



Pohl, B. (2018). Two Downside manuscripts and the liturgical culture of Lambach in the twelfth century. *The Downside Review*, 136(1), 41-79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0012580617751330>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1177/0012580617751330](https://doi.org/10.1177/0012580617751330)

[Link to publication record on the Bristol Research Portal](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via SAGE Publications at <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0012580617751330#articlePermissionsContainer>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol – Bristol Research Portal

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available: <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/brp-terms/>

Two Downside manuscripts and the liturgical culture of Lambach in the twelfth century

Introduction¹

This study is dedicated to two medieval manuscripts kept today in the monastic Library and Archives of Downside Abbey in Stratton-on-the-Fosse, Somerset, UK. It is no exaggeration to say that very little is known about the history and context(s) of these codices. They were both catalogued in 2002 but seem to have eluded most scholars' attention since.² The information made available in published form so far primarily pertains to the provenance of one of the manuscripts, a large-format codex containing the major and minor prophets from the Old Testament. The book is sometimes referred to as the *Lambach Prophetar(i)um*, being named after its presumed place of origin, Lambach Abbey, a Benedictine monastic community (re-)founded during the mid-eleventh century in the ecclesiastical province and later Prince-Archbishopric of Salzburg, Upper Austria. As we will see below, this attribution is almost certainly correct, though our present understanding of the manuscript's date and context of production can be expanded and revised. In addition, I will suggest that the second manuscript also belonged to the medieval monks of Lambach. Both codices will be identified as having been in the community's possession by the end of the twelfth century, if not slightly earlier, and the new evidence presented in this article suggests that they played a central part in the monastery's liturgical life and routine. I shall also link them to other liturgical (or liturgically-relevant) books that survive both in the UK and on the Continent.

This article is divided into two parts. The first part provides a full codicological and palaeographical analysis of the two manuscripts, the first to appear in published form, and which, in the absence of a complete catalogue of Downside's manuscript holdings, hopes to

¹ In writing this article, I have benefited from the generous help and expertise of Teresa Webber, who kindly advised me on the codicology of medieval liturgical books and commented on an early draft. I would also like to thank the journal's anonymous peer-reviewers for their many helpful comments and suggestions. My special thanks go to Simon Johnson, Keeper of the monastic Library and Archives at Downside, as well as to my colleagues George Ferzoco and Carolyn Muessig, all three of whom have gone out of their way in supporting my research and facilitating frequent access to the manuscripts. All web links cited in this article were last accessed on 6 December 2017.

² N. R. Ker, *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries, Vol. 5: Indexes and Addenda*, ed. I. C. Cunningham and A. G. Watson (Oxford, 2002), p. 10 (= nos. 151 and 152); K. Holter, "Lambach, Stift. Sammlungsbestände: Die Handschriften und Inkunabeln", in *Die Kunstdenkmäler des Gerichtsbezirks Lambach*, ed. E. Hainisch (Vienna, 1959), pp. 213-67 (p. 236).

serve as a useful resource and reference point for future scholarship.³ The second part then offers a thematic study that seeks to contextualise the two codices and their contents within Lambach's liturgical culture during the twelfth century. The article's primary aim is thus to introduce and make accessible to scholars two largely unrecorded manuscripts along with a critical commentary and contextual analysis, as well as some thoughts as to how these two Downside codices might inform and, hopefully, inspire future research. For ease of reference, and in the absence of established Downside shelfmarks, the following *sigla* will be used throughout this article:

*D*₁ = Major and minor prophets (OT) ('Lambach *Prophetar[i]um*') (CmL XXII)

*D*₂ = Lectionary for Mass (Epistolary) (*olim*: Lambach)

G = Göttweig, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 53b (CmL CVI)

O = Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Lyell 56 (CmL XLIII)

I: The manuscripts

As indicated above, *D*₁ and *D*₂ have not attracted much scholarly attention to date, nor have they had their codicological and palaeographical attributes scrutinised in detail. On the one hand, this lacuna is due to what was, until very recently, severely restricted access to the manuscripts.⁴ On the other, both codices only found their current home relatively recently, meaning that previous scholarships often had to rely primarily (or indeed exclusively) on summary descriptions and photographic reproductions like those in Sotheby's 1929 auction catalogue.⁵

³ George Ferzoco is currently preparing a catalogue of all the medieval manuscripts kept at Downside, which will also include detailed entries for the two manuscripts that form the subject of this study. I am thankful to him for reading and commenting on a draft version of this article.

⁴ For many decades, Downside's monastic Library and Archives remained difficult to access for scholars from outside the community. Thanks to new institutional links such as that established by Muessig and Ferzoco on behalf of the University of Bristol's Centre for Medieval Studies, the community's important collections are now beginning to feed more regularly into scholarship.

⁵ Sotheby's London, 12 November 1929, lot 393. This important catalogue was used extensively in previous scholarship, including some of the most recent studies such as L. F. Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary: Liturgy and Music in Twelfth-Century Lambach* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 32-33.

D₁

So far, there are only two descriptions of *D₁* available in published form. The first is that provided by Kurt Holter in volume thirty-four of the *Österreichische Kunsttopographie*, published in 1959:

XXII. Altes Testament: Prophetae maiores et minores. 214 Bl., 350 × 225 mm, 1 Sp. – Lambach, 12. Jh. Bl. 1r und 4v sehr gute Initialen in Rot und Violett mit Prophetenbrustbildern [...]. Schweinsledereinband.⁶

The second reference, equally brief, can be found in the appendices and addenda to Neil Ker's catalogue of *Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries (MMBL)*, edited by Ian Cunningham and Andrew Watson in 2002:

152. 79131. *Biblia (prophetae maiores et minores)*. s. xii. Germany. Binding (s. xv/xvi) with contemporary library mark B.41 [sic]⁷ of Benedictine abbey of Lambach, Austria. Rogers bequest.⁸

Concise though they may be, these catalogue entries contain some important information that will serve as a starting point for our study. As recognised correctly by the two cataloguers, the manuscript contains the books (plus prologues) of the Old Testament's four major (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel) and twelve minor prophets (Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi). As stated in *MMBL*, *D₁* forms part of a bequest made to Downside Abbey by David Rogers (†1995), an Indian-born historian and bibliographer who served as Head of the Bodleian Library's Special Collections (1978-84) and Chairman of the Catholic Record Society.⁹ Following a life devoted to historical scholarship, Rogers bequeathed an important corpus of medieval manuscripts, early printed books and recusant materials to Downside, whose public school he had attended as a boy.

⁶ Holter, "Die Handschriften und Inkunabeln", p. 236.

⁷ See below.

⁸ Ker, *MMBL*, V, 10.

⁹ On Rogers' life and career, see his obituary by Bent Juel-Jensen in *The Independent*, 8 June 1995, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/obituaries-david-rogers-1585536.html>. The Catholic Record Society maintains the David Rogers Research Fund in his name, <http://catholicrecordsociety.co.uk/awards/the-david-rogers-research-fund-3/>.

Amongst these bequests were the fourteenth-century ‘Ely Psalter’, formerly owned by Simon Montacute, bishop of Worcester (1333/34-37) and Ely (1337-54), as well as *D₁*, which on its pastedown carries a small commemorative note reading ‘DOWNSIDE EX · DONO D · M · R’.¹⁰

Even though the provenance and history of transmission of *D₁* prior to its acquisition by Rogers do not form part of the present study,¹¹ we can establish with reasonable certainty that the book belonged to the monastic community of Lambach until at least the later nineteenth century. The first religious community at Lambach had been established in 1046 by Count Arnold II of Wels-Lambach (†1055), and it consisted of a college of secular canons (*Säkularkanonikerstift*). A decade later, in 1056, this college was reformed and re-founded as a Benedictine monastery by Arnold II’s son, Bishop Adalbero of Würzburg (1045-90).¹² In 1233, the monastery was attacked and looted by soldiers of Duke Otto II of Bavaria, and most of its original eleventh-century buildings were destroyed in the process – a traumatic event in the community’s history and institutional memory which, until relatively recently, has traditionally been held responsible for the loss and subsequent dispersal of the monks’ medieval book collection.¹³ Following several rebuilding campaigns in the seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries, the monastery was dissolved temporarily in 1784. This hiatus was short-lived, however, and the community soon resumed its monastic routine, which continues

¹⁰ The bequest forms what is known as the Rogers Collection, <http://www.downside.co.uk/downside-library/the-library-collections/the-rogers-collection/>; also cf. *Downside Diary* 20 (2015), p. 31, available online: http://www.downside.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/Web_DownsideDiary.pdf.

¹¹ The manuscript was sold at auction by Sotheby’s in 1929; see Sotheby’s London, 12 November 1929, lot 393; Holter, “Die Handschriften und Inkunabeln”, p. 236. Also M. Schaller, “Nachlese zu einem verschollen geglaubten Codex: Brotherton Collection (Leeds) MS 22 (olim: Lambach, Cml XXXIII; olim: Reichenbach/Regen)”, *Codices manuscript & impressi: Zeitschrift für Buchgeschichte* 106 (2017), 528-40 (p. 530, note 10). Unfortunately, I have not been able to obtain a copy of the 1929 sales catalogue. For more information, I once more refer the reader to Ferzoco’s forthcoming catalogue of Downside’s medieval manuscripts.

¹² On Lambach’s foundation, see K. Rumpler, “Die Gründung Lambachs unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Gründungsurkunden”, in *900 Jahre Klosterkirche Lambach: Oberösterreichische Landesausstellung 20. Mai bis 8. Oktober 1989 im Benediktinerstift Lambach*, ed. H. Litschel (Linz, 1989), pp. 25-32; Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, pp. 7-10. See also the older yet still relevant study by E. Trinks, “Beiträge zur Geschichte des Benediktinerklosters Lambach”, *Jahrbuch des Oberösterreichischen Musealvereins* 81 (1926), 85-152.

¹³ This was first argued by A. Eilenstein, “Zur Geschichte der Stiftsbibliothek in Lambach (Ober-Österreich)”, *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens und seiner Zweige* 51 (1933), 205-17. For a subsequent discussion and revision of this hypothesis, see K. Holter, “Zwei Lambacher Bibliotheksverzeichnisse des 13. Jahrhunderts”, *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung* 64 (1956), 262-76 (pp. 262-63). Note, however, that Davis in her more recent monograph seems to subscribe to the traditional argument as presented by Eilenstein; Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, pp. 36-37.

to the present day.¹⁴ Around the time of Lambach's temporary dissolution, a book now commonly identified with *D*₁ was catalogued by one of its monks, Felix Resch (†1789). Resch served his community in a variety of different capacities, including those of priest, archivist and librarian, and he personally oversaw the abbey's book collection and acquisition under the leadership of Abbot Amandus Schickmayr (1746-94).¹⁵ In a handwritten inventory,¹⁶ Resch lists a total of one hundred and ninety-six manuscripts made from vellum (*codices membranei*), plus another two hundred and fifteen made from paper (*codices chartacei*), with both arranged by format (*in folio, in quarto, in octavo*, etc.) – numbers that serve to relativise the supposedly devastating effect of Otto II's pillaging of the monastery's library. The shelfmarks used by Resch have maintained their currency until the present day, with even the most recent scholarship still referring to the abbey's vellum manuscripts as *Codices membran[ac]ei Lambacensis* (hereafter CmL).¹⁷ The contents of the manuscript inventoried by Resch under the shelfmark 'CmL XXII' are listed as 'Textus Prophetarum majorum et minorum, ex saeculo 12' (Fig. 1).¹⁸ Glued onto the front cover of *D*₁ is a small rectangular piece of parchment bearing a similar title, 'Liber xii prophetarum et 4^{orum} maiorum prophetarum' (Fig. 2). This parchment tag is not contemporary with the manuscript's current binding, which, as we will see below, probably dates from the late fourteenth/early fifteenth century.¹⁹ Rather, this tag showing the title and the accompanying shelfmark 'B.14' – mistakenly transcribed in *MMBL* as 'B.41' – were cut out and reused from an older binding. The use of Arabic numerals strongly points to a fourteenth-century date,²⁰ and a shelfmark written in the same hand as that of *D*₁ survives on the cover of another Lambach manuscript now kept in the Bodleian Library in Oxford (*O*₁).²¹

¹⁴ On Lambach's monastic community today, see <http://www.stift-lambach.at/index2.html>.

