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Eleanor J. Giraud

The ceremonial cleansing of the altars was one of the main rituals of Holy Week for Christians in the fifteenth century, as it is for many Catholics and Anglicans today. Following supper, religious communities processed to each altar in their church, singing melodically elaborate responsories that narrated the events of Maundy Thursday. Then, stationed in turn at each altar while it was cleansed and anointed, the community sang a simpler antiphon in praise of the saint to which the altar was dedicated. These altars, saints, and antiphons were local to the church in question. Candlebearers then said a short versicle and response at each altar, petitioning the saint to pray on their behalf, and the priest recited a prayer (oratio) addressed to God but naming the saint, before the procession continued to the next altar.1

For Dominican nuns in St. Catherine's convent, Nuremberg, however, participation in this ceremony was restricted following the convent's adoption of Observance in 1428, and with it strict claustration.2 No longer permitted to mix with the male clergy who served their church, the altar-washing ceremony was one of various “processions” in which the nuns did not physically process. They were instead confined to their gallery at the west end of the church. For other feasts on which processions did occur, these took place entirely within the nuns’ enclosure.3 Removed from the action, the nuns’ principal connection with the altar-washing procession was thus through their singing—visiting each altar orally by means of the chants—and through the books that they used, namely processionals. It is notable that, even though the nuns remained stationary, these books were nonetheless designed for use in procession, with large script in small, portable books that facilitated reading on the go. This may in part have been owing to tradition: the altar-washing ceremony had always been copied in this way, why change it? Yet processionals could also have held a ceremonial significance for the nuns. The very nature and format of the books materially connected them to the essence of a procession, and therefore constituted an essential aspect of their participation in a processional ritual, whether or not they themselves were actually moving.

Three processionals from the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University—Ms. 205, Music Deposit 60, and Music Deposit 61—can be linked to the Observant Dominican convent of St. Catherine in Nuremberg, also known as the “Katharinenkloster.”4 These books facilitate a deeper understanding of the Observant Dominican nuns’ experience of procession, inviting the consideration of questions of space and boundaries, and of broader networks of influence among Observant communities. Ms. 205 is a Processional-Rituale copied around 1450, and was undoubtedly used at St. Catherine's convent, Nuremberg.5 Music Deposit 60 and 61 are almost identical, with only small differences in layout and contents. They appear to have been copied from a processional
of St. Catherine’s convent, Nuremberg, at the end of the fifteenth century, but were made for use elsewhere, likely the Dominican convent of the Holy Cross in Regensburg. All three processionals were neatly produced, but are not particularly high-grade: the parchment is thick with occasional holes, and the decoration is simple with monochrome initials. These were clearly functional manuscripts, and they bear numerous signs of use, including corrections and later additions. It is well documented that nuns at Nuremberg copied, notated, and decorated their own liturgical books, and there is nothing to argue against in-house production for all three processionals. Together these three books usefully exemplify the networks and processes of liturgical book production in and among Dominican Observant convents.

This article will first situate Ms. 205 and Music 60 and 61 within the corpus of processionals originating from the convents of St. Catherine’s, Nuremberg, and Holy Cross, Regensburg, respectively. Through their books, it is possible to trace the evolution of the church architecture, the Observant experience of the altar-washing procession, and the interactions between Observant convents. Finally, the article considers the extent to which the Observant reform movement achieved one of its principal goals, that of liturgical unity. Processionals at the convents of St. Catherine’s and Holy Cross are compared with the processional archetype preserved in the authoritative thirteenth-century exemplar of the Dominican liturgy, Rome, Santa Sabina, XIV L 1. Although thorough study of the Mass and Office liturgy would be required to establish more comprehensive findings, this case study nonetheless productively highlights and analyzes the types of differences that can be found in Dominican nuns’ processionals. It confirms the vast extent to which Dominican friars and Observant nuns shared a common practice, and offers important new insights into particular religious experiences, the ritual contexts in which Observant nuns practiced, and their responses to the restrictions imposed on their liturgical participation.

St. Catherine’s Convent, Nuremberg, through the Lens of Its Altar-Washing Procession

Founded in 1295, St. Catherine’s convent was a wealthy and influential house. A relatively early adopter (among German Dominican convents) of Observance, it was reformed in 1428 by nuns from the Observant Dominican convent of Schönensteinbach in Alsace, and nuns from St. Catherine’s convent in turn went on to reform eight other houses. The Observant reform saw the strict enclosure of the nuns and a renewed emphasis on correct, uniform liturgical devotion. Consequently, there was a flurry of scribal activity: new liturgical books and numerous other texts were produced in St. Catherine’s scriptorium. Fortunately, a substantial proportion of St. Catherine’s sizable library survives today, as do various writings by the nuns documenting their daily lives.

