkov and Sarah Larratt Keefer (Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2008), 242–75, at 269–73, 275; Gittos, *Liturgy*, Tables 1–4, pp. 46–47, 116–18, 125–27, 246–55.

[64] S. Hamilton, this book, 155 for an example.

[65] For example, in the church dedication ceremony in the later tenth-century Egbert Pontifical (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Ms. latin 10575) the scribe appears to have had several rites in front of him and on one occasion copied out a rubric commonly found in tenth-century Frankish pontificals and then, noticing that this conflicted with contemporary Anglo-Saxon practice, struck it out, and copied out a rubric found in several other Anglo-Saxon manuscripts: *Two Anglo-Saxon Pontificals (the Egbert and Sidney Sussex Pontificals)*, ed. H.M.J. Banting, HBS 104 (London: HBS, 1989), 42–43; Kozachek, 'Repertory', 303n16, 305–6, 313n30; Gittos, *Liturgy*, 223, fig. 79. For other examples see Jones, 'Chrism Mass', 128–30, and S. Hamilton, 142–43 below.

one can see that a medieval liturgist has chosen features characteristic of one type of rite and inserted them into another. In early versions these can appear as marginal additions, which then get incorporated into later copies.[66] One recurring characteristic of the history of rites is that to begin with only the key texts required by the celebrant and skeletal rubrics are recorded. In later versions, the service gets more complex, and more detail is written down. This tendency may then be checked as it becomes desirable to slim down *ordines* in part to make them more usable. It does not follow that the simplest rites are the earliest, but it is often the case.[67] It is also common to find new material placed at the end of a rite; only in later versions does it get moved into its proper, intended location, displacing earlier texts.[68] Using all this information it should be possible to work out the simplest explanation for how the various rites within a family are related to one another – and to those in other families.[69] All the time one needs to keep an eye on the manuscript contexts of the texts in question. It may be possible to test one's resulting hypothesis by collating the texts of prayers to see whether variants follow the predicted pattern.[70]

It is worth saying here that whilst there has been an understandable backlash against the desire to seek the origins of rites, it is not a completely futile enterprise. The reason for the negativity is that in the past liturgical scholarship was dominated by a search for origins and an erroneous belief that there was once a single early text which could be reconstructed. This meant that the surviving manuscripts were not considered as valuable evidence in their own right and attempts were made to reconstruct ancient texts that never existed and establish evolutionary models that were false.[71] However, new rites *were* created – sometimes surprisingly late – and the process can sometimes be recovered and be of considerable historical interest.[72]

---

66 Jones, 'Chrism Mass', 128.

67 J. Brückmann, 'The Ordines of the Third Recension of the Medieval English Coronation Order', in *Essays in Medieval History Presented to Bertie Wilkinson*, ed. T.A. Sandquist and M.R. Powicke (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969), 99–115, at 110; Rankin, *Music of the Medieval Liturgical Drama*, 1:12; Bradshaw, *Origins of Christian Worship*, 9; Symes, this book, 251–52; for an example of a streamlined rite see S. Hamilton, this book, 143–53.

68 For an example see Jones, 'Origins', 280n169; Kozachek, 'Repertory', 254.

69 Examples of diagrammatic representations of such hypotheses: Mansfield, *Humiliation of Sinners*, 194–95; Gittos, *Liturgy*, figs. 10, 35, 84. For the difficulties in doing such research see Parkes, 79–80 below.

70 For an example along these lines, see Jones, 'Origins', 280.

71 Bradshaw, *Origins of Christian Worship*, 1–13; Parkes, this book, Chapter 4; Salisbury, this book, Chapter 5, esp. 104; Flynn, this book, 58.

72 Gittos, *Liturgy*, 39–54 (for the consecration of cemeteries), 235–36 (for relaying pavements moved from elsewhere).

When all this is done it is possible to read the rites much more attentively and to suggest where, when and by whom a version of a rite was created and for what reasons.