¹⁵ On Schickmayr, see A. Eilenstein, "Schickmayr, Amand", in: *Biographia Benedictina (Benedictine Biography)*, available online, http://www.benediktinerlexikon.de/wiki/Schickmayr,_Amand.

¹⁶ Resch's catalogue has been digitised, <http://manuscripta.at/diglit/resch/0001>.

¹⁷ The most recent inventory of the surviving manuscripts and their known locations based on Resch's catalogue is that compiled by Christoph Egger, published online on 1 May 2016 via the online portal *Iter Austriacum*, <http://www.iter-austriacum.at/bibliotheksgeschichte/olim-lambach/>.

¹⁸ <http://manuscripta.at/diglit/resch/0016>.

¹⁹ Note that Ker, *MMBL*, V, 10 proposes a late fifteenth-/early sixteenth-century date instead.

²⁰ Cf. A. Cappelli, *Lexicon Abbreviatarum: Wörterbuch lateinischer und italienischer Abkürzungen*, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1928), p. 425.

²¹ The shelfmark on *O*₁ reads 'D.6', and the title identifies the book as 'Sermones dominicales post penthecosten beati Augustini et aliorum sanctorum doctorum'. Also cf. A. de la Mare, *Catalogue of the Collection of Medieval Manuscripts Bequeathed to the Bodleian Library Oxford by James P. R. Lyell* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 163-68. An entry matching this title also features in Resch's catalogue, <http://manuscripta.at/diglit/resch/0010>.

An entry resembling that in Resch's list can be found in a second inventory of Lambach's book collection compiled by one of its monks about a century later. Like Resch, the author of this second inventory, Augustin Rabensteiner (†1920), who made his profession in 1873, was appointed as the monastery's librarian (1876) and archivist (1880); he also served as the community's novice master, guest master and prior (from 1890).²² With full access to the monastery's book collection, and drawing directly upon Resch's list, Rabensteiner provides additional details about the codex which he refers to as '17. Cod. membr. XXII. Saec. 12. fol. 241. 2^o' (Fig. 3).²³ Similar to Resch, Rabensteiner lists the manuscript's format as *in folio*, and he, too, dates it to the twelfth century. *D₁* certainly qualifies as *in folio*, measuring about 35 × 22.5 cm per folio (= 35 × 45 cm per bifolium). In addition, Rabensteiner identifies the book as comprising two hundred and forty-one folios, which is the exact number of folios preserved in *D₁*. Finally, the identification of Rabensteiner's manuscript with *D₁* can be cemented further by means of its contents. To begin with, Rabensteiner, like Resch, calls the manuscript 'Prophetiae maiores et minores', which once again reflects the title preserved on the cover of *D₁*. He then adds a more detailed list of contents, including incipits and folio numbers, all of which correspond exactly to those in *D₁*. There can be little doubt, therefore, that this codex was indeed kept at Lambach until the end of the nineteenth century, where it was inventoried as *in situ* by both Resch and Rabensteiner.

What none of the above tells us, however, is just how long *D₁* had been at Lambach before it was catalogued by Resch and Rabensteiner. For this, we need to go back to the thirteenth century. Surviving in two separate codices are a pair of medieval book inventories that list the manuscripts owned by the monks of Lambach not long after 1200.²⁴ The first, and shorter, of these lists survives on the first leaf (fol. 1r) of a rather famous manuscript known as

²² See the concise biography in "Rabensteiner, P. Augustin (Johann Martin)", in *Österreichisches Biographisches Lexikon 1815-1950*, 12 vols. (Vienna, 1957-2005), VIII, 359. On the history of Lambach's monastic library and its medieval/early-modern librarians, see Eilenstein, "Zur Geschichte der Stiftsbibliothek", pp. 216-17. Also K. Holter, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Stiftsbibliothek Lambach", *Jahrbuch des Musealvereins Wels* 15 (1969), 96-123; K. Holter, "Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Stiftsbibliothek von Lambach im hohen Mittelalter", in *Buchkunst, Handschriften, Bibliotheken: Beiträge zur mitteleuropäischen Buchkultur vom Frühmittelalter bis zur Renaissance*, ed. K. Holter et al. (Linz, 1996), pp. 1037-54.

²³ <http://manuscripta.at/diglit/rabensteiner/0013>.

²⁴ Holter dates them to c.1210; see Holter, "Zwei Lambacher Bibliotheksverzeichnisse", p. 270. For a more recent study of these book lists, see R. G. Babcock, *Reconstructing a Medieval Library: Fragments from Lambach* (New Haven, 1993), pp. 53-56, who dates them 'a decade earlier' (p. 64). Babcock closely links one list to Lambach's monastic school, the other, which includes liturgical books, to the abbey's 'main library' (*ibid.*, p. 56).

the ‘Lambach Williram’ (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, MS Theol. lat. qu. 140 – CmL XCIII).²⁵ The list counts a total of twenty books, including the ‘Lambach Williram’ itself (*libellum istum*), but none of these can be identified with *D1*.²⁶ As we shall see below, however, this list is by no means comprehensive, and there is good reason to believe that it contains (and was only ever meant to contain) a mere fraction of the books kept at Lambach around the time of its composition, particularly those books destined for and used in the monastic school.²⁷ More insightful, in this regard, is the second, and longer, inventory that survives on the final page (fol. 227v) of a copy of Haimo of Halberstadt’s *Expositio super epistolas Pauli* (CmL XIX), whose main text is contemporary with the ‘Lambach Williram’.²⁸ Traditionally, it has been argued that the two lists are written by the same hand. According to Holter, but rejected subsequently by Lisa Fagin Davis, both lists were penned by a man called Gottschalk, probably the most well-known scribe and artist from medieval Lambach, whose main activity falls within the period c.1197-1204.²⁹

Gottschalk, who according to Davis was responsible only for the shorter of the two book lists, probably held the office of Lambach’s librarian and cantor, in addition to being headmaster of the monastic school.³⁰ On the second book list, which ends abruptly and must also be considered incomplete, either Gottschalk or one of his contemporaries, if we follow

²⁵ A digitised version of the ‘Lambach Williram’ including the book list on fol. 1r is available online, <http://resolver.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/SBB0001B8C600000000>. The book list was first studied by T. Gottlieb, *Über mittelalterliche Bibliotheken* (Leipzig, 1890), pp. 85, 456. See also Holter, “Zwei Lambacher Bibliotheksverzeichnisse”, pp. 262-68; Holter, “Die Handschriften und Inkunabeln”, pp. 245-46; Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, p. 17.

²⁶ The list has been edited in Holter, “Zwei Lambacher Bibliotheksverzeichnisse”, pp. 271-72, and H. Paulhart, “F. Lambach”, in *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Österreichs, Vol. 5: Oberösterreich*, ed. H. Paulhart (Vienna, 1971), pp. 49-58 (p. 56) respectively. See also Babcock, *Reconstructing a Medieval Library*, p. 53.

²⁷ This is argued compellingly by Babcock in *ibid.*, pp. 53-54.

²⁸ Holter, “Die Handschriften und Inkunabeln”, p. 235; Holter, “Das mittelalterliche Buchwesen”, p. 201 (= no. VIII.04). A photographic reproduction of the book list in CmL XIX is provided by Egger, <http://www.iter-austriacum.at/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Lambach-Cm-XIX-f.-227v.jpg>.

²⁹ Paulhart, “Lambach”, p. 55; Holter, “Zwei Lambacher Bibliotheksverzeichnisse”, pp. 266-68, who attributes both lists (CmL XCIII and XIX) to Gottschalk’s own pen. This attribution is called into question by Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, p. 27, note 59, who ascribes only the shorter list (CmL XCIII) to Gottschalk, whilst arguing that the hand that wrote the longer list belongs to a different, yet contemporary, scribe. On Gottschalk and his scribal activity in Lambach’s scriptorium, see *ibid.*, pp. 17-26. Also cf. Babcock, *Reconstructing a Medieval Library*, p. 56, as well as M. Dorninger, “Gottschalk von Lambach”, Adalbert-Stifter-Institut des Landes Oberösterreich, http://www.stifterhaus.at/lib/publication_read.php?articleID=248.

³⁰ Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, p. 26. On medieval monastic cantors and their activities, see the various contributions to the recently published volume by K. A.-M. Bugyis et al. (eds.), *Medieval Cantors and their Craft: Music, Liturgy and the Shaping of History, 800-1500* (Woodbridge, 2017).

Davis' suggestion, catalogues no fewer than one hundred and eighteen of the abbey's books, one of which he calls 'Prophetia nova at vetus'.³¹ Apart from the aforementioned incident of 1233, which might or might not have caused a hiatus in the abbey's book production, Lambach's monastic library seems to have remained largely undisturbed between the mid-thirteenth and late-eighteenth century. Rather than suffering heavy losses, the monastery's book collection actually appears to have been expanded continuously during this period, not only with manuscripts, but also with early prints that were acquired in ever-increasing numbers from as early as 1460-1500 onwards.³² Considering that neither Resch nor Rabensteiner knows of more than a single codex in Lambach's book collection containing the minor and major prophets from the Old Testament, there is no compelling reason to suggest that the book seen and inventoried by either Gottschalk or one of his contemporaries around 1200–1210 is any other than that catalogued by the abbey's two more recent librarians. We can be confident, therefore, that the codex referred to by the book list in CmL XIX is indeed identical with *D_I*, and therefore with the manuscript CmL XXII,³³ which certainly places *D_I* at Lambach by around 1200, if not slightly earlier. But was the book actually produced at Lambach? And, if so, when precisely?

To answer these important questions, we must turn to the palaeographical evidence of *D_I*. There can be no doubt that the manuscript is the work of a single, well-trained scribe. The main text is formatted in a single column that occupies the full width of the page, or rather, the area designated to the text – with margins of c.2.9 cm on the top, 5.2 cm on the bottom and 4.8 cm on the left/right hand side respectively. The double sheets of parchment have been ruled individually on the recto using a metal point (blind ruling), rather than a lead point. The ruling pattern corresponds to that identified by Davis as 'Pattern 6', which is characterised by its double outer and inner margins, and which represents 'by far the most common' pattern at Lambach during the twelfth century.³⁴ Each of the book's pages accommodates twenty-nine lines of text, with an average of eight to ten words per line. The scribe's hand is marked by a regular and reasonably formal ductus, and its features are in line with the principal conventions

³¹ Holter, "Zwei Lambacher Bibliotheksverzeichnisse", p. 274; Paulhart, "Lambach", p. 57.

³² Holter, "Beiträge", pp. 108-14; Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, pp. 36-37. See also P. F. Krammel, "Das Kloster Lambach im Spätmittelalter", in *900 Jahre Klosterkirche Lambach: Oberösterreichische Landesausstellung 20. Mai bis 8. Oktober 1989 im Benediktinerstift Lambach*, ed. H. Litschel (Linz, 1989), pp. 81-92.

³³ On this identification, see also, <http://www.iter-austriacum.at/bibliotheksgeschichte/olim-lambach/>.