Processions and processional books are fundamentally shaped by their local context: the location of each church, its altars, and the rite to which it belonged determined when and how processions were conducted. Centered on each church’s own altars, the Maundy Thursday altar-cleansing ritual (ablutio altarium) is particularly revealing of a book’s intended place of use. In this ceremony, the responsories were standard
across the Dominican Order: ten are supplied in the Dominican exemplars, whose texts together summarize the Last Supper and Jesus’s agony in the Garden of Gethsemane. The first nine responsories were borrowed from Matins of that day, the tenth ("Circumdederunt me") from the preceding Palm Sunday.\(^\text{12}\) If a church had fewer or more than ten altars, the first nine responsories were repeated, as required, until the arrival at the penultimate altar. The tenth responsory, “Circumdederunt me,” was reserved exclusively for processing to the final altar. While the responsories were universal across Dominican churches, the choice and order of antiphons were unique to each church, since these were specifically related to the local dedicatee of each altar. The antiphons in the three Beinecke processions thus correspond to the layout and dedication of altars in the institutions where they were used: the convents of St. Catherine in Nuremberg and, as I argue below, of the Holy Cross in Regensburg.

In Ms. 205’s *ablitio altarium*, all ten standard responsories are provided (ff. 9r–18v), followed by the antiphons, versicles, and prayers for eight local altars (ff. 19r–25v), which correspond to items 1–8 in Table 1. To guide users between

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fig. 1</th>
<th>Altar</th>
<th>Consecrated</th>
<th>Dedicatee(s)</th>
<th>Associated antiphon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High altar</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>Catherine of Alexandria</td>
<td>“Ave virgo katharina”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>South aisle</td>
<td>[1327]</td>
<td>Blessed Virgin Mary, three kings, Nicholas</td>
<td>“Regali ex progenie”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>South column</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>John the Baptist, John the Evangelist</td>
<td>“Valde honorandus est”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>North aisle</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td>Ten thousand Martyrs, including Catherine of Alexandria</td>
<td>“Gaudent in celis”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>North column</td>
<td>Before 1436</td>
<td>James and all 12 apostles</td>
<td>“Estote fortes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Center</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>Angastallar (described in the <em>Notel</em> as “der angst unsers lieben herren,” literally “Our Dear Lord’s fear/anguish”)</td>
<td>“Anxiatus est in me”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sacristy altar</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>Catherine of Alexandria, Anna, Erasmus, and the Virgin Mary</td>
<td>“Salvator mundi” (All Saints)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>Sigismund, Barbara, Catherine of Alexandria, Dominic, Peter and Paul, Nicholas, Victorinus, the Theban Legion, the 11,000 virgins, Cecilia, Margaret, Brigit, and Valentine</td>
<td>“Hic est vere martyr” (Sigismund) “Ista est” (Barbara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nuns’ gallery</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>Dominic, Thomas Aquinas, and Peter Martyr</td>
<td>“Magne pater sancte dominice”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>South aisle, third or fourth column</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>Catherine of Siena, Vincent Ferrer, Leonhard, Sebald, Servatius, Adolf</td>
<td>“Rerum omnium”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>[Location unknown]</td>
<td>[1493–1505]</td>
<td>Cosmas and Damian</td>
<td>“Corpora sanctorum”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 1: Altars and Their Maundy Thursday Antiphons at St. Catherine’s Convent, Nuremberg, up to ca. 1500
these two sections, the scribe provided the incipit of the responsory with which each antiphon was to be paired. Although Ms. 205 includes the eighth and ninth responsories (“Seniores populi,” f. 16r, and “Revelabunt celi,” f. 16v) in the section of standard responsories, it does not assign local material to them: these were thus to be excluded and the procession was to use the first to seventh responsories before closing with the final tenth responsory. This indicates that the church had only eight altars.

Various processionals and other texts associated with St. Catherine’s convent, Nuremberg, can be used to identify the church’s altar dedicatees and locations across the fifteenth century. (See Table 2 for the sources and Fig. 1 for the altar layout.) In particular, a key source identifying St. Catherine’s convent’s altars from the same period as Ms. 205 is a small handbook copied by the “Küsterin,” or sacristan, of the house in 1436 (known as the Notel der Küsterin, now Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek, Cent. VII, 16). Among the sacristan’s responsibilities were the liturgical objects of the church, and her Notel includes a short description of their eight altars (ff. 213v–218r), which match those in Ms. 205. In addition, three further processionals associated with St. Catherine’s convent, Nuremberg, contain matching altars and antiphons to Ms. 205: two Processional-Rituales (Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek, Cent. VII, 100, and Überlingen, Leopold-Sophien-Bibliothek, Ms. 47) and the processional Freiburg im Breisgau, Stadtarchiv, B1 (H) Nr. 120. Ms. 205 can therefore be placed securely in the corpus of mid-fifteenth-century manuscripts from St. Catherine’s convent, Nuremberg.