Problems

Having suggested a way of proceeding, it is worth considering some of the problems that are likely to be encountered. These liturgical sources pose challenges owing to the very diversity that makes them so interesting. Such a small proportion of the evidence survives that major changes can be obscured from view. The vast majority of evidence is unpublished, sometimes either uncatalogued or poorly catalogued, and is likely to remain so.[73] This is why the digitization of manuscripts will have a particularly significant impact on this field. The degree of difference encountered can be hard to manage, especially for complex rites such as the dedication of churches or royal coronations. For this reason studies tend to aim broadly but end up tackling only aspects of a rite, or material from a limited chronological or geographical area.[74] Because of the need to deal with very large numbers of manuscripts it can be hard to keep a firm grip on the evidence for the dates and places of origins of those that one is not working on directly. One often finds that histories of rites are marred by errors of this kind, which can seriously undermine the conclusions drawn. It is worth spending time on this; *Scriptorium Online* is a useful bibliographic resource for published work on medieval manuscripts.[75]

Another type of problem is encountered with those rituals that have a rather unusual textual history, of which two examples are discussed in Chapters 6 and 7. The excommunication rites considered by Sarah Hamilton only began to be written down some time after they were first used and continued to be viewed as being 'peripheral to the content of pontificals'.[76] They were initially recorded in legal manuscripts alongside canon law and later on tended to be added into liturgical manuscripts, often in an ad hoc manner. As Florence Chave-Mahir reveals, exorcisms are even more elusive – they were rarely written down at all

73 The situation today is little different from the one depicted just after the war: 'Every study in this field … is bound, despite extensive consultation of manuscripts, to be incomplete and provisional … and the student will notice that many roads are as yet unpaved and that even the highways are not always reliable'; Ernst H. Kantorowicz, *Laudes regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Mediaeval Ruler Worship*, University of California Publications in History 33 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1946), ix.

74 For example, McMillan, *Episcopal Ordination*, 2, and Paxton, this book, 41–42.

75 www.scriptorium.be last accessed 23 April 2015.

76 See 140 below.

until the very end of the Middle Ages.[77] Why this was remains to be discovered: perhaps both were considered too potent and dangerous to be routinely written out as *ordines* in pontificals. Certainly these examples demonstrate that one needs to be alert to the possibility that evidence may lurk in unlikely places.[78] This is also a useful reminder of the extent to which only a limited amount of what was performed ever got written down.

Even when one does have an *ordo*, it is highly unlikely to be in any sense complete.[79] A fundamental aspect of liturgical books is that they were usually designed to be used by a particular person and to contain only those parts of the service required by that individual.[80] So, for Palm Sunday, one may find additional material in a processional (a book containing chant for use in processions) that is not included in an *ordo*. It is also common to find only the *incipits* of chant rather than full texts, and this can alter the apparent rhythm of a rite considerably. In a re-enactment of a late medieval rite for reconciling penitents on Maundy Thursday, those participants used to reading liturgical texts were a little taken aback by how long it took to sing the seven penitential psalms – a rubric of only a few words actually took almost twenty minutes to complete.[81] This point is made forcibly in Fred Paxton's attempt to create a full text of all the elements in the death ritual from a late eleventh-century customary from Cluny: the result is many times longer than the original *ordo*.[82] One aspect of learning to read rites is knowing where else to look to find texts that are not given in full.

Another problem is knowing how to recognize rites in the first place. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, editors tended to make judgements about the genre to which texts belonged, many of which now look inappropriate. Eager to seek the origins of European drama, vernacular texts displaying what were perceived to be dramatic characteristics were identified and printed in such a manner that they were completely detached from their manuscript contexts. The text known as 'Sponsus', for example, a 'liturgical play' in Latin and Occitan

---

77 Chapter 7.

78 For baptismal *ordines* in manuscripts intended for educational purposes or as exempla, see Keefe, *Water and the Word*, 1:21–30.

79 S. Hamilton, this volume, 153–58 for an example.

80 John Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Eighteenth Century: A Historical Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), 59, ch. 4.

81 This was organized by John Harper and took place at St Teilo's church, St Fagans National History Museum, Cardiff, in June 2010. A film of it can be seen at the AHRC Interpreting Medieval Liturgy Network website (http://projects.exeter.ac.uk/mlnetwork/workshop3.php) and on YouTube (http://www.youtube.com/user/MedievalLiturgy). See also p. 70.