³⁴ Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, pp. 34-36, which includes a helpful sketch of all the different ruling patterns in use at Lambach during the period under consideration (p. 35).

of twelfth-century monastic scriptoria in the wider region which today encompasses Southern Germany and Austria (Fig. 4). The script shows advanced levels of angularity, yet there is little to no discernible fusion ('biting') between adjacent letters such as '-pp-' or '-bb-', whose rounded strokes do not touch or overlap, but remain separated from each other throughout.³⁵ Some minims, particularly those at the end of miniscule 'm' and 'n', have feet that are firmly turning to the right, a feature sometimes referred to as 'Gothic-style minims', but this is not the case throughout – indeed, a fair number of minims found in *D_I* maintain their 'Romanesque style' or have no feet at all. When contextualised within the wider stylistic trends and developments identified by scholars on the basis of large corpora of dated manuscripts produced in medieval Austria/Germany and elsewhere, the features in *D_I* noted above point towards a date of production between the second and fourth quarters (inclusive) of the twelfth century.³⁶

Distinctive features in the execution of letter forms (or parts thereof) include: minuscule 'g' with its off-centre lower compartment, which regularly protrudes into the space inhabited by adjacent letters; forked ends on the straight ascenders/back strokes of minuscule 'l', 'h', 'b' and 'd'; a sharp upward tick on the tail strokes of minuscule 'c' and 'x'; the frequent use of 'pseudo-ligatures' formed by artificially lengthening, and thereby connecting, the horizontal top/head strokes on sequences of two or more letters including minuscule 't' (= 'flat-top t'), 'r', 'i' and 'e' (e.g., 'habitatores', fol. 7r, line 27), and/or by extending the feet on minuscule 'm', 'n', 'i' and 'l' so as to connect them with the following letter ('dilecto', fol. 7r, line 21). Note, however, that the shaft of minuscule 't' never extends below the base line, but always ends in a sharp upwards tick, whereas the descenders on the stems of long minuscule 'r', 's' and 'f' are shaved off at an acute angle just below the base line. The only descenders that extend significantly below the base line are those on minuscule 'p', 'q' (both straight) and 'y' (curved), as do the abovementioned lower compartments on minuscule 'g'. The overall result is a pointed, visually dense and compact (almost square) script with a slight but steady momentum and strong vertical compression. Whilst broadly resembling the general palaeographical developments north of the Alps during the mid- to later twelfth century, this particular variant of monastic book hand features prominently in manuscripts produced at Lambach and other

³⁵ See E. Kwakkel, "Biting, Kissing and the Treatment of Feet: The Transitional Script of the Long Twelfth Century", in *Turning Over a New Leaf: Change and Development in the Medieval Book*, ed. E. Kwakkel et al. (Leiden, 2012), pp. 79-125, 206-8. Also cf. A. Derolez, *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books: From the Twelfth to the Early Sixteenth Century* (Oxford, 2003).

³⁶ Kwakkel, "Biting, Kissing and the Treatment of Feet", pp. 206-07.

associated communities located within the ecclesiastical province of Salzburg, including the monasteries of Admont, Göttweig and Melk (on which see below).

Examples of book hands similar to, though not identical with, that of the scribe responsible for *D₁* can be found in other Lambach codices. These include the first part of Augustine's *Expositiones super Psalterium* (CmL XVII, produced at Lambach during the twelfth century), the late twelfth-century copy of Haimo of Halberstadt's *Expositio super epistolas Pauli* (CmL XIX), which, as we saw earlier, contains the longer of the two book inventories, as well as the abovementioned 'Lambach Williram' (CmL XCIII), including the shorter book list that was certainly written by Gottschalk.³⁷ Whilst these different hands and their palaeographical features cannot be analysed in detail here, they have all been identified beyond reasonable doubt as belonging to a team of monastic scribes working in Lambach's scriptorium during the second half of the twelfth century.³⁸ Meanwhile, there is another hand from Lambach's medieval workshop that shows even stronger similarities with that of *D₁*, strong enough indeed to suggest that they belong to one and the same person. Specimens of this hand can be found in at least half of the books of Lambach's six-volume set of Gregory the Great's *Moralia* (CmL XLIV-IL, the three volumes in question being CmL XLVII, XLVIII and IL), all copied during the final quarter of the twelfth century, the so-called *Rituale Lambacense* (CmL LXXIII; see below), presumably produced c.1200, as well as the second volume of Augustine's *Expositiones* (CmL XVIII), which has also been dated to around 1200.³⁹ Davis was able to show that most of these books were written by a Lambach scribe strictly contemporary to Gottschalk, whom she identifies as 'Scribe B', and whose hand she traces in no fewer than ten extant manuscripts, making him an extremely prolific and 'by far the best-represented scribe of the Lambach scriptorium during this period'.⁴⁰

³⁷ In fact, Gottschalk's hand as identified by Davis shows a number of common features with that of the scribe of *D₁*; see Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, pp. 24-25.

³⁸ I refer the reader to the detailed discussions in Holter, "Das mittelalterliche Buchwesen", pp. 55-61; Holter, "Die Handschriften und Inkunabeln", pp. 235, 245-46. Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, pp. 27-34. On Gottschalk's hand, see particularly *ibid.*, pp. 24-25.

³⁹ For descriptions and images of these manuscripts, see Holter "Die Handschriften und Inkunabeln", pp. 218-24, 234-49; also cf. Holter, "Beiträge", p. 97.

⁴⁰ Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, pp. 32-33 (with quote on p. 32). Davis describes this hand as 'quite distinctive, with a pronounced pointed character' (p. 32). Note that Davis attributes CmL XLVII, XLVIII, IL and XVIII to 'Scribe B', as well as *D₁* (CmL XXII), but not CmL LXXIII, which she considers the work of the 'Rituale Artist' (*ibid.*, p. 34).

As Davis has demonstrated, ‘Scribe B’ and Gottschalk were not just contemporaries, but they actually collaborated on several occasions, with Gottschalk acting as artist and illustrator for a number of codices copied by ‘Scribe B’.⁴¹ This is precisely what seems to have happened in the production of *D_I*, with ‘Scribe B’ copying the main text, as well as some of the rubrics and minor initials, and Gottschalk supplying the more elaborate decorative features and illuminations. The scribal and artistic execution of *D_I* must not be viewed in isolation, of course, but in the wider context of Lambach’s considerable artistic production at the time. Holter, in studying the decoration and illustration in Lambach’s medieval manuscripts over several decades, identifies a prolific school of illumination (*Malschule*) that operated within the walls of the twelfth-century monastery.⁴² As Holter’s research has shown, the monk-artists of this school were true masters of their craft, whose repertoire over the course of the twelfth century developed from Romanesque pen-flourished initials and simple floral designs to a wide range of sophisticated figural depictions and elaborate historiated initials. Two particular highlights produced by these Lambach-based illuminators during the closing decades of the twelfth century are the large dedicatory portrait on fol. 2r of the ‘Lambach Williram’ (CmL XCIII), depicting a monk humbly presenting a (or his?) book to the Virgin and Child, and the delicate full-page miniature occupying fol. 4r of the *Rituale Lambacense* (CmL LXXIII), attributed by Davis to the ‘Rituale Artist’, whose lead scribe, as we saw above, was almost certainly a close contemporary and fellow monk of the scribe who wrote *D_I* – Davis’ ‘Scribe B’ –, perhaps even the same person.⁴³ Gottschalk and the two illustrated initials he inserted in *D_I*, taking the shape of two bust-like ‘author portraits’ of the Old Testament prophets Jeremiah (fol. 1r) and Isaiah (fol. 4v), belong to the same school of illumination (Figs. 5 and 6), situating them firmly within the second half of the twelfth century. Together with the palaeographical evidence presented earlier, this allows us confidently to identify *D_I* as a genuine product of Lambach’s monastic scriptorium and school of illumination, where it was most likely made during the final quarter of the twelfth century.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 32.

⁴² Holter, “Beiträge”, pp. 100-07; Holter, “Die Handschriften und Inkunabeln”, pp. 214-25, with a miniature from *D_I* (fol. 4v) being depicted in *ibid.*, 237; Holter, “Das mittelalterliche Buchwesen”, *passim*. Also cf. Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, pp. 18-24. On Lambach’s medieval book decoration, see also the recent remarks by Schaller, “Nachlese”, pp. 539-40, as well as the literature referred to in *ibid.*, p. 539, note 33. *D_I* has been included into the online database of illuminated manuscripts from Austria (“Illuminierte Handschriften aus Österreich, c.780-c.1250”), where it is classified as ‘lost’ (“verschollen”); <https://homepage.univie.ac.at/Martina.Pippal/Verschollen.htm>.

⁴³ Images of these folios and their illustrations are reproduced in Holter, “Die Handschriften und Inkunabeln”, pp. 217, 220. See also Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, p. 22.

⁴⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 32.

Before moving on to the second Downside manuscript, we must turn briefly to the construction and binding of *D_I*. The book's quire structure survives intact, and its two hundred and forty-one folios listed correctly by Rabensteiner are arranged into thirty quires of eight folios/four bifolia each (quaternions). The final folio (fol. 241) is a single sheet of parchment. Rather than representing a fragment from a lost quire, it would appear that this was always a single sheet. The book's quire structure can be summarised as $30 \times \text{VIII} + \text{I}$, which resembles the shape of the original twelfth-century codex, even though the current binding is a later medieval modification/replacement dating from the later fourteenth/early-fifteenth century. The skin coverings are wrapped tightly around the wooden boards and decorated with a simple geometrical design cut into the skin after being outlined with a pointed tool, a technique known as *cuir-ciselé*. The design consists of a straight double border running along the four edges matched by two pairs of double lines running diagonally across and intersecting in the middle, thereby forming an elongated 'X' with a diamond shape at its centre (Fig. 2). More elaborate variations of this basic design survive on the medieval bindings of other Lambach codices. These include a late twelfth-/early-thirteenth-century copy of the Gospel of Matthew (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS Cvp. ser. nov. 3596 – CmL XX), an early printed version of John Bromyard's *Summa praedicatorum* (Lambach, Stiftsbibliothek, Ink. II/15), which, however, might have been bound at the monastery of Melk with whom the monks of Lambach enjoyed close fraternal links, and a late-fifteenth-century collection of sermons (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS Cvp. ser. nov. 3619 – Ccl 454), whose design is based around square shapes, however.⁴⁵ What distinguishes these bindings from that of *D_I* is that they embellish the book's simple geometrical design by means of blind stamps (*Blindstempel*) that add decorative detail in the shape of reoccurring geometrical and/or floral patterns. The use of blind stamps for the decoration of book bindings goes back as far as the Carolingian period, and it is attested at Lambach between the twelfth and fifteenth centuries.⁴⁶

Meanwhile, a decorated binding that resembles that of *D_I* in its simplicity is that of *O*, a collected volume produced at Lambach during the third quarter of the twelfth century

⁴⁵ On these codices and their bindings, see the images and descriptions in Holter, "Das mittelalterliche Buchwesen", pp. 213-14 (= no. IX.18), 215 (= no. IX.24), 223 (= no. X.32). Also cf. the Lambach bindings depicted in Babcock, *Reconstructing a Medieval Library*, pp. 66, 75.

⁴⁶ Holter, "Das mittelalterliche Buchwesen", pp. 58-60.

containing the theological works of Honorius of Autun and others.⁴⁷ Although the skin on the front and back of the codex has been worn away in places, it is just possible to make out the pattern of decoration consisting of a plain rectangular border and a large diagonal cross, both made from straight double lines similar to those on the cover of *D₁*. Unlike the binding of *D₁*, however, that of *O* seems to be the twelfth-century original, rather than a later medieval replacement. Tell-tale signs include the holes in the book boards left by four round corner bosses (plus a matching centre boss on the back board), a set of brass fittings that once would have secured two straps with clasps set along the book's fore edge, as well as a pair of braided endbands. This combination of accoutrements is found in large numbers of Austrian/German manuscripts from the later eleventh and twelfth centuries.⁴⁸ Bindings such as this were produced in substantial numbers at Lambach during the final quarter of the twelfth century, and again, albeit without the endbands and fore-edge clasps, in the fifteenth century.⁴⁹ In sum, therefore, the decoration on the binding of *D₁* matches (or perhaps imitates) the style and appearance of Lambach's twelfth-century books much more closely than it resembles that of the abbey's later medieval (re-)bindings – an intriguing observation which might suggest that the monks of Lambach sought to establish a deliberate connection and continuity with their past that could be expressed visually on the covers of their books.