A processional made for St. Catherine’s convent, Nuremberg, and later used by the nuns of the Holy Cross convent, Regensburg (Regensburg, Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek, Ch 113), matches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
<th>Altars, in processional order (cf. Table 1)</th>
<th>Sacristy altar antiphon (dedicatee)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1436</td>
<td>Notel der Küsterin (Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek, Cent. VII, 16)</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 [illegible]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1438</td>
<td>Processional: Regensburg, Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek, Ch 113</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 “Salvator mundi” (All Saints)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1438–64</td>
<td>Processionals: Beinecke, Ms. 205; Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek, Cent. VII, 100; Überlingen, Leopold-Sophien-Bibliothek, Ms. 47; Freiburg im Breisgau, Stadtarchiv, B1 (H) Nr. 120</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 “Hic est vere martyr” (Sigismund)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480s–90s</td>
<td>Letters from St. Catherine’s convent, Nuremberg, to St. Gall (Wil, Dominikanerinnenkloster, Chronik/”Konventsbuch”)</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 9, 5, 8, 4, 6, 7 “Ista est” (Barbara)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1464–1505</td>
<td>Processional: Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek, Hert Ms. 7</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 9, [10 marginal addition,] 5, 8, 4, 6, 7 “Ista est” (Barbara)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After 1493</td>
<td>Processional: Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek, Cent. VI, 76</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 5, 8, 4, 6, 7 “Ista est” (Barbara)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Manuscript Evidence for Altars at St. Catherine’s Convent, Nuremberg, in the Fifteenth Century
Ms. 205 in all antiphons but that of the sacristy altar. Instead of an antiphon for St. Sigismund, the All Saints antiphon “Salvator mundi” is provided for the altar, whose dedicatee is not indicated in the manuscript. This processional presumably predates 1438, when the sacristy altar was rededicated to St. Sigismund among others (see Table 1). Nuns from St. Catherine’s convent reformed the house in Regensburg in 1482–83, and this book may have been given to Regensburg because it had been superseded at Nuremberg, thus illustrating the movement of both books and personnel as part of the Observant reform.

It is possible to place Ms. 205 in a period of sustained liturgical book production in the mid-fifteenth century, following the Observant reform of 1428. A colophon on the front flyleaf of Ms. 205 provides a terminus post quem for its copying:

**Figure 1: Plan of altars in St. Catherine’s convent, Nuremberg, up to ca. 1500 (for key, see Table 1).**

Item ich swester barbara pfinczingin ward geporn noch unsers lieben herren ihesu christi gepurt. .m.cccc. und in dem .xxv. Iar am achten tag vor weihen nahnten. Vnd kom in das kloster an sant Erharcz tag .m.cccc. und in dem .xlj. iar.

(I, sister Barbara Pfinzing, was born in the year of our dear Lord Jesus Christ 1425 on the eighth day before Christmas [December 17]. And I entered the cloister on St. Erhard [of Regensburg]'s day [January 8], in the year 1441.)

Barbara Pfinzing, named in the colophon, is likely the daughter of Peter Pfinzing, who left his daughter money in 1453, at which point she was at St. Catherine's convent. She died in 1513. The Pfinzings were an important family in Nuremberg and their involvement with St. Catherine's convent can be traced back to its foundation: the convent was endowed by Adelhaid Pfinzing and her husband, Conrad von Neumarkt, in 1295, prior to its dedication in 1297. Ms. 205 must have been copied after 1441, the year in which Barbara entered St. Catherine's convent, but before 1464, when an altar—which does not feature in Ms. 205’s altar-washing ceremony—was consecrated to St. Catherine of Siena. The production is likely to be in the later portion of this date range, given the style of decoration of the manuscript’s single initial that was embellished with pen flourishing (f. 1r). The marginal addition of St. Vincent Ferrer’s name to the litany (f. 80r) may indicate that the book was written before his canonization in 1455; however, his absence from the original text is not conclusive: it may simply be that the scribe was copying from a book that dated from before 1455. Either way, this date of the 1450s or early 1460s coincides with an increase in liturgical book production in St. Catherine’s scriptorium between 1452 and about 1470: at least one breviary, four missals, four graduals, and four antiphoners were copied in this period, and other preexisting liturgical books were updated and corrected. This scribal activity was undertaken by the reforming nuns who had come to Nuremberg from Schönensteinbach, alongside new recruits who had joined the house since it became Observant. Barbara Pfinzing, if she copied her own processional, would match the latter profile, having joined St. Catherine’s convent in 1441. It is notable that this period of production came some decades after the initial reform in 1428. In the immediate aftermath of enclosure, the nuns at St. Catherine’s convent presumably made do with books that were brought with them by the nuns of Schönensteinbach. These books perhaps included the processional Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M.p.th.d.5, which was brought to Nuremberg in the fifteenth century. This may suggest that energies were initially spent in reforming the existing nuns, attracting new ones, and educating enough of them to a sufficient standard to be able to copy books in the scriptorium.

In addition to education and book production, the Observant reform had a radical impact on the nuns’ experience of the liturgical rituals, including the altar-washing ceremony. From first-hand descriptions, recorded in the sacristan’s Notele (1436) and in letters written in the 1480s and 1490s from the Nuremberg prioress to the Dominican nuns at St. Gall (reformed by Nuremberg sisters in 1482), it is apparent that on Maundy Thursday the nuns stayed and sang the processional chants from their gallery, while the priest washed the altars of
the church. The physical divide is evident from the sacristan’s description of the only encounter between the two parties, when two nuns receive the priest at the door of the choir gallery to wash their altar:

When they [two candle-bearing nuns] have sung the verses, they go down to the door, where the priest will enter and go ahead of them [the nuns] into the choir [i.e., the gallery].

With claustration, the nuns’ movements within the church were limited to a wooden gallery in the west of the church. Previously, they had been able to access the gallery from the nave, but following claustration a door was cut in the northern wall of the church—through a fourteenth-century wall painting—to allow direct access from the cloister into the gallery and to prevent contact with the outside world. Their experience of “procession” during the altar-washing ceremony thus differs vastly from that of the friars, visiting each altar orally, by means of the dedicated antiphons, versicles, and prayers, from the remove of the gallery. As such, the singing of processional chants, and the books in which they were contained, gained ritual significance for the Observant nuns, connecting them with the liturgy and the moving procession.