82 Frederick S. Paxton, *The Death Ritual at Cluny in the Central Middle Ages / Le rituel de la mort à Cluny au moyen âge central*, Disciplina monastica 9, fontes 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013); and see below 50–56.

for the Easter Vigil, was printed in a facsimile as if it were a discrete item in the manuscript, starting on its own line. In fact, it follows on directly from the preceding liturgy. It is found in a late eleventh-century proser-troper (which contains sung embellishments for use in the mass and office) from the abbey of Saint-Martial, Limoges: there is no reason to think that contemporaries would have seen this as anything other than liturgy. As Carol Symes says, 'Plays independent from liturgical context are what scholars have wanted to see, and they will occasionally go to great lengths in order to ensure that this is all there is to be seen.'[83] Parallels can be made with a group of Latin and Old English texts known as the 'Cattle Theft Charms' for use when a horse or cow was stolen. These 'charms' tend to be found in legal manuscripts. Once interpreted as pagan survivals, they are now being considered as examples 'of episcopal performative power in a realm that falls somewhere between our modern labels of liturgy and law'.[84] I suspect even this may be unnecessarily tentative and they are best considered simply as liturgical texts. Anglo-Saxon medical remedies and other kinds of charms have also suffered from having been gathered up and mislabelled. It is only in very recent times that scholars are finally willing to see that some, if not all, of these are best understood as prayers, blessings and liturgical rites. This is despite the number of clues available: they sometimes contain liturgical Latin, are found in liturgical books, and refer to their being carried out by priests in churches.[85] These are examples of how the assignment of texts to particular

[83] Carol Symes, 'The Appearance of Early Vernacular Plays: Forms, Functions, and the Future of Medieval Theatre', *Speculum* 77, no. 3 (2002): 778–831, at 795; Carol Symes, 'A Few Odd Visits: Unusual Settings of the *Visitatio sepulchri*', in *Music and Medieval Manuscripts: Paleography and Performance: Essays Dedicated to Andrew Hughes*, ed. John Haines and Randall Rosenfeld (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 300–22, at 301–12.

[84] Tracey-Anne Cooper, 'Episcopal Power and Performance: The Fugitive-Thief Rite in Textus Roffensis (Also Known as the Cattle-Theft Charm)', in *Textus Roffensis: Law, Language and Libraries in Early Medieval England*, ed. Bruce O'Brien and Barbara Bombi (Turnhout: Brepols, forthcoming). Thanks to the author for sending me a copy of this prior to publication. Geoffrey Koziol, 'The Early History of Rites of Supplication', in *Suppliques et requêtes: le gouvernement par la Grâce en Occident, XIIe–XVe siècle*, ed. Hélène Millet (Rome: Ecole française de Rome, 2003), 21–36, at 29 argues that early medieval petitions 'were essentially prayers'.

[85] For relevant discussion see John D. Niles, 'The Æcerbot Ritual in Context', in *Old English Literature in Context: Ten Essays*, ed. John D. Niles (Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1980), 44–56, 163–64; Karen Louise Jolly, *Popular Religion in Late Saxon England: Elf Charms in Context* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 113–23, 132–68; Stephanie Hollis, 'Scientific and Medical Writings', in *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature*, ed. Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001), 188–208, esp. 203; John Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 484–85; R.M. Liuzza, 'Prayers and/ or Charms to the Cross', in *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies in Honor of George Hardin Brown*, ed. Karen Louise Jolly, Catherine E. Karkov and Sarah Larratt Keefer (Morgantown: West Virginia University Press, 2007), 279–323; Rebecca M.C. Fisher, 'The Anglo-Saxon Charms:

genres in modern times continues to influence the way material is classified and interpreted.

My final example of a problem is also partly a solution. In this chapter I have focused on *ordines* because they are of fundamental importance. However, there are likely to be a very large number of other types of sources for the history of any given rite including sermons, saints' lives, expositions of the liturgy, artistic depictions, architectural settings, other narrative sources, even account books listing payments for materials and work in preparation for a particular service. Ideally one would take all of this material into account.[86] However, this is often impractical, and instead scholars tend to focus on particular types of sources. This is not ideal because different genres of source tend to provide insights which may be complementary but can be apparently contradictory. Chapter 8 explores this by comparing the types of information about rites for dedicating churches that can be gained from liturgical books and sermons. By looking across a range of sources we may understand more about how rituals were experienced and considered. Attention to other sources is crucial when few *ordines* survive and in Chapter 7 Florence Chave-Mahir explores the use of hagiography as a source for liturgical practice. As we learn to ask better questions, there are likely to be many more inferences that can be made about liturgical practices from church buildings themselves and in Chapter 9 Carolyn Marino Malone gives some examples of what can be learnt by combining texts and buildings.[87] Wherever