D₂

The second Downside manuscript analysed in this article is a lectionary, that is, a liturgical book collecting the readings – either scriptural or patristic (or both) – for either Mass or the Divine Office.⁵⁰ *D₂* belongs to the former category, being made specifically for the liturgy at Mass and containing selected passages from the Gospels (*periscopes*). This makes *D₂* a specific

⁴⁷ See the detailed description of the manuscript in de la Mare, *Catalogue*, pp. 168-74; also cf. Holter, "Das mittelalterliche Buchwesen", p. 206 (= no. VIII.23).

⁴⁸ J. A. Szirmai, *The Archaeology of Medieval Bookbinding* (Aldershot, 1999), pp. 140-41, 163-66. Similar bindings are known from the book collections of other German/Austrian monasteries, including a twelfth-century codex from St Vitus in Gladbach; see B. Pohl, "(Re-)Framing Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* in twelfth-century Germany: John Rylands Library, MS Latin 182", *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 93 (2017), 67-119.

⁴⁹ Holter, "Beiträge", p. 99. See also the discussion and drawings in Babcock, *Reconstructing a Medieval Library*, pp. 17-18.

⁵⁰ A good introduction to the 'genre' of lectionaries is provided by A. Nocent, "The Roman Lectionary for Mass", in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Vol. 3: The Eucharist*, ed. A. J. Chupungco (Collegeville, MN, 1999), pp. 177-88. See also A. G. Martimort, *Les lectures liturgiques et leur livres* (Turnhout, 1992), pp. 21-43.

type (or ‘genre’) of lectionary called an epistolary – also known as *Apostolus*, *Comes* or *Liber comitis* –, to be distinguished from a Gospel lectionary (evangelary), even though the two were sometimes combined into a single volume.⁵¹ This epistolary came to Downside in the same way, and around the same time, as did *D*₁. A note stuck to the inside of its pastedown clearly identifies it as part of Rogers’ bequest of 1995 (‘DOWNSIDE EX · DONO D · M · R’). Once incorporated into the monastic Library and Archives, the manuscript was catalogued in *MMBL* as follows:

151. 79128. *Lectionarium* (with Ps.-Hieronymus’ letter to Constantinus Lugdunensis). s. xi/xii. Italy(?). Blind-tooled binding, N. Europe, s. xv/xvi. Rogers bequest.⁵²

Unlike *D*₁, the entry for *D*₂ is much more tentative with regard to the manuscript’s date and origin. This should not surprise us, however, given that medieval liturgical books can sometimes be particularly difficult to place with certainty due to their largely homogenous contents – that is, unless their scribal and material execution holds additional clues.

Whilst recognising these ambiguities, I would like to suggest an alternative provenance north of the Alps, possibly at Lambach. *D*₂ is of much smaller size and format than *D*₁, measuring only 12.5 × 17.2 cm per folio (= 13.9 × 18.7 cm when including the binding). The codex originally comprised of fourteen quires, each holding eight folios/four double sheets. Today, the first and final quire are missing half a sheet each, whilst two single sheets have been added to the fifth (fol. 33b) and eleventh (fol. 85b) quires. In total, the manuscript contains one hundred and twelve folios, with the following quire structure: VIII-i + 2 × VIII + VIII+i + 5 × VIII + VIII+i + 2 × VIII + VIII-i. Similar to *D*₁, the pages of *D*₂ were ruled blind, and the text has been copied in long lines across a single column. There are twenty-six lines to a page, accommodating between seven and nine words on average – that is, three lines per page and one word fewer per line than is the case in *D*₁. The spaces between words are more generous than those in *D*₁, especially when considering the book’s significantly smaller size. These

⁵¹ Nocent, “The Roman Lectionary”, p. 177. See also A. Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office: A Guide to Their Organization and Terminology* (Toronto, 1982), 118-20; J. Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy from the Tenth to the Thirteenth Century: A Historical Introduction and Guide for Students and Musicians* (Oxford, 1991), pp. 62-63. On the historical development of the lectionary, see especially C. Folsom, “The Liturgical Books of the Roman Rite”, in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Vol. 1: Introduction to the Liturgy*, ed. A. J. Chupungco (Collegeville, MN, 1997), pp. 245-314 (pp. 254-57, as well as the literature cited on p. 306).

⁵² Ker, *MMBL*, V, 10.

differences in format and execution make the epistolary's *mise-en-page* feel less busy, and its script appear less dense and compact, than is the case in *D₁*. The lectionary does not survive in its original binding, nor does it reveal any trace of a medieval shelfmark like those preserved on the bindings of *D₁* and *O*. The current binding dates from the later Middle Ages, probably the early- to mid-fifteenth century. It has been decorated with a symmetrical cover design of three nested rectangles interspersed with repetitive patterns of blind stamps (Fig. 7). A variation of the same basic design can be seen on the back board. Upon closer examination, these patterns can be identified as containing at least two distinct and recognisable 'Lambach blind stamps' (*Lambacher Blindstempel*).⁵³ These stamps, of which Holter has identified a corpus of forty-five examples, were used habitually by the monks of Lambach during the mid-fifteenth century to embellish leather carved bindings (*Lederschnitteinbände*), a binding technique popular throughout Western Europe at the time. No fewer than eighteen examples of these bindings have survived from Lambach's scriptorium and bookbinding workshop,⁵⁴ and a comparison with *D₂* makes it likely that the lectionary, too, was (re-)bound at Lambach. This allows us to entertain at least the possibility that *D₂* might have been part of the monastery's book collection prior to the fifteenth century.

Turning to Rabensteiner's book list, there is no entry that matches *D₂*, and the same holds true for Resch's inventory. It must be pointed out, however, that neither of these two inventories contains many liturgical books to begin with, and certainly fewer than would have been required to keep a medieval monastery's liturgical routine running smoothly on a daily basis. Indeed, Rabensteiner lists almost no liturgical books at all, whereas most of those mentioned by Resch are missals, breviaries and various collections of sermons for selected feast days. There are several plausible explanations for this disproportionately small number of *liturgica* in the early-modern inventories. First of all, many of the liturgical books owned by a medieval or early-modern monastery were not necessarily kept in the main library or book cupboard, but in various different locations around the monastic precinct. What is more, we must remember that liturgical books, including lectionaries such as *D₂*, could also become obsolete – sometimes virtually overnight – as a result of religious reforms and changes in

⁵³ Cf. the drawing in Holter, "Das mittelalterliche Buchwesen", p. 59. The blind stamps seen on the binding of *D₂* correspond closely with Holter's stamps nos. 37 and 22 (as well as, perhaps, no. 21).

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 58-60. For further examples and photographic reproductions of Lambach bindings, see Holter, "Die Handschriften und Inkunabeln", pp. 229-30, and K. Holter, "Der Lederschnitteinband in Oberösterreich", in *Festschrift Ernst Kyriss. Dem Bucheinbandforscher Dr. Ernst Kyriss in Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt zu seinem 80. Geburtstag am 2. Juni 1961* (Stuttgart, 1961), pp. 83-121.

institutional and/or liturgical custom.⁵⁵ Some of these changes were so significant that existing liturgical books were not infrequently discarded and new ones commissioned.⁵⁶ With regard to lectionaries more specifically, perhaps one of the most crucial developments prior to the Second Vatican Council, if not indeed the Concilium Tridentinum, was the gradual move away from the practice of having several separate books for Mass and Office and towards the use of collected or ‘conflated’ books such as the missal and the breviary.⁵⁷ North of the Alps, this shift was more or less complete by the end of the thirteenth century. By that point, lectionaries of the old style had become a rarity, as their contents were now merged into breviaries (for Office lectionaries) and missals (for Mass lectionaries).⁵⁸ The fact that the liturgical books listed by Resch consist almost exclusively of the latter might well indicate that at the time the inventories were drawn up, any medieval lectionaries previously owned by the monastic community of Lambach had long been replaced and/or removed from the monks’ book collection.

That liturgical books had in fact been part of Lambach’s medieval book collection, and in fairly substantial numbers, is evidenced by the early-thirteenth-century book lists (CmL XCIII and CmL XIX). The two inventories together contain a total of forty-two *liturgica*, most of which are now classified as lost:⁵⁹ a Gospel concordance (*liber de concordia evangeliorum*), a book of sermons (*liber aliquorum sermonum*) – both recorded in the shorter of the two inventories –, four lectionaries (*lectionaria*), five Gospel books (*evangelia*), three *plenaria*, three *sequentionaria*, five *matutinalia*, three *officialia*, three *antiphonaria*, five *gradualia*, eight missals (*missalia*) and a single breviary (*breviarium*).⁶⁰ Whilst the last two entries in particular are evidence that the historical shift towards the production of conflated liturgical

⁵⁵ See also the discussion in Babcock, *Reconstructing a Medieval Library*, pp. 59-63.

⁵⁶ Some of the most momentous of these developments are summarised in A. J. Chupungco, “History of the Roman Liturgy until the Fifteenth Century”, *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Vol. 1: Introduction to the Liturgy*, ed. A. J. Chupungco (Collegeville, MN, 1997), pp. 131-52. Also cf. Folsom, “The Liturgical Books”, pp. 276-83. With regard to Lambach more specifically, the survival of a large number of liturgical fragments now gathered in the Beinecke Library at Yale goes some way towards compensating for the paucity of complete liturgical codices. Many of these fragments have been digitised and can be viewed online at <https://brbl-dl.library.yale.edu/vufind/>.

⁵⁷ See Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy*, pp. 59-66.

⁵⁸ Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office*, pp. 119-20. See also Martimort, *Les lectures liturgiques*, pp. 42-43, 56-58.

⁵⁹ Holter, “Das mittelalterliche Buchwesen”, p. 54. See also Holter, “Zwei Lambacher Bibliotheksverzeichnisse”, p. 269.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 271-75; Paulhart, “Lambach”, pp. 56-58. It should be said, however, that books listed as *matutinalia*, *officialia* and *breviaria* in practice may resemble similar uses and practices of codification.

volumes was already underway by the time that Gottschalk and/or one of his fellow scribes composed his/their inventories, the presence of no fewer than four proper lectionaries suggests that this development was still far from complete. To the best of my knowledge, none of the lectionaries listed on these inventories has ever been identified as extant, which makes it possible that one of them might be the very codex which received its decorative binding at Lambach during the fifteenth century and was later bequeathed to the community of Downside by Rogers. Mystery remains, of course, as to why the monks would have held on to this lectionary, let alone provide it with a fashionable new binding, centuries after the introduction of the missal into Western liturgical practice.