Models and Adaptations: A Pair of Processionals for Holy Cross (Regensburg?)

The pair of Dominican processionals at the Beinecke Library, Music 60 and 61, are very similar in their contents and even appearance. In the *ablutio altarium*, where variation between manuscripts is normal, the two processionals supply the same antiphons, versicles, and prayers (see Table 3), although in slightly different arrangements—as was typical of processionals more generally, where the manuscript presentation of this ritual is rarely consistent. Music 61 gives first the standard responsories (ff. 8v–14r), followed by the local antiphons, versicles, and prayers (ff. 14r–17r). Music 60 interweaves the local material with its respective responsories (ff. 8r–17r); this is a more sophisticated approach requiring greater planning during the production of the book, and would have been more practical for the user(s), obviating the need to flip between two groups of folios. Since both processionals omit the sixth to ninth standard responsories, closing with the tenth, “Circumdederunt me,” after the fifth responsory, six altars were cleansed during the ceremony.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsoy</th>
<th>Altars indicated in Music 60</th>
<th>Antiphon</th>
<th>Altars implied by antiphons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“In monte oliveti”</td>
<td>High altar</td>
<td>“Tuam crucem”</td>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Tristis est anima”</td>
<td>Blessed Virgin Mary</td>
<td>“Salvator mundi”</td>
<td>All Saints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Ecce vidimus”</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>“O per omnia”</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Amicus”</td>
<td>Catherine of Siena</td>
<td>“Laudemus dominum”</td>
<td>Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Unus ex vobis”</td>
<td>Cosmas and Damian</td>
<td>“Ave regina celorum”</td>
<td>Blessed Virgin Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Circumdederunt me”</td>
<td>[unspecified]</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: *Ablutio altarium* in Music 60 and 61
Music 61 does not identify any of the altars or dedications other than the first responsory, “In monte oliveti,” which is assigned to the high altar in both manuscripts. Music 60 indicates that the subsequent four responsories were sung processing to altars in honor of the Virgin Mary, St. John, St. Catherine of Siena, and Sts. Cosmas and Damian. No altar is given for “Circumdederunt me.” Although these altars differ from those supplied in Ms. 205 above, they too can be linked to St. Catherine’s convent, Nuremberg, albeit at a later date, when the arrangement of altars had changed somewhat. A description of the church’s altars from the final decades of the fifteenth century is given in one of the aforementioned letters sent from the prioress of St. Catherine’s convent, Nuremberg, to that of St. Gall (Table 2, row 5). This differs from the sacristan’s list of 1436 in three ways: an extra altar is found in the nave, consecrated in 1464 to St. Catherine of Siena following her canonization in 1461 (no. 9 in Fig. 1 above); the altar of “Sancta salvatoris,” the Holy Savior, is presumably the “Angstaltar,” for both are given the same Good Friday antiphon, “Anxiatus est”; and at the sacristy altar, St. Barbara is now celebrated instead of St. Sigismund.

Two St. Catherine’s convent processions closely match this altar arrangement (Table 2, rows 6–7): Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek, Hert Ms. 7 supplies exactly these altars and antiphons in the text proper. In addition, an altar for Sts. Cosmas and Damian (no. 10 in Fig. 1 above) is added in the margins of Hert. Ms. 7, and within the text proper of the (presumably slightly later) procession, Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek, Cent. VI, 76. An indulgence for the altar of Sts. Cosmas and Damian at St. Catherine’s convent is recorded during the episcopate of Raymund Bertrand (1493–1505). The altar-washing procession is rerouted in order to incorporate the altars for St. Catherine of Siena and Sts. Cosmas and Damian (see the black route in Fig. 1). The five altars specified for the responsories in Music 60 (Table 3) match exactly the first five altars visited during the altar-washing ceremony at St. Catherine’s convent, Nuremberg, in the late fifteenth century: a high altar and altars for the Virgin Mary, Sts. John the Baptist and John the Evangelist, St. Catherine of Siena, and Sts. Cosmas and Damian.

Notably, the number of responsories (six) falls short of the ten required for late fifteenth-century St. Catherine’s convent, Nuremberg. Moreover, it is unconventional that the paired antiphons do not match the dedicatees of the responsories, instead praising the Holy Cross, All Saints, St. Nicholas, St. Michael, and the Virgin Mary. The most logical explanation for this is that a processional from St. Catherine’s convent, Nuremberg, was used as a model for Music 60 and 61, which were made for a different house with its own set of local antiphons. With the first antiphon praising the Holy Cross, it is likely the convent also had the same dedication, das Heilig Kreuz. Three German-speaking Dominican convents dedicated to the Holy Cross have connections to St. Catherine’s convent, Nuremberg: Tulln and Regensburg (which were reformed by nuns from St. Catherine’s convent in 1436 and 1482–83, respectively) and Holy Cross, Nuremberg (which stood in geographic proximity to St. Catherine’s convent, but appears to have become defunct at some point in the Middle Ages). I have not been able to ascertain the location and/or dedicatees of the altars at any of these three convents, which would permit the secure location of Music 60 and
61; however, given that the rubrication of
the responsories matches the dedications
of the altars at St. Catherine's at the end
of the fifteenth century, and that nuns
from St. Catherine's reformed the house
of Regensburg in 1482–83, Holy Cross
(Heilig Kreuz), Regensburg, seems the most
plausible candidate.\(^{37}\)