---

Texts in Context', in *Approaching Methodology*, ed. Frog and Pauliina Latvala, with Helen F. Leslie (Helsinki: Finnish Academy of Science and Letters, 2012), 221–47; Jones, 'Performing Christianity', 441–43; Rebecca M.C. Fisher, 'Genre, Prayers and the Anglo-Saxon Charms' in *Genre, Text, Interpretation: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Folklore and Beyond*, ed. Kaarina Koski (University of Helsinki, forthcoming); and now particularly Ciaran Arthur, 'The Liturgy of Charms in Anglo-Saxon England' (working title for unpub. PhD thesis, University of Kent, in progress). I am grateful to Ciaran Arthur and also former students on my special subject *Ritual, Ceremony and Magic in the Early Middle Ages* and on the University of Kent's MA in Medieval and Early Modern Studies for helping me explore this material, especially Ruth Stone, and to Rebecca Fisher for sending me an advance copy of her forthcoming article.

86 Examples of studies of individual rites that draw on several genres of evidence include Robert Bartlett, *Trial by Fire and Water: The Medieval Judicial Ordeal* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986); Mansfield, *Humiliation of Sinners*, with comments on sources at 14–16; Joseph H. Lynch, *Christianizing Kinship: Ritual Sponsorship in Anglo-Saxon England* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998); Sarah Hamilton, *The Practice of Penance, 900–1050* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2001); Florence Chave-Mahir, *L'exorcisme des possédés dans l'Eglise d'Occident (Xe–XIVe siècle)*, Bibliothèque d'histoire culturelle du moyen âge 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011).

87 These are useful bibliographies: Sible de Blaauw, 'Architecture and Liturgy in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Traditions and Trends in Modern Scholarship', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 33 (1991): 1–34; Eric Palazzo, 'Art and Liturgy in the Middle Ages: Survey of Research (1980–2003) and Some Reflections on Method', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 105, no. 1 (2006): 170–84. Examples of other recent studies which adopt a variety

possible, triangulation with other types of sources can greatly help interpretation of the *ordines*.

Possibilities

In order to understand better how liturgical rites were created, revised and used in the Middle Ages, research needs to proceed in several directions:

> A fast rule in the study of liturgical manuscripts generally, and of pontificals especially, is that relations between books as wholes cannot be argued merely on the evidence of this or that single component. And yet the working out of such larger relationships has few options but to proceed ritual by ritual.[88]

In other words, there needs to be more investigation of the history of individual rites, the relationships between individual manuscripts, as well as between families of manuscripts. One question is: Was diversity more acceptable in some rituals – and books of rituals – than others? It is widely accepted that 'as one moved outward from the canon first to the rest of the liturgy of the mass, then to the daily office, and finally to occasional rites like penance, one finds at each step more tolerance for alteration.'[89] It has also been said that pontificals 'tend to be much less conservative than sacramentaries [mass books]'.[90] Are these impressions correct and, if so, what do they suggest about how different types of rituals were classified, and do these observations remain valid throughout the Middle Ages?[91] Another major question is: At what stage do we begin to see a great deal of homogeneity in rites? Is this true for the late Middle Ages? Are

of approaches include: P.S. Barnwell, 'The Laity, the Clergy and the Divine Presence: The Use of Space in Smaller Churches of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 157 (2004): 41–60; Richard Gem, 'How Much Can Anglo-Saxon Buildings Tell Us about Liturgy?', in *Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Gittos and Bedingfield, 271–89; Paul Everson and David Stocker, 'The Common Steeple? Church, Liturgy, and Settlement in Early Medieval Lincolnshire', in *Anglo-Norman Studies 27: Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2005*, ed. C.P. Lewis (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2006), 103–23; Paul Crossley, '*Ductus* and *Memoria*: Chartres Cathedral and the Workings of Rhetoric', in *Rhetoric Beyond Words: Delight and Persuasion in the Arts of the Middle Ages*, ed. Mary Carruthers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 214–49; Tomás Ó Carragáin, 'Archaeology of Early Medieval Baptism at St Mullin's, Co Carlow', *Peritia: Journal of the Medieval Academy of Ireland* 21 (2010): 285–302; Gittos, *Liturgy*. See also the references in Paxton, this book, 54n64.