In terms of its palaeography, *D*₂ is a relatively plain and unadorned product. The lack of decoration beyond the basic level of rubrics and *litterae notabiliores* together with the book's compact format seems to suggest a 'practical', quotidian context of use, rather than a prestigious and/or display function. The lectionary is the work of a single, fairly well-trained scribe, whose hand is distinct from those discussed earlier in relation to *D*₁. Although the hand shares certain characteristics with those of Lambach's known twelfth-century scribes, such as the construction of (pseudo-)ligatures and the limited use of descenders below the base line, it generally exhibits a much rounder aspect than the hand that wrote *D*₁ (Fig. 8). There are no discernible cases of fusion or 'biting' between double consonants. Whilst these attributes *prima facie* make the hand appear more traditionally Romanesque or 'proto-Gothic', possibly indicating a later eleventh- or early twelfth-century date, there are also certain features that point towards the middle of the twelfth century, for example, the 'Gothic-style' feet on the minims of minuscule 'm' and 'n', most of which are firmly turning to the right, as well as the upright back stroke on minuscule 'a'. In the face of these ambiguities, and in the absence of a precise date, it is safest to conclude that the book was likely produced during the first half of the twelfth century. More insightful, in this regard, are the lectionary's marginal annotations. Most of the marginalia in *D*₂ date to the second half of the twelfth century, and they were penned by one or, more likely, two scribe(s). These short paratexts primarily contain liturgical instructions and textual cues that assist the reader/user during Mass, for example, by marking the end of a specific reading with the words '[Haec] dicit Dominus' (fols. 6v, 13r, 21r, etc.) which, when reading from the prophets, indicated that the usual terminating versicle ('Tu autem Domine, miserere nobis') had to be replaced with 'Haec dicit Dominus Deus: convertimini ad me et salvi eritis'. Further annotations include 'Respice Domine', which marks the introit on the Sunday after Pentecost, 'Da pacem domine', 'Ecce Deus', 'Exaudi Domine'

and ‘Omnia quae fecisti’ (Fig. 9). Their liturgical function apart, what renders these marginalia of particular interest is that they are a close match – both textually and palaeographically – for a similar set of marginal notes that survives in *D₁*. In both manuscripts, the marginalia provide important guidance and instruction for the reader/user, whose task it was to recite parts of the text in a liturgical setting (Mass or Divine Office). Both sets of marginalia are heavily abbreviated, which unfortunately leaves us with a relatively limited corpus of letter forms, and any conclusions drawn from their palaeographical comparison must be treated with caution. Based on what is available, however, we can be reasonably confident that the annotators of the two books were, if not necessarily the same person, then at least close contemporaries. They share a number of scribal habits that are similar enough to suggest that they worked in one and the same scriptorium or workshop (see Fig. 10). Again, this observation in and of itself does not necessarily place *D₂* at Lambach during the twelfth century, and nor does it act as proof that the lectionary was produced there. When combined with the evidence presented earlier in this article, however, it emerges as the most plausible case for establishing the book’s provenance presented to date. In the absence of equivalent evidence pointing to a different location, Lambach might therefore be accepted, tentatively, as the lectionary’s most likely place of residence during the later twelfth century, and perhaps even its place of production.

II: The books and their context(s)

Having established a better sense of the two Downside manuscripts’ likely dates and contexts of production, we are now in a position to explore their possible use(s) and application(s) in the context of Lambach’s monastic routine during the twelfth century. In this second part of my study, I will build upon the information generated in the previous section to revisit our understanding of liturgical life at medieval Lambach and discuss the various kinds of books that played a part therein. This will be done in two stages. First, I will address some fundamental questions touched upon previously, for example, what sort of liturgical (or liturgically-relevant) books can we expect at a twelfth-century monastery such as Lambach, and in what quantities? How/when would these books have been used by the monks, and where were they stored? In addressing these questions, I will incorporate evidence from manuscripts other than those at Downside, and my analysis will draw on scholarship dedicated not just to Lambach, but to other monastic communities as well. As a second and final step of my analysis, I will (re)turn to the two Downside manuscripts, *D₁* and *D₂*, and identify their specific locus

within Lambach's liturgical and historical culture. I will argue that the two books were probably used in very similar contexts, and that they can be linked closely with other extant manuscripts from the abbey's medieval book treasure. I will show that the monks of Lambach used these books throughout the liturgical year in a way that was both traditional and innovative, and which provides us with valuable insights into how the community celebrated its own specific identity within the wider context of twelfth-century monastic reform.

As we saw earlier, the thirteenth-century inventories (CmL XCIII and XIX) make explicit reference to Lambach's liturgical book holdings. In both lists, the liturgical codices appear to form a distinct category that is set apart from the monastery's other books, which are, contrastingly, categorised according to their 'authors', for example, the Church Fathers (*opera Augustini, opera Gregorii, etc.*).⁶¹ This system of classification was not uncommon during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and similar examples can be found in book lists from other contemporary monasteries in Austria/Germany and elsewhere.⁶² The same also holds true for the historical system of shelf- or classmarks used at Lambach, examples of which we saw on the fifteenth-century bindings of *D₁* and *O*. Far from being unique, this system was shared by many monastic communities and their libraries, not just within the diocese of Salzburg, but as far away as the Rhineland.⁶³ Lambach's medieval *liturgica* do not survive in large numbers, and most of them are fragments which owe their preservation to accidental transmission, usually because they were dismembered, cut up and re-used in later book bindings, as flyleaves or pastedowns.⁶⁴ The few liturgical codices that either have survived or at least can be reconstructed in their entirety include the previously mentioned *Rituale Lambacense* (CmL LXXIII), which is a Roman Ritual from the abbacy of Bernard (1148–67),⁶⁵ the book of sermons (*liber aliquorum sermonum*) inventoried by Gottschalk on the shorter book list found in the 'Lambach Williram' (CmL CXLIII) and, perhaps most importantly, the so-called 'Gottschalk Antiphony', whose original contents Davis has been able to reconstruct by

⁶¹ Holter, "Das mittelalterliche Buchwesen", pp. 54, 58.

⁶² See G. Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn, 1885).

⁶³ For example, at Gladbach; see Pohl, "(Re-)Framing Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*", p. 75. On these shelfmarks, cf. also R. Kottje and E. M. Wermter, *Der Bücherbesitz des Klosters St. Vitus in Gladbach von der Gründung bis zur Auflösung des Klosters, 974-1802*, 2 vols. (Cologne, 1998), II, 11.

⁶⁴ On these fragments, see Babcock, *Reconstructing a Medieval Library*, pp. 13-34; Holter, "Beiträge", pp. 98-100.

⁶⁵ Holter, "Das mittelalterliche Buchwesen", p. 56; Paulhart, "Lambach", p. 50.

carefully analysing a large number of manuscript fragments scattered between different libraries, including New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, MS 481.51.⁶⁶

Holter calculates the survival rate of Lambach's liturgical manuscripts from the eleventh and twelfth centuries at about one in seven (or 40:6), and he suspects that this disproportionately low number compared with that of other 'genres' of extant books might be due to the various monastic reforms undergone by the abbey and its religious community during the later medieval and early-modern periods.⁶⁷ Indeed, Lambach was situated at an important crossroads of eleventh- and twelfth-century reform activity, which in several cases had been inspired and promulgated by communities and individuals with whom the monks enjoyed close relationships. This included, most notably, the influential reform movements originating at Gorze (more specifically the so-called 'Junggorze Reform'), Hirsau and its daughter-house of Saint Blasien, as well as Münsterschwarzach.⁶⁸ According to Holter, the implementation of these reforms affected the existing liturgical customs at Lambach to such a degree as to render many of their books obsolete and, ultimately, redundant.⁶⁹ Whilst this argument probably goes some way towards explaining the limited survival of Lambach's liturgical book treasures into the modern period, it does little to assist us in reconstructing and contextualising the monastery's medieval book holdings. For this, we need to turn once more to the earliest surviving book lists, which also brings us to the important question of where precisely medieval monasteries such as Lambach would have stored their liturgical codices.

⁶⁶ Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, passim.

⁶⁷ Holter, "Zwei Lambacher Bibliotheksverzeichnisse", p. 269.

⁶⁸ Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, pp. 10-12. See also J. Eldevik, *Episcopal Power and Ecclesiastical Reform in the German Empire: Tithes, Lordship and Community, 950-1150* (New York, 2012), pp. 206-07; F. Prinz, "Klöster und Stifte", in *Handbuch der bayerischen Geschichte, Vol. 1: Das alte Bayern/Das Stammherzogtum bis zum Ausgang des 12. Jahrhunderts*, ed. M. Spindler, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1981), pp. 462-94 (pp. 475-76); K. Birnbacher et al., "Einleitung: Benediktinertum in Österreich", in *Die Benediktinischen Mönchs- und Nonnenklöster in Österreich und Südtirol, Vol. 1*, ed. U. Faust and W. Krassnig (St. Ottilien, 2000), pp. 15-70 (pp. 20-21). On monastic reform in twelfth-century Germany/Austria more generally, see K. Hallinger, *Gorze-Kluny: Studien zu den monastischen Lebensformen und Gegensätzen im Hochmittelalter*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1950-51), as well as, more recently, the various contributions to *Manuscripts and Monastic Culture: Reform and Renewal in Twelfth-Century Germany*, ed. A. I. Beach (Turnhout, 2007).

⁶⁹ Holter, "Das mittelalterliche Buchwesen", p. 54. The loss of medieval literature (defined in the widest sense) and the various internal and external factors responsible for it form the subject of a recent study by T. Haye, *Verlorenes Mittelalter: Ursachen und Muster der Nichtüberlieferung mittellateinischer Literatur*, *Mittellateinische Studien und Texte* 49 (Leiden, 2016). Also cf. the data collated by E. Buringh, *Medieval Manuscript Production in the Latin West*, *Global Economic History Series* 6 (Leiden, 2011).

As mentioned earlier, at least one (if not both) of the thirteenth-century book inventories must be considered incomplete. Even if the two list(s) survived complete, however, there is no guarantee that we would find a lot of liturgical books being catalogued. After all, liturgical codices were stored not necessarily in the monastic library or book cupboard (*armarium*), but more often in those parts of the monastic precinct that were used for delivering Mass and/or the Divine Office. Depending on where a specific book was used most frequently, it could therefore be stored in a variety of locations, for example, in the chapter house or even on the high altar. This was a practical decision as much as symbolic one. On the one hand, keeping the books near the altar and within reach of the monastic priest(s) facilitated the liturgical routine by ensuring that the required codices were always readily at hand. On the other hand, we must not underestimate the symbolic value of having certain books constantly on display in the abbey church's inner sanctum. This has been shown most conclusively with regard to codices that, in addition to their liturgical relevance, also fulfilled commemorative functions and helped the community express a sense of identity, for example, the monastic necrology or *liber vitae*.⁷⁰ Either way, the variety of locations used by medieval monastic communities to store their books means that the number of *liturgica* owned and used by the community of Lambach during twelfth century is likely to have exceeded that recorded by Gottschalk and/or his contemporary when taking stock of the monastery's main library.

As Holter has shown, there are between thirty-five and forty codices that do not appear in the early thirteenth-century inventories, even though they are known with certainty to have been part of Lambach's later twelfth-century book holdings. Whilst these lacunae do not consist exclusively, or even primarily, of liturgical books, they do contain some: besides a Psalter (*psalterium*) and three large-format Bibles, several books omitted by the lists of Gottschalk and/or his fellow scribe would have lent themselves naturally to liturgical applications, even though this might not have been their primary *raison d'être*. This is true, for example, of a collection of sermons for the Sundays after Pentecost (*sermones dominicales post Pentecosten*), a book of sermons for various feast days (*sermones de festis*) and a copy of Rupert of Deutz's *De divinis officiis*.⁷¹ The fact that none of these books is recorded in the two inventories should not lead us to conclude that they played no part in Lambach's liturgical

⁷⁰ See, for example, the various contributions to *The Durham Liber Vitae and Its Context*, ed. D. W. Rollason et al., *Regions and Regionalism in History 1* (Woodbridge, 2004). Also A. J. Piper, "The Durham Cantor's Book (Durham, Dean and Chapter Library, MS B.IV.24)", in *Anglo-Norman Durham, 1093-1193*, ed. D. W. Rollason et al. (Woodbridge, 1994), pp. 79-92.