Two further processions are likely
from the same house as Music 60 and
61: Philadelphia, Free Library, Lewis E
151 contains antiphons to the same saints
(ff. 91r–94v); and a procession, sold at
Sotheby's in 1971 and now in unknown
private hands, references altars for the Holy
Cross, the Virgin, St. Catherine of Siena,
and Sts. Cosmas and Damian (presumably
mixing the Nuremberg and Regensburg
altars in a similar way to Music 60).\(^{38}\)
It has not been possible to cross-reference
these with a Holy Cross, Regensburg,
processional, since the only processional
that is securely located at Holy Cross does
not supply local antiphons (Regensburg,
Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek, Proschesche
Musikabteilung, Ch 67).\(^{39}\)
Another procession used at Holy Cross mentioned above
(Regensburg, Ch 113; see Table 2) was
originally from St. Catherine's convent,
Nuremberg, and its antiphons were not
updated. A third procession that has been
attributed to Holy Cross (Regensburg,
Bischöfliche Zentralbibliothek, Proschesche
Musikabteilung, Ch 93) is likely a mis-
identification, and is now placed instead
by Claire Taylor Jones in Altenhohenau
(another house reformed by the nuns of
St. Catherine's convent, Nuremberg, in
1465).\(^{40}\)

Music 60's referencing of Nuremberg's
altars exemplifies how newly reformed
houses relied on their “mother” house to
supply models for their new books, in order
to ensure correct, uniform performance
of the liturgy. Moreover, as was the case
in Nuremberg, the evidence from Music
60 and 61 suggests that liturgical book
production in Regensburg occurred
(or at least continued) some years after
reform: Music 60 was copied no earlier
than 1493, the terminus post quem of the
consecration of an altar dedicated to Sts.
Cosmas and Damian in Nuremberg. This
suggests ongoing close ties between the
two houses, with Nuremberg supplying a
model procession for copying at least 13
years after first sending reforming nuns.
A similar example of continued support
can be seen in the case of St. Gall, also
reformed by Nuremberg nuns in 1482,
where letters were exchanged between
the two houses over almost two decades
(1483–1501).\(^{41}\)

In the initial period after
the reform, in all likelihood, books from
Nuremberg would have been brought for
use at Regensburg. The aforementioned
processional Regensburg, Ch 113 may be
one such example: its altars match those in
Nuremberg prior to 1438, so presumably
it was surplus to requirements by the end
of the century and thus was donated to the
newly Observant community at Regensburg.
Further evidence of copying from
a Nuremberg exemplar can be deduced
from the supplementary material supplied
at the end of Music 60 and 61. As small
books that were practical for use outside
of the daily liturgy, it was not uncommon
for processions to become a repository
for other material for occasional rituals,
such as the Triduum or burials.\(^{42}\)
The supplementary material in Music 60 and
61, which is identical in both volumes, is
unrubricated but was likely for penitential,
processional, and other occasional use, such
as profession.\(^{43}\)

Much of the same material
is also found in the two aforementioned late fifteenth-century processionals from St. Catherine’s convent, Nuremberg (Nuremberg, Stadtbibliothek, Hert Ms. 7 and Cent. VI, 76), thus reinforcing the hypothesis that a book or books from Nuremberg were the source for Music 60 and 61. Rubrics in Cent. VI, 76 specify the function of some of these chants: the responsory “Aspice domine” is rubricated “de tribulatione” (f. 59v), indicating penitential use, and the antiphon “Exurge domine” (f. 62v) is rubricated “Wenn man process get yn den creutztagen” (When one processes on the days of the cross). This suggests it was sung for the Rogationtide processions (on April 25 and Monday to Wednesday before Ascension), when the Holy Cross was carried through the city of Nuremberg, including to a station at St. Catherine’s church. Presumably the same processions occurred in Regensburg too, although the Observant nuns in neither city would have mixed with the public for the occasion. The lack of rubrication in this section may indicate that the processionals were compiled specifically for in-house use, with material selected to suit local needs. The function of these chants may have been well known to the books’ users, such that rubrication was not necessary.

The close similarity between the contents of Music 60 and 61 is evidence that they were made for use at the same house. They may even have been copied by the same text scribe, as one catalogue suggested, although this is difficult to state categorically. The music scripts of Music 60 and 61 are also close, although not quite identical; the notations have similar forms, but the noteheads in Music 60 are slightly more regular and assured (see Fig. 2). More notational errors occur (and are corrected) in Music 61 (see Fig. 3). Notably, contrary to Dominican regulations, neither Music 60 nor 61 included virgule pausarum (short lines dividing phrases), and their custodes (tick-like cues placed

Figure 2 (above): Notation in Music 60 (left, f. 31v) and 61 (right, f. 31v). Credit: Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.

Figure 3 (left): Correction of afe (ink) to ged (pencil), Music 61, f. 27v. Credit: Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
at the end of the line to indicate the first pitch of the next line) appear to have been added by later users.\textsuperscript{47} Since the staves are 1 millimeter larger in Music 60, the two books were not ruled with the same rastrum. Nevertheless, the high degree of similarity between the two manuscripts certainly suggests that they originate from the same place of production, likely an in-house scriptorium at Holy Cross.