88 Jones, 'Chrism Mass', 128.

89 Mansfield, *Humiliation of Sinners*, 160.

90 Jones, 'Chrism Mass', 111.

91 See also S. Hamilton, this volume, 158.

there particular regions in which this happened? Did the availability of printed texts curtail improvisation?[92]

Greater attention to evidence for moments of decision making in the process of putting together a text would be instructive. Occasionally one can see that a scribe had one or more manuscripts open in front of him/her, and was selecting bits from each rite, as is the case with a church dedication rite in the late tenth-century Egbert Pontifical.[93] Such instances give some insight into the process by which rites were revised and the options available at a particular place. More attention to the working documents of liturgists would be useful too. Some of the materials in the commonplace books of Wulfstan, archbishop of York (1002–23) look as if they were gathered up by a man with a keen interest in liturgy.[94] It seems likely that more evidence of this kind will have survived, particularly given the materials for the composition of sermons that are being recovered.[95] Another approach would be to make careful comparisons between manuscripts which are similar: examples I am familiar with are the Dunstan and Anderson pontificals, and two mid-eleventh-century pontificals associated with Leofric, bishop of Exeter (1046–72).[96] Each pair of manuscripts is substantially, though not entirely, alike: working out the ways in which they differ and the inferences that can be made from those differences could be instructive. More work on larger groups of closely related manuscripts also would be helpful. There are some places from which many manuscripts survive, and this allows one to trace change over time in some detail. Fred Paxton and Eric Palazzo have demonstrated how productive such analysis can be in their work on the ninth-century sacramentaries from St Amand and Fulda.[97] Canterbury Cathedral in

[92] I am grateful to Matthew Salisbury for this suggestion. Analogously, it has been argued that printed texts served to delineate genres of plays: Symes, 'Appearance of Early Vernacular Plays', 828–29. See also p. 16 and n. 12 above.

[93] See above, n. 65.

[94] Jones, 'Wulfstan's Liturgical Interests'.

[95] For example, Ursula Lenker, 'The Rites and Ministries of the Canons: Liturgical Rubrics to Vernacular Gospels and Their Functions in a European Context', in *Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Gittos and Bedingfield, 185–212.

[96] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Ms. latin 943; London, British Library, Additional Ms. 57337; London, British Library, Additional Ms. 28188, an edition of which is being prepared by Christopher A. Jones for publication by the HBS; London, British Library, Ms. Cotton Vitellius A. vii. For discussion and references see Gittos, *Liturgy*, 279–80, 283, 285–86. This is something I hope to pursue.

[97] Paxton, *Christianizing Death*, 169–85, and this book Chapter 2; Eric Palazzo, *Les sacramentaires de Fulda: Etude sur l'iconographie et la liturgie à l'époque ottonienne*, Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 77 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1994). Carolyn Malone makes use of the three surviving customaries from Saint-Bénigne, Dijon, in Chapter 9 of this book, pp. 208–25.

the central Middle Ages is one place where it is possible to do this for rites, and some research has demonstrated the potential of the material, but more could be done.[98] Another candidate would be the cathedral of Sens, France, from where many manuscripts survive.[99] These are examples of the kinds of research that would help reveal more about the processes involved in the creation and revision of rites.

Such research feeds into debate about the circumstances in which rites were created and revised. Did this tend to happen in preparation for a particular occasion? Or when a new manuscript was commissioned? Were there moments when a desire for reform led to thorough revision? To what extent were written rites intended to control behaviour, close down options and curtail improvisation?[100] Such questions are bound up with the issue of who was responsible for revising rites: cantors? precentors? librarians? abbots? bishops? deans?[101] Were new rites disseminated from particular centres, such as the cathedrals of Canterbury, Salisbury, York and Rome, or the monastery at Cluny? And in what circumstances were the manuscripts themselves produced? It has been suggested that in late Anglo-Saxon England, 'a new pontifical was created for each archbishop as he took up office'.[102] Mary Mansfield has argued that northern French pontificals from c. 1150 to 1350 'had an average life span of fifty years or so' and from the fourteenth century pontificals 'were increasingly luxury items produced to celebrate the election of a particular bishop rather than to serve the diocese during several episcopates'.[103] Is this true? If so, who was responsible for shaping the contents of these books?[104] Was this used as an opportunity for liturgical revision or were these compilations of rites that had been revised since the last pontifical was made? How influential were pontificals? Were they vehicles for authorizing new ideas or hardly used books largely for display?[105] What purpose did explicatory and theological rubrics serve? One oddity that remains to be explained is that although pontificals contained rites

98 Jones, 'Origins'; Gittos, *Liturgy*, 42–54, 113–21, 124–29, 220–30; Gittos, 'Sources for the Liturgy of Canterbury Cathedral'.