⁷¹ See the list in Holter, "Zwei Lambacher Bibliotheksverzeichnisse", pp. 275-76.

culture and daily routine, however. Indeed, the number of codices potentially owned by the monks without being listed in the medieval inventories increases further once we take into account books whose liturgical applications might not be apparent straight away. This means counting not just *liturgica* in the strictest sense – that is, books made to be used primarily, or even exclusively, for Mass and the Divine Office –, but also what I shall call ‘liturgically-relevant’ books. This is an important distinction, because it allows us to acknowledge and contextualise better some books which would otherwise fly under the radar of liturgical studies and catalogues. As I will now show, this is particularly pertinent to the books surviving from Lambach, not least the two manuscripts at Downside.

Books from Lambach’s medieval collection that can be considered ‘liturgically relevant’ in the sense defined above include a passional (*passionale*), a copy of Guido of Arezzo’s instructions for chanting and memorising musical notations (*musica Guidonis*), as well as several volumes of homilies and Biblical commentaries by the Church Fathers.⁷² Evoking Susan Boynton’s compelling plea for recognition of the intrinsic, and indeed inseparable, relationship between liturgy and history, including hagiography,⁷³ we might also want to add a little book on the miracles of the Virgin Mary (*libellus de miraculis S[anctae] Mariae*), as well as several volumes of saints’ lives dedicated to St Leonard, St Stephen and others.⁷⁴ Another book that fits into this category of liturgically-relevant manuscripts is mentioned in the preface of the shorter inventory (CmL XCIII, fol. 1r), which threatens potential book thieves by not only evoking the standard threat of anathema, but specifying further that the offender’s name shall be erased forever from the monastery’s *liber vitae* (*de libro viventium nomen eius deletur*).⁷⁵ The common place for storing a *liber vitae* was near or on the altar of the abbey church, rather than in the library, which again could explain why it is mentioned in the preface but not in the inventory proper. Similar explanations might also apply to books such as the Martyrology and Necrology combined into a single volume together with

⁷² Holter, “Zwei Lambacher Bibliotheksverzeichnisse”, pp. 271, 274; Paulhart, “Lambach”, pp. 56-57.

⁷³ Boynton, “Writing History with Liturgy”.

⁷⁴ Holter, “Zwei Lambacher Bibliotheksverzeichnisse”, p. 264; Paulhart, “Lambach”, p. 56.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* As recent scholarship has shown, a *liber vitae* could fulfil a variety of different functions in and on behalf of a monastic community. Not only did it provide an up-to-date register in which the names of the professed monks were inscribed upon completion of their novitiate, but it was also a commemorative record, a prosopographical source used by monk-chroniclers when writing the history of their community and its benefactors, as well as, not least, a liturgical instrument. The prosopographical value of a *Liber Vitae* has been studied recently with regard to the twelfth-century abbey of Le Bec and its in-house historian, Robert of Torigni; see Pohl, “The ‘Bec *Liber Vitae*’”.

the *Rule of St Benedict* (CmL CXXXI), the *Vita* of Bishop Adalbero of Würzburg, Lambach's founder, Rufinus' *Historia ecclesiastica* and Honorius of Autun's *Summa historiarum*, the last of which has been identified with manuscript *O* studied earlier in this article.⁷⁶

Even with regard to Lambach's books that qualify as *liturgica* in the narrower sense, we must be careful to distinguish between those whose application was purely liturgical and those that could also be used in other contexts. For most of the earlier and central Middle Ages, religious communities in the Latin West, particularly those situated north of the Alps, habitually relied on a variety of books for celebrating the liturgy. Prior to the introduction of the missal, fusing together the lectionary, sacramentary and antiphonal, these books had existed independently,⁷⁷ and the same holds true for the development of the lectionary and psalter.⁷⁸ The texts to be delivered during the liturgy – including passages from Scripture, sermons and homilies of the Church Fathers, but also pieces of hagiography – were prepared in two main ways. The first and increasingly widespread option was to collect the required passages in a separate book (e.g., capitulary, epistolary, homiliary, passionary, legendary) or independent booklets (*libelli*). Whilst easier and more convenient to use, this option required additional resources in the shape of materials, scribes and time required to produce new books. The second option was much simpler, and all it entailed was identifying the relevant textual passages in the existing manuscripts and marking them up with marginal notes and symbols. The medieval user, rather than having a separate book, would then read out the marked-up passages directly from the Bible and/or patristic codices. As I will now demonstrate, it is in this context that *D₁* and *D₂* find their specific locus.

The annotations that survive in the margins of *D₁* can tell us a great deal about the specific contexts in which the book was used by its medieval owners. Written by two contemporary hands whose scribal features point strongly to the second half of the twelfth century, these marginalia can be identified as mark-ups for the readings (*lectiones*) at matins (Fig. 11). They belong to two distinct sequences, one of which relates to Lent (fols. 55v-113v), the other to Advent and Epiphany (fols. 5v-49r; see the Appendix at the end of this article).

⁷⁶ These codices all feature in Holter's list of books not inventoried by Gottschalk but known nevertheless to have been at Lambach during the twelfth century; Holter, "Zwei Lambacher Bibliotheksverzeichnisse", p. 276.

⁷⁷ On the development of liturgical books throughout the medieval and early-modern periods, see the concise overview in Folsom, "The Liturgical Books".

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 276-83. See also Nocent, "The Roman Lectionary".

The *lectiones* for matins were usually longer than those for other Canonical Hours, and they could be drawn from a variety of sources, most commonly the Bible (Old and New Testament), patristic commentaries, sermons and homilies, but also hagiographical or apocryphal texts.⁷⁹ Scriptural readings such as those of the major and minor prophets collected in *D_I* were often reserved for the first nocturne, though this was not a hard-and-fast rule. They were delivered in groups (*legenda*) of three or four lessons at a time, each preceded by a blessing and followed by a response. Generally speaking, in Western monastic usage the matins on Sundays and Double Feasts always had twelve lessons (four per nocturn), whereas Simple Feasts could feature either twelve or sometimes nine lessons (three per nocturn).⁸⁰ On week days (*ferias*), the arrangement was slightly different: during the summer months, when the nights were short, the first nocturn usually only included a single short lesson, whereas the longer nights of the winter months featured the full three lessons, meaning that larger amounts of Scripture could be read in a comparatively short amount of time, sometimes covering several books in a single month.⁸¹

Being interlinked in this way, the Bible and the liturgy together formed a powerful ‘intra- and extratextual continuum’ which served to provide medieval communities with a strong sense of continuity and history that found its expression through repetition and celebration.⁸² In a sense, it allowed the monks not only to read, but also ‘(re-)live’ the Bible collectively, an experience that was key for a monastery’s communal identity and historical consciousness, and which on occasion was intensified further through dramatic liturgical performances such as the elaborate Magi play staged annually by the monks of Lambach as part of their Epiphany celebrations.⁸³ On winter *ferias* in particular, the *lectiones* at matins were typically chosen from the historical parts of the Bible (*historia*) that lend themselves particularly well to being embedded within the narrative framework of salvation history

⁷⁹ Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office*, pp. 22-23, 60-63; Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy*, pp. 81-82. See also S. Boynton, “The Bible and the Liturgy”, in *The Practice of the Bible in the Middle Ages: Production, Reception, and Performance in Western Christianity*, ed. S. Boynton (New York, 2011), pp. 10-33.

⁸⁰ Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy*, pp. 81, 90-97.

⁸¹ Boynton, “The Bible and the Liturgy”, pp. 23-24.

⁸² On this notion of an intra- and extratextual continuum, see R. De Zan, “Bible and Liturgy”, in *Handbook for Liturgical Studies, Vol. 1: Introduction to the Liturgy*, ed. A. J. Chupungco (Collegeville, MN, 1997), pp. 33-51.

⁸³ Boynton, “The Bible and the Liturgy”, pp. 13-19. On the Lambach Magi play, see Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, pp. 119-21, as well as the remarks on the importance of Epiphany at Lambach more generally in *ibid.*, pp. 127-37.

(*Heilsgeschichte*).⁸⁴ In marking-up two sequences of *legenda* comprising of sometimes three, sometimes four lessons – together covering Jeremiah 1:1 (fol. 55v) to 52:15 (fol. 113v) and Isaiah 2:10 (fol. 5v) to 63:7 (fol. 50r) –, and by assigning them to the periods of Advent and Lent respectively, *D_I* can be seen as conforming to the prevailing Roman custom (*Ordo Romanus*) practised by twelfth-century communities throughout the Latin West.⁸⁵ Apart from a few exceptions, most notably Christmas Day (fols. 10v, 32r, 42v, 50r) and Epiphany (fols. 44r, 47v, 48v, 49r), the Scriptural passages assigned for the *lectiones* at matins had not yet been fixed at that point. Even the *Ordo* prescribed only the general order in which the books of the Bible were to be read over the course of the year, along with their respective months/seasons, thereby providing medieval communities such as Lambach with a certain degree of flexibility and individuality in the design of their specific liturgical routines.⁸⁶

The marginalia in *D_I* relating to the Night Office held on Christmas Day are a good example of this. The *Ordo* stipulates categorically that the first reading on Christmas Day should always be Isaiah 9:1 (*Primo tempore adleviata est terra Zabulon...*), the second Isaiah 20:1 (*Consolamini, consolamini...*) and the third Isaiah 51:9 (*Consurge, consurge, induere fortitudinem...*).⁸⁷ The same is true regarding Epiphany, where the three fixed readings are set in the *Ordo* as (i) Isaiah 55:1 (*Omnes sitientes venite ad aquas...*), (ii) Isaiah 60:1 (*Surge, inluminare, Ierusalem...*) and (iii) Isaiah 61:10 (*Gaudens gaudebo in Domino...*).⁸⁸ In both cases, the three readings set in the *Ordo* are the same as the *lectiones* marked-up in *D_I*, except that the latter labels Isaiah 61:10 ‘[lectio] IIIIa in epiphanie’ (fol. 49r). Meanwhile, the choice of the fourth reading designated by the annotator(s) of *D_I* in addition to (or in lieu of) those prescribed by the *Ordo* for Christmas and Epiphany provides an important insight into the individual design and delivery of the liturgy at Lambach: on Christmas Day, the monks chose Isaiah 63:7 (*Miserationum Domini recordabor laudem...*) as the fourth and final reading at

⁸⁴ Harper, *The Forms and Orders of Western Liturgy*, p. 92; Hughes, *Medieval Manuscripts for Mass and Office*, p. 61.

⁸⁵ M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen âge, Vol. 2: Les textes (Ordines I-XIII)* (Leuven, 1971), p. 482: *In quintodecimo die ante pascha ponunt Hieremiam prophetam usque in caena Domini*; *ibid.*, p. 485: *In dominica prima mensis decembris, id est in prima dominica de adventu Domini nostri Iesu Christi, ponunt Esaiam prophetam usque in natalem Domini*. Also Boynton, “The Bible and the Liturgy”, p. 23; I. Cochelin, “When Monks Were the Book: The Bible and Monasticism (6th-11th Centuries)”, in *The Practice of the Bible in the Middle Ages: Production, Reception, and Performance in Western Christianity*, ed. S. Boynton (New York, 2011), pp. 61-83.

⁸⁶ Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen âge*, II, 481-88 (= Ordo XIII A). I am grateful to Teresa Webber for advising me on this subject.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 486.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, II, 487.

matins (fol. 50r), whilst on the Feast of Epiphany they opted for Isaiah 61:1 (*Spiritus Domini super me eo...*) (fol. 48v). *D*₁ instructs its users to read Isaiah 61:1 straight after Isaiah 60:1 – the place traditionally reserved for a reading from Isaiah 61:10 in keeping with the *Ordo* (see above). The insertion of Isaiah 61:1 means that the two readings effectively swap positions, with Isaiah 60:1 coming first, Isaiah 61:1 second, and Isaiah 61:10 concluding the nocturn according to *D*₁. By introducing such subtle yet meaningful modifications of liturgical practice and observance, the annotations in *D*₁ offer valuable windows onto the specific negotiations that governed the communal religious life and routine at Lambach. To be clear, I am not suggesting that liturgical modifications such as these were unusual, let alone unique, during the twelfth century. If anything, this seems to have been the norm, rather than the exception. The regionally (or even locally) specific character of medieval liturgical practice, and the fact that religious customs varied widely, and often significantly, from institution to institution, meant that the liturgical routines prescribed in monastic customaries and other normative sources had to be adjusted frequently so as to be flexible enough to accommodate different local/regional/institutional conditions, thereby responding to specific needs and preferences.