Music 60’s contents and palaeographical characteristics suggest that it was a later iteration of Holy Cross’s processional. Its more sophisticated, planned approach—interweaving the local \textit{ablitio altarium} material—fewer notational errors and corrections, and the inclusion of additional material not in Music 61,\textsuperscript{48} all point toward Music 60 as representative of a later stage of development. Both processionals contain an initial embellished with pen flourishing on their opening pages; Christine Sauer has identified the initial of Music 61 as typical of the decoration found in Nuremberg in the late fifteenth century, whereas that of Music 60 is not.\textsuperscript{49} Since Music 61 was likely made in Regensburg, it is probable that it was produced in-house by a newly transferred nun, who came to the convent of the Holy Cross from that of St. Catherine and continued to use the Nuremberg style of decoration. By extension, it may be hypothesized that by the time Music 60 was produced around 1500, the local Regensburg nuns had had sufficient practice in producing their own books that they had developed their own artistic style.

The three Beinecke manuscripts and the related Nuremberg manuscripts illustrate the clear network of support between St. Catherine’s convent and its “daughter” convents, as well as the patterns of book production at each site. A clear picture emerges of long-term support and exchange of personnel and of books, reaffirming and contributing further detailed evidence to support the similar findings of other studies.\textsuperscript{50} The following part of this article explores the relationship between books of these convents and those of the male branch of the order. This is undertaken through comparison with the authoritative exemplar created in the thirteenth century for Dominican friars, seeking to highlight and evaluate features of the nuns’ books that are, or have conventionally been perceived to be, distinctive to female communities. The analysis reveals precisely how and to what extent processionals from St. Catherine’s and its daughter convents represent the distinctive practices of Observant Dominican nuns. It invites further historiographical reflection on ways in which scholars have tended to understand and (de)value such female practices.

The Use of the Vernacular in Nuns’ Liturgical Books

One of the features that is often used to identify a liturgical book as being from a female house is the presence of the vernacular language. While there are rarely (if ever) any changes to the chants, prayers, and readings, which invariably remain in Latin, the vernacular language is sometimes used for performance instructions given in rubrics. All three of the Beinecke processionals include use of the vernacular in their original production (as well as later marginal additions). Music 60 and 61 only have one instance of vernacular rubrics, for a troped Kyrie supplied among the supplementary
material section (Music 60, ff. 56r–57r, and Music 61, ff. 50v–51v). At the end of Lauds on Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, and Holy Saturday, this Kyrie was sung in dialogue between two brothers or nuns before the altar step, two in the middle of the choir, and the choir (presumably in their stalls). The description in Music 60 and 61 opens:

Die czwu swestern vor dem altar
Kyrie Eleyson
Der chor Kyrie [Eleyson]
Die ersten herwider Kyrie [Eleyson]
Die in der mitte Domine miserere [etc.]

(The two sisters in front of the altar:
Kyrie Eleyson
The choir: Kyrie [Eleyson]
The first [sisters] in reply:
Kyrie [Eleyson]
The [sisters] in the middle:
Domine miserere [etc.])

The vernacular rubric appears to be a fairly direct translation of the Latin instructions found in the exemplar Santa Sabina, XIV L 1, f. 255va. The use of the vernacular may have been prompted here because of the complicated delivery of this particular chant, which required different members of the community to sing specific portions of the Kyrie.

In Ms. 205, vernacular rubrics are used throughout the Rituale (ff. 63v–138v), which contains the rites for the sick, the dying, and the dead. These may have been performed for lay sisters who might not have had a firm grasp of Latin; consequently, the vernacular may have been necessary to ensure that the rites were correctly performed and understood. For example, in the section on extreme unction (“De extrema unctione,” f. 68v), the words of the “Mea culpa” to be said by the recipient were provided with a translation into German:


(But if she is not able to say the Confiteor, then she should beat her heart, and if she is comfortably able then she should say “Mea culpa de omnibus peccatis meis,” which is in German, “My fault for all my sins.”)

Helen Gittos’s current research shows that the use of the vernacular in the liturgy occurs particularly at rites (such as marriages) when it was important for everyone present to comprehend the proceedings, and a similar requirement may be at play in the Rituale of Ms. 205. Another factor could be the infrequency and thus unfamiliarity of these rites, necessitating their use of the vernacular.

Nevertheless, it is also important to highlight that the Beinecke processionals remain primarily in Latin: in Ms. 205, the processional section (ff. 1r–62v) is entirely in Latin, and Music 60 and 61 are almost fully in Latin with the exception of the troped Kyrie. It would be unwise to assume from the presence of limited vernacular rubrics that the users of these books had no understanding of Latin whatsoever. The constitutions of Dominican nuns required that they learned enough Latin in order to read and recite the liturgy. Dominican nuns were also permitted to learn Latin for more general use, but this was not obligatory, which led to localized differences in degrees of Latin literacy. In Unterlinden, for example, a significant number of Dominican nuns were proficient in Latin, whereas in Nuremberg, Ehrenschwendtner argues, Latinate nuns were “a small minority,” as
evidenced by the exclusively vernacular refectory readings and the preponderance of vernacular texts in their library. However, at least some of the nuns in Nuremberg must have been sufficiently literate in Latin to not only read it but also write it: about a quarter of their books were in Latin (161 of 726 codices, primarily liturgical books), and the majority of these were copied by the nuns themselves. While this points to a lack of parity in the literacy of the community at Nuremberg, this does not necessarily mean that the nuns performed the liturgy without comprehension. Indeed, on Sundays during mealtimes, vernacular translations of the liturgical texts of the Mass, the Gospel, and the Epistle were read, and on saints’ days their legends were read, to ensure comprehension of the day’s liturgy.