99 Mansfield, *Humiliation of Sinners*, 162n6, 231–34.

100 Symes, Chapter 10 below with references to her previous work.

101 Margot E. Fassler, 'The Office of the Cantor in Early Western Monastic Rules and Customaries: A Preliminary Investigation', *Early Music History* 5 (1985): 29–51; Mansfield, *Humiliation of Sinners*, 163.

102 David N. Dumville, *Liturgy and the Ecclesiastical History of Late Anglo-Saxon England: Four Studies* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), 93; Gittos, 'Sources for the Liturgy of Canterbury Cathedral', 41–44.

103 Mansfield, *Humiliation of Sinners*, 162, 230.

104 Ibid., 163–64.

105 'At times, in fact, the liturgical books actually anticipated theological changes'; Mansfield, *Humiliation of Sinners*, 164.

that were designed to be used by bishops they appear to have been owned by a wider range of people and institutions, especially monasteries and nunneries. This seems to have been the case right through the Middle Ages. So far, some possible explanations have been suggested but no sustained research has been done. Such books may have been used as academic resources, especially for the theology of the liturgy, or available for use by visiting bishops, or by abbots when they participated in grand episcopal ceremonies, or they may have been part of the accoutrements of a mitred abbot.[106] Nicholas Litlyngton, the abbot of Westminster whose missal we have previously encountered, seems to have been very keen in that book to demonstrate that he could perform liturgical ceremonies usually restricted to a bishop.[107] The range of possible reasons why places other than cathedrals had copies of pontificals shows how useful it would be to understand the problem better.

And what about manuals, book for priests: how were they put together? Recent research has begun to undermine the negative stereotypes of priests as poorly educated, lazy incompetents. Examples of priestly books and book collections have been studied, though so far only on a small scale.[108] One late eighth- or early ninth-century Carolingian example was written by at least three scribes simultaneously, which led Yitzhak Hen to wonder whether there was 'mass production of similar codices for the use of priests and itinerant missionaries throughout the Carolingian empire'.[109] Were there times when priests compiled their own manuscripts, gathering materials they anticipated would be useful, copying out texts encountered during their training?[110] The fundamental nature of some of these questions illustrates how much remains to be understood.

Conclusion: Performance

In this chapter I have not focused on what rites may reveal about how they were performed because this topic is explored by Carol Symes in Chapter 10. However, in conclusion it is worth making two points about this here. The

[106] For further discussion see Henry Parkes, *The Making of Liturgy in the Ottonian Church: Books, Music and Ritual in Mainz 950–1050* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015) and this book, Parkes, 98–99. For an eleventh-century example see the discussion of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Ms. 44 in Gittos, *Liturgy*, 282, and the references cited there.

[107] See above, 22–23.

[108] See above, n. 25 and Matthew Wranovix, 'Ulrich Pfeffel's Library: Parish Priests, Preachers, and Books in the Fifteenth Century', *Speculum* 87, no. 4 (2012): 1125–55.

[109] Hen, 'Liturgical Handbook'.

[110] This would make sense of the contents of the 'Red Book of Darley': Gittos, 'Is There Any Evidence?', 69.

first is that recent work on medieval and early modern drama is highly relevant to students of medieval liturgy. Current work on performance practices, and the relationship between written texts and actual performances, provides very close parallels with the problems faced by liturgical historians. It is instructive, for example, to think about the different ways in which 'complex performance pieces' were recorded for those who were already familiar with them, or for those who had not encountered them before.[111] Variety in what was written down, and how it was presented, may be explained by differences in the intended audiences as well as changing ideas about what ought to be recorded. A second, related, point worth emphasizing is that liturgical rites are extremely valuable historical sources even if they were never performed, or in very different ways from what was written, or with participants who did not understand them.[112] That is because even in such circumstances, liturgical manuscripts are evidence for decisions made by their compilers and copyists. Because medieval liturgy was neither conservative nor uniform it is extremely revealing – so long as we can learn to read its rites right.

[111] Symes, 'Appearance of Early Vernacular Plays', 800–802 (p. 792 for the quote); S. Hamilton, this volume, 153–58.

[112] Bobrycki, 'Royal Consecration *Ordines*', 2; Gittos, *Liturgy*, 8–11.