How, then, can we interpret the annotations found in *D*₁ in relation to the readings contained in *D*₂, if at all? From a functional perspective, it would seem that *D*₂ complements *D*₁ (and vice versa) within the context of Lambach's liturgical practice and routine. Semantically, the *lectiones* in *D*₂, whilst read at Mass, serve to supplement and, in a sense, complete those marked-up in *D*₁ for reading during the Divine Office. When taken together, they form a single narrative unit. We can see this clearly by looking at, for example, the readings from Isaiah (*D*₂, fols. 2r-6v): the readings for Christmas Eve (*In vigilia nativitatis Domini; In vigilia Domini nocte*) copied in the lectionary are Isaiah 62:1 (*Propter Sion non tacebo...*) (fol. 2r), Isaiah 9:2 (*Populus gentium qui ambulabat in tenebro...*) (fol. 2v) and Isaiah 61:1 (*Spiritus Domini super me eo quod unxerit...*) (fols. 2v-3r); for Christmas Day (*In die natalis Domini*), we find Isaiah 52:6 (*Propter hoc sciet populus...*) (fols. 3r-v). With regard to Epiphany, *D*₂ sets readings from Isaiah 60:1 (fols. 5v-6r) and Isaiah 25:1 (fol. 6r-v). Except for Isaiah 60:1, none of these *lectiones* contained in the first quire of *D*₂ are marked-up anywhere in *D*₁. Rather than duplicating each other's readings, therefore, the two Lambach manuscripts actually appear to supplement one another. Indeed, when taken together and contextualised within the annual liturgical cycle, their contents effectively combine into a complete sequence of interlinked Scriptural readings (*lectio continua*), which was delivered continuously across Mass and the Divine Office in such a way as to establish a coherent

spiritual narrative and sense of continuity throughout the year. If we assume further that the annotation of *D*₁ and *D*₂ was done systematically, thereby resembling a certain scribal and liturgical agenda, this might indicate that the two codices were used, and meant to be used, in similar and related contexts – one during Mass, the other as part of the Divine Office.

We can get a lively impression of the kinds of liturgical occasions on which the two books were used from a manuscript kept at the Stiftsbibliothek Göttweig under the shelfmark MS 53b (hereafter *G*).⁸⁹ This manuscript, now a fragment, was produced at Göttweig Abbey during the first half of the twelfth century and sent to Lambach shortly afterwards.⁹⁰ On fols. 1v-85v, *G* contains detailed liturgical directions according to the customs (*consuetudines*) of Fruttuaria, an influential centre of monastic reform founded by William of Volpiano in the early years of the eleventh century.⁹¹ As part of these liturgical directions, the *Consuetudines Fructuarienses* provide specific instructions as to how the nocturns of Christmas Day and Epiphany are to be structured. Following the lighting of all the candles in the church, the recitation of prayers and the singing of psalms under the joint direction of the abbot, the cantor and the chamberlain, twelve lessons are to be delivered across the subsequent nocturns of the Night Office on Christmas Day (four lessons per nocturn). The four *lectiones* marked-up in *D*₁, though not identified specifically in *G*, thus constitute the main content of the first nocturn held on Christmas Day, which is entirely consistent with the annotator's instructions (Fig. 12).⁹² Whether or not the Lambach monks always obeyed the prescriptive directions of the *Consuetudines Fructuarienses* in their everyday liturgical practice, let alone if they followed them to the letter, is impossible to know. Yet, the fact that their monastery was reformed in 1124–28 according to the customs of Göttweig – which, in turn, had been modelled closely on those of Saint Blasien and Fruttuaria – makes it plausible that Lambach's liturgical routine during the twelfth century as reflected in *D*₁ and *D*₂ constituted a flexible adaptation and modification of the guidelines found in *G*.⁹³

⁸⁹ The manuscript has been fully digitised and is available online, <http://manuscripta.at/diglit/AT2000-53b/0001>.

⁹⁰ Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, p. 11.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 12. The *Consuetudines Fructuarienses* have been critically edited in *Consuetudines Fructuarienses – Sanblasianae*, ed. L. G. Spätling and P. Dinter, 2 vols., *Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum* 12.1-2 (Siegburg, 1985-87). On William of Volpiano and the influence of 'his' reforms, see N. Bulst, *Untersuchungen zu den Klosterreformen Wilhelms von Dijon (962-1031)* (Bonn, 1973).

⁹² *G*, fol. 8v, ll. 14-24.

⁹³ *Consuetudines Fructuarienses*, I, xxxii-xxxvii. Indeed, Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, p. 10 even goes so far as to argue that "at twelfth-century Lambach, [...] all aspects of monastic life – from

Given the strong relationship and bonds of fraternity that had existed between the communities of Lambach and Göttweig ever since their respective foundations, it is perfectly conceivable that *G* might even have been commissioned by the monks of Lambach based on a now-lost exemplar at Göttweig.⁹⁴ As Davis has shown, the *Consuetudines Fructuarienses* implemented at and possibly disseminated from Göttweig had a significant impact on Lambach's liturgical music.⁹⁵ On its opening page, *G* has a song in praise of St Andrew with full musical notation to assist oral performance. Similar notation can be found in *D₁*, where it has been added subsequently by a twelfth-century scribe whose hand might be identical with that of the marginal annotator(s) discussed earlier (Fig. 13). The passages of text marked-up for signing are the Lamentations of Jeremiah (fols. 114v-120r), recited as part of the celebrations during Holy Week, usually on Good Friday. Taken together, the annotations and notations in *D₁* guide us through virtually the entirety of the liturgical year, from Lent and Easter to Christmas and Epiphany, and they are important pieces of evidence for how this liturgical routine was celebrated and re-interpreted by the monks of Lambach during the twelfth century in the face of liturgical innovation and monastic reform. Of course, medieval monastic identities relied not just on innovation, but equally, and perhaps more importantly, on tradition and historical precedent. Traces of such tradition can be identified in our final piece of evidence that survives hidden in the binding of *D₁*.

On the inside of the book's back board, largely obscured by a glued-on sheet of paper, we can see traces of a single sheet of parchment which was re-used as a pastedown (Fig. 14). The handwriting visible on this fragment dates to the Carolingian period, most likely the first half of the ninth century. The text is arranged into two columns, and upon closer inspection can be identified as two sermons. The words in the left-hand column (*...eam adduci. Quitamen idolatrie magis [...] dedit eam cuidam...*) belong to a sermon on the passion of St Agatha, whereas those in the right-hand column (*...[qu]antum aliquis debet [...] pro opere facto reputatur...*) are from a pseudo-Augustinian sermon on St Sixtus. Both sermons form part of a Carolingian collection of one hundred and forty-five sermons and *passiones* from southern

the liturgy the monks recited to the books they produced – were heavily influenced by eleventh- and twelfth-century monastic reform movements”.

⁹⁴ For a full codicological description of the manuscript, including the identification of its different scribes, see <http://manuscripta.at/?ID=36516>.

⁹⁵ Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, p. 11.

Germany/Austria.⁹⁶ The origin of this collection has been located in Bavaria or, as proposed more recently, the diocese of Salzburg.⁹⁷ In the absence of the original exemplar or ‘Urtext’, the two oldest and most complete manuscript witnesses of what is now widely referred to as the ‘Salzburg Sermon Collection’ (*Salzburger Sermones-Sammlung*) today are kept in Würzburg (Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, MS M.p.th.q. 15) and Munich (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm. 14418), both produced during the ninth century in the scriptoria of Freising and, possibly, Regensburg.⁹⁸ Eighteen more copies written between the ninth and fifteenth centuries have been identified by scholars, testifying to the sermons’ continuing popularity throughout the region for centuries after their compilation.⁹⁹ Four of these fragments once belonged to Lambach, including one paper copy (Lambach, Stiftsbibliothek, MS CcL 480a, fragm. 8, I-VII) and three single sheets of parchment (New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, MSS 482.4 and 484.2; Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, MS ser. nov. 3620).¹⁰⁰ A palaeographical comparison between these loose sheets and the fragment found in the binding of *D₁* serves to confirm that the latter comes from the same scriptorium as the Beinecke fragments, all of which have been dated to the second quarter of the ninth century.¹⁰¹ Indeed, a close match for the script on the fragment in *D₁* can be found in a fragment of a Lambach homiliary, now New Haven, Yale University, Beinecke Library, MS 481.8.¹⁰²

So far, no exact historical origin has been established for these fragments, but they are widely assumed to have been produced in the Southeast of Germany bordering on Austria. Today, seven copies of the ‘Salzburg Sermon Collection’ (or parts thereof) are known from the

⁹⁶ On this sermon collection, see most recently M. Diesenberger, *Predigt und Politik im frühmittelalterlichen Bayern: Arn von Salzburg, Karl der Große und die Salzburger Sermones-Sammlung* (Berlin, 2016), pp. 420-21 (*Passio sanctae Agathae brevior*), 429-30 (*Passio Syxti brevior*). Also J. McCune, ‘Four Pseudo-Augustinian Sermons *De concupiscentia fugienda* from the Carolingian Sermonary of Würzburg’, *Revue d’études augustiniennes et patristiques* 52 (2006), 391-431.

⁹⁷ Diesenberger, *Predigt und Politik*, pp. 29-30.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 30-35, 412-13; McCune, ‘Four Pseudo-Augustinian Sermons’, pp. 391-93.

⁹⁹ Diesenberger, *Predigt und Politik*, pp. 412-17.

¹⁰⁰ McCune, ‘Four Pseudo-Augustinian Sermons’, p. 422; Diesenberger, *Predigt und Politik*, pp. 397, 414; Babcock, *Reconstructing a Medieval Library*, p. 92 (= no. 7). Also cf. B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts, Vol. 1: Aachen – Lambach*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für die Herausgabe der mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz (Wiesbaden, 1998), pp. 422-23.

¹⁰¹ Diesenberger, *Predigt und Politik*, p. 414; B. Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit, Vol. 2: Die vorwiegend österreichischen Diözesen* (Wiesbaden, 1980), pp. 40-44; Babcock, *Reconstructing a Medieval Library*, p. 92.