The ability of Dominican friars to use the local vernacular has been heralded as one of their strengths: it broadened their reach by allowing them to engage with local populations. Yet the same skill in Dominican nuns is paradoxically seen as a deficiency. The presence of the vernacular in nuns’ books could instead be argued to be a sign of sophistication, proof of their ability to work bilingually. Further, as Ehrenschwendtner has suggested, the use of vernacular by Dominican nuns was a choice that allowed for a greater expression of their spirituality. In this manner, they catered to the spiritual needs of all members of their internal community. This is not dissimilar to the way in which preaching friars used the vernacular to facilitate dialogue and devotion in their local communities.

**Gendered Nouns and Pronouns**

Another means of distinguishing books from male and female houses is the gender of the nouns and pronouns used in prayers and rubrics. In Dominican processionals, as with many liturgical books, the majority of prayers are not adjusted according to the gender of their community: they are typically addressed to God or to a particular saint, and any reference to the community comes in the form of the (ungendered) first person plural. However, very occasionally, adaptations are made to the gender of words in prayers; this occurs in the burial rites in Ms. 205’s *Rituale*, in order to match the gender of the sick or deceased. For example, the first prayer of the burial rite refers to the deceased as “ancilla tua” (your handmaiden), whereas the exemplar uses the phrase “servo tuo” (your servant); likewise, pronouns are given in their respective masculine or feminine forms (see Fig. 4). This reflects the fact that the nuns were primarily involved in performing rites for the burial of their fellow sisters. Alternative terms for the male gender were also provided in superscript, which may suggest that the nuns in Nuremberg occasionally had cause to recite these rites for men—perhaps their confessor, or a benefactor—which, naturally, could not be done using the feminine address. It is unlikely that nuns attended such burials in person; rather, they would have been celebrated commemoratively from within the nuns’ enclosure.

**Figure 4:** Ms. 205, f. 113r; prayer from the *Officio sepulchare*. Credit: Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, Yale University.
On the rare occasions where the rubrics indicate who should be performing a specific action, the processionals use the appropriate term for their own community. For example, in the troped Kyrie in Music 60 and 61 (discussed above), the main singers are “swestern” (sisters, in the German vernacular), whereas in the exemplar they are “fratres” (brothers, in Latin). Such adaptations are commonsense, but they are also infrequent: in the processional portion of Ms. 205, no liturgical actors are named.

Devotion to Male and Female Saints
It might be expected that nuns would show a particular devotion to female saints, but in the convents examined here, this does not seem to be the case. In terms of patron saints, a greater number and wider range of female saints were the patrons of German Dominican convents, as male saints were likewise for friaries. Yet the relationship between female saints and female houses was not exclusive: St. Catherine of Alexandria, for example, was a common patron of both male and female German Dominican houses, even if favored by nuns in particular. In Nuremberg, the primary dedications of their altars were to St. Catherine of Alexandria, the Virgin Mary, Sts. John the Evangelist and John the Baptist, the Apostles, the 10,000 Martyrs, the “Angstaltar” for Christ’s Agony, St. Sigismund and St. Barbara, St. Dominic, and later St. Catherine of Siena and Sts. Cosmas and Damian. Music 60 and 61 were written for altars dedicated to the Holy Cross, All Saints, St. Nicholas, St. Michael, and the Virgin Mary. None of the books, then, shows a preponderance of female saints.

The litany for the death of a sister (de transitu sororis) in Ms. 205 (ff. 78v–82r) confirms this picture. The original text lists the standard Dominican saints celebrated across the order by the mid-fifteenth century (including a number who had been added to the Dominican calendar since the exemplars were issued, namely St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bernhard, St. Martha, St. Margaret, and St. Ursula and her associates). A near-contemporary hand added various other saints to the margins: St. Vincent Ferrer (a Dominican, canonized 1455), St. Heinrich and St. Kunigund (founders of the bishopric of Bamberg, in which Nuremberg is situated), St. Louis (added to the Dominican calendar in 1301), St. Richard, St. Gervalde, St. Anna (added 1518), St. Barbara (added 1421), and St. Elizabeth. Ms. 205’s marginal additions to the standard Dominican litany, then, show no particular preference for petitioning female saints over male ones.

Uniformity in Chant
For each feast, the Beinecke manuscripts share the same choice of antiphons, responsories, and their verses as the authoritative Dominican exemplar and, in the main, their melodies also closely respect the authorized versions, with only minor and fairly typical deviations. Figure 5 displays the antiphon sung on Easter Day, “Regina celi,” which exemplifies the types of differences that occur between chant melodies among the processionals. The authorized version provided in the exemplar is supplied on the main staff, and any deviations in the Beinecke processionals are shown on small superscript staves.

There are four main differences to be noted. Liquescent neumes, present in the thirteenth-century exemplar – where a semi-vocalized note was used to articulate the liquid consonants r and l and the diphthong of the words “portare” and
“alleluia”—are absent in all of the later processions (see letters A, B, D, E, H, and J in Fig. 5). While not universal, the disappearance of the liquescence from chant over the centuries is a wider trend, not limited to the Dominican Order. Although no liquescence is indicated between the final two syllables of the second “alleluia” in the exemplar (G), the context is similar and the second note is omitted in the three Beinecke processions. The second type of change concerns repeated pitches: in Music 61 (F) the repeated pitch a is first omitted, and then a single pitch a is repeated. Again, variation regarding repeated pitches is not an uncommon type of melodic difference between Dominican chant books. Third, of the two melodic repetitions that occur in the exemplar (on “portare” and the final “alleluia”), one has been eliminated from Music 60 (C); this may indicate that the copyist was aware of the Dominican preference for eliminating melodic repetition, or it may simply be a
case of eye-skip, accidentally jumping over the repetition. Either of these reasonings may also be behind the elimination in Music 61 of one of the repeated G–a pairs at (D). Finally, at (I), all three Beinecke processional books give the passing note of b instead of a; again, alterations to passing notes is one of the rare but known types of variation within Dominican chant. Overall, although minor differences occur, these are not atypical, and it is clear that the Beinecke processional books all closely adhere to the chant of the Dominican exemplar. The scale of the different readings here is minimal compared to, say, non-Dominican books from different dioceses or between Benedictine monasteries. This thus reflects a high degree of uniformity within the Dominican liturgy.

Furthermore, there is no noticeable difference between the chant traditions of the nuns and the friars. For example, all three nuns’ processional books are pitched in the same clef as the exemplar. This is not to suggest that the nuns were singing in low tenor voices, but rather that the clefs simply gave an indication of the relationships between notes, and each cantor or cantrix would have chosen a starting pitch suitable for their community. It is also notable that the nuns followed the same chants as the brothers: brevity in liturgical activities was valued by the friars, as it facilitated time for study. With their life dedicated to prayer and devotion, Dominican nuns could have afforded longer chants with more elaborate melismas. This is reflected in the constitutions of the Dominican nuns, issued by Humbert of Romans in 1259, which instructed that nuns were to recite the office “slowly and distinctly” (tractim et distincte), whereas the brothers were to recite it “briefly and succinctly” (breviter et succincte). There is no evidence, however—at least in their processional chants—of corresponding melodic alterations. Finally, it is noteworthy that the Nuremberg and Regensburg nuns used square chant notation, at a time when this was not the norm in their region. This was clearly a deliberate, somewhat political move to align themselves visually with the wider Dominican Order. Just as the nuns used processional books even when not physically processing, their use of square chant notation was integral to their performance of the correct Dominican liturgy.

The lack of liturgical differences between the nuns and friars in the Beinecke manuscripts may, in part, be owing to the Observant reform. One of the main aims of the Dominican Observant reformers was a uniform liturgy. Incoming reforming nuns took on key roles in their new house regarding the performance of the liturgy (such as sacristan or cantor), and also often were involved in copying new choir books for their new institutions. In Nuremberg specifically, there was a campaign of liturgical book production and book correction, making changes by erasure where possible, swapping in new versions of the calendar and canon missae, and adding supplementary material in quires at the end. This implies a change in liturgical practice, requiring new books to be copied and existing books to be amended. Therefore, the close similarity between the books examined here may be a result of the Observant reform: these liturgical books were newly copied specifically to ensure that the nuns conformed with the liturgical practices of the friars. Prior to the Observant movement, there may have been greater differences between the liturgy performed by the nuns and the friars. This merits
further investigation and is by no means a given: liturgical books before and after the Observant reform at Altenhohenau, for example, were apparently largely similar, and, more generally, Observant chroniclers were prone to emphasize a narrative of decline prior to the reform in order to justify their own position.

This select group of related processions shows the Observant Dominican network in action. Together, the nuns’ processions demonstrate the interdependence of the Observant communities in terms of personnel, material books, and ritual, liturgical activities. The need for local accommodations in processional is at odds with the Dominican drive for uniformity. The books examined here display a variety of approaches to balancing the local and the universal in their integration of local antiphons for the altar washing, and their inclusion of material for occasional rites, and penitential and processional activities. Nonetheless, the processions display a marked unity in the selection and melodies of chants, using the normative Dominican chants without exception and with only minor musical differences, some two centuries after the authorized form of the Dominican liturgy was issued. Uniformity was not a practical requirement between nuns’ convents: unlike itinerant Dominican friars, Dominicans nuns typically remained in the house they joined, and nuns sent to reform other houses were the exception to this rule. Nevertheless, uniformity was clearly desired. This may have been part of a quest for “correct” observance, as well as a means of identification with the order as a whole.

Paradoxically, the Observant movement in Dominican convents ensured uniformity in liturgical utterances at the same time as imposing on its nuns a fundamentally different and much more restricted experience of ritual actions from that of their brother friars. In this context, the shared chants, and the liturgical books in which they were contained, gain significance: these shared melodies and material objects facilitated the nuns’ participation, acting as the touchstone of their ritual experience, and bridging a