¹⁰² I would like to thank one of the anonymous peer-reviewers for pointing me to this fragment, which can be viewed online at <https://brbl-dl.library.yale.edu/vufind/Record/3520583>.

eleventh and twelfth centuries alone. The one copied closest to Lambach is a codex from the Abbey of Admont (now Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 664).¹⁰³ The two monasteries enjoyed a close connection during this period, due not least to the relationship between Lambach's founder, Bishop Adalbero of Würzburg, Bishop Gebhard of Salzburg (1060-88), founder of Admont Abbey, and Bishop Altmann of Passau (1065-91), founder of Göttweig Abbey.¹⁰⁴ The longevity of this relationship was instrumental for the history of monastic reform in the medieval diocese of Salzburg, and Gebhard's foundation of Admont, established in 1074, played an important role in this. Admont's monastic customs, like those of Göttweig, are known to have exercised a strong influence on Lambach's liturgical culture, and its scriptorium is widely accepted as the closest parallel to and inspiration for that of Lambach, with Göttweig taking second place ahead of smaller regional monasteries such as Melk and Mondsee.¹⁰⁵ These scriptoria, in turn, had developed under the influence of Salzburg, the metropolitan see and an important centre of book production.¹⁰⁶ Whilst this influence continued to be felt strongly at Admont during the eleventh and twelfth centuries, there was relatively little direct contact and exchange between the scriptoria of Lambach and Salzburg.¹⁰⁷ Indeed, most scribal and artistic influences seem to have reached Lambach 'second-hand' via Admont, Göttweig and Melk. There is a real chance, therefore, that the 'Salzburg Sermon Collection' came to Lambach from one of these three monasteries, with Admont and Göttweig being the most likely candidates.¹⁰⁸

In conclusion, it was not only with regard to scribal and artistic customs that the circulation and exchange of manuscripts made the monastic community of Lambach receptive to external influences and reforms. The same is true also, and importantly, in the context of the abbey's liturgical culture and routine. The codices and fragments now kept at Downside and studied here for the first time offer vibrant evidence of this dynamic culture that combined tradition with innovation and occupied an important part of the abbey's daily life. With liturgical activities being embedded deeply within the monks' historical consciousness and

¹⁰³ Diesenberger, *Predigt und Politik*, p. 416.

¹⁰⁴ The three prelates had studied together in Paris, and they remained such loyal allies that one scholar refers to them as the "Austrian *Dreigestirn* (trio of stars)"; Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, p. 9.

¹⁰⁵ W. Telesko, "Lambach, Admont und das 'Antiphonar von St. Peter': Überlegungen zur 'Vorbildqualität' der Salzburger Buchmalerei der zweiten Hälfte des 12. Jahrhunderts", *Jahrbuch des Oberösterreichischen Musealvereines* 140 (1995), 57-82; Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, pp. 13-37; Holter, "Das mittelalterliche Buchwesen", p. 53.

¹⁰⁶ Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, p. 13.

¹⁰⁷ Holter, "Das mittelalterliche Buchwesen", p. 53.

¹⁰⁸ See Davis, *The Gottschalk Antiphonary*, pp. 13-14 and the references provided therein.

communal identity, manuscripts such as *D*₁ and *D*₂ hold valuable clues for scholars interested in the everyday realities and experiences of monastic communities past and present. This article could do little more than scratch the surface of what is a fascinating and promising opportunity for future discoveries, and much work remains to be done. Still, by investigating two largely unknown manuscripts and making some of their features more easily accessible for future scholarship, I hope to have provided a useful point of departure. Both books were used by the monks of Lambach at different stages within the liturgical year, together allowing them to celebrate their communal identity within the wider context of twelfth-century monastic culture and reform.

Benjamin Pohl, University of Bristol

benjamin.pohl@bristol.ac.uk

Appendix: Liturgically-relevant marginalia in *D1*, fols. 5v-113v

- Feria IIa = Ingredere in petram... (Isaiah 2:10) (fol. 5v)
IIa = In die illa proiciet... (Isaiah 2:20) (fol. 6r)
IIIa = Vae impio in malum retribution (Isaiah 3:11) (fol. 6v)
- Feria IIIa = Cantabo dilecto meo canticum... (Isaiah 5:1) (fol. 7r)
IIa = Vae qui coniungitis domum... (Isaiah 5:8) (fol. 7v)
IIIa = Vae qui trahitis iniquitatem... (Isaiah 5:18) (fol. 8r)
- Feria IIIa = In anno quo mortuus est rex... (Isaiah 6:1) (fol. 8v)
IIa = Et volavit ad me unus de seraphin... (Isaiah 6:6) (fol. 8v)
IIIa = Et dixit Dominus ad Isaiam egredere... (Isaiah 7:3) (fol. 8v)
- Feria Va = In die illa radet Dominus in novacula ... (Isaiah 7:20) (fol. 9v)
IIa = Et dixit Dominus ad me sume tibi... (Isaiah 8:1) (fol. 9v)
IIIa = Haec enim ait Dominus ad me sicut... (Isaiah 8:11) (fol. 10r)
- Feria VIa = Vae qui condunt leges iniquas... (Isaiah 10:1) (fol. 11r)
IIa = Vae Assur virga furoris mei... (Isaiah 10:5) (fol. 11v)
IIIa = Numquid gloriabitur securis contra eum... (Isaiah 10:15) (fol. 11v)
- Sabbato = Et egredietur virga de radice Iesse... (Isaiah 11:1) (fol. 12v)
IIa = Habitabit lupus cum agno et pardus... (Isaiah 11:6) (fol. 12v)
IIIa = Super montem caligosum levate... (Isaiah 13:2) (fol. 13r)
- Dominica IIa lectio prima = Et egredietur virga... (Isaiah 11:1) (fol. 12v)
IIa = Habitabit lupus cum agno et pardus... (Isaiah 11:6) (fol. 12v)
IIIa = In die illa adiciet Dominus... (Isaiah 11:11) (fol. 12v)
IIIIa = Et desolabit Dominus linguam maris... (Isaiah 11:15) (fol. 13r)
Va = Super montem caligosum levate... (Isaiah 13:2) (fol. 13r)
VIa = Ululate quia prope est dies Domini... (Isaiah 13:6) (fol. 13r)
VIIa = Preciosior erit vir auro... (Isaiah 13:12) (fol. 13v)
VIIIa = Et erit Babylon illa gloriosa... (Isaiah 13:19) (fol. 13v)
- Dominica IIIa [lectio prima] = Ecce Dominus ascendet... (Isaiah 19:1) (fol. 16v)
IIa = Et arescet aqua de mari... (Isaiah 19:5) (fol. 16v)
IIIa = Stulti principes Thaneos sapientes... (Isaiah 19:11) (fol. 17r)
IIIIa = In die illa erit Aegyptus... (Isaiah 19:16) (fol. 17r)

Va = Clamabunt enim ad Dominum... (Isaiah 19:20) (fol. 17r)
VIa = In die illa erit Israhel tertius... (Isaiah 19:24) (fol. 17v)
VIIa = Et dixit Dominus sicut ambulavit... (Isaiah 20:3) (fol. 17v)
VIIIa = Onus deserti maris sicut turbines... (Isaiah 21:1) (fol. 17v)

Lectio Ia in natale = Primo tempore adleviata est... (Isaiah 9:1) (fol. 10v)

IIa in natale = Consolamini consolamini populus meus... (Isaiah 20:1) (fol. 32r)
IIIa in natale = Consurge consurge induere fortitudinem... (Isaiah 51:9) (fol. 42v)
IIIIa in natale = Miserationum Domini recordabor laudem... (Isaiah 63:7) (fol. 50r)

[Lectio] Ia in epiphanie = Omnes sitientes venite ad aquas... (Isaiah 55:1) (fol. 44r)

IIa in epiphanie = Surge inluminare Ierusalem quia... (Isaiah 60:1) (fol. 47v)
IIIa in epiphanie = Spiritus Domini super me eo... (Isaiah 61:1) (fol. 48v)
IIIIa in epiphanie = Gaudens gaudebo in Domino... (Isaiah 61:10) (fol. 49r)

Dominica in passione Ia [lectio prima] = Verba Hieremiae filii... (Jeremiah 1:1) (fol. 55v)

IIa = Et dixi a a Domine Deus ecce nescio... (Jeremiah 1:6) (fol. 55v)
IIIa = Et factum est verbum... (Jeremiah 1:11) (fol. 56r)
IIIIa = Ne formides a facie... (Jeremiah 1:17) (fol. 56r)
Va = Audite verbum Domini domus Iacob... (Jeremiah 2:4) (fol. 56v)
VIa = Sacerdotes non dixerunt ubi est... (Jeremiah 2:8) (fol. 56v)
VIIa = Numquid servus est Israhel... (Jeremiah 2:14) (fol. 56v)
VIIIa = A saeculo confregisti iugum... (Jeremiah 2:20) (fol. 57r)

[erased] = Verbum quod factum est... (Jeremiah 18:1) (fol. 74r)

IIa = Repente loquar adversum gentem... (Jeremiah 18:7) (fol. 74r)
IIIa = Ideo hec dicit Dominus. Interrogate gentis... (Jeremiah 18:13) (fol. 74v)
IIIIa = Adtende Domine ad me... (Jeremiah 18:19) (fol. 74v)
Va = Hec dicit Dominus. Vade et accipe laguncula... (Jeremiah 19:1) (fol. 75r)
VIa = Propterea ecce dies veniunt dicit Dominus... (Jeremiah 19:6) (fol. 75r)
VIIa = Inmunde omnis domus in quarum domatibus... (Jeremiah 19:13) (fol. 75v)
VIIIa = Cumque illuxisset in crastinum eduxit Fassur... (Jeremiah 20:3) (fol. 75v)

- [erased] = In principio regis Ioachim filii Iosie... (Jeremiah 26:1) (fol. 82r)
- IIa = Cumque complisset Ieremias loquens omnia... (Jeremiah 26:8) (fol. 82r)
- IIIa = In principio regni Ioachim filii Iosie regis... (Jeremiah 27:1) (fol. 83r)
- Feria IIIa = Et factum est in anno illo in principio regni Sedechie... (Jeremiah 28:1) (fol. 84r)
- IIa = Verumtamen audi verbum hoc quod ego loquor... (Jeremiah 28:7) (fol. 84r)
- IIIa = Hec enim dicit Dominus exercituum... (Jeremiah 29:8) (fol. 85r)
- [Feria IVa = missing?]
- IIa = Et precepit Ieremias Baruch dicens... (Jeremiah 36:5) (fol. 94r)
- IIIa = Rex autem sedebat in domo Hiemali in mense nono... (Jeremiah 36:22) (fol. 95r)
- Feria Va = Et misit rex Sedechias Ioachal filium Selemie... (Jeremiah 37:3) (fol. 95v)
- IIa = Hec dicit Dominus. Nolite decipere animas... (Jeremiah 37:8) (fol. 96r)
- IIIa = Audivit autem Saphatias filius Mathan et Godolias... (Jeremiah 38:1) (fol. 96r)
- Feria VIa = Mansit autem Ieremias in vestibulo carceris... (Jeremiah 38:13) (fol. 97r)
- IIa = Et dixit rex Sedechias ad Ieremiam: Sollicitus sum... (Jeremiah 38:19) (fol. 97v)
- IIIa = Undecimo autem anno Sedechie mense quarto quinta... (Jeremiah 39:2) (fol. 98r)
- Sabbato = Sermo qui factus est ad Ieremiam a Domino postquam... (Jeremiah 40:1) (fol. 98r)
- IIa = Venit autem Ieremias ad Godoliam filium Aicham... (Jeremiah 40:6) (fol. 99r)
- IIIa = Iohanna vero filius Caree dixit... (Jeremiah 40:15) (fol. 99v)
- Feria IIa = Audivit autem Iohannan filius... (Jeremiah 41:11) (fol. 100r)
- IIa = Tulit ergo Iohannan filius Caree et omnes principes... (Jeremiah 41:16) (fol. 100v)
- IIIa = Propter hoc nunc audite verbum Domini reliquie... (Jeremiah 42:15) (fol. 101r)
- Feria IIIa = Et factus est sermo Domini ad Ieremiam... (Jeremiah 43:18) (fol. 101v)
- IIa = Verbum quod factum est ad Ieremiam... (Jeremiah 44:1) (fol. 102r)
- IIIa = Responderunt autem Ieremie omnes viri scientes... (Jeremiah 44:15) (fol. 103r)
- Feria IIIIa = Verbum quod precepit Ieremias... (Jeremiah 51:59) (fol. 112v)
- IIa = Filius viginti et unius anni erat Sedechias... (Jeremiah 52:1) (fol. 113r)
- IIIa = De pauperibus autem populi et de reliquo... (Jeremiah 52:15) (fol. 113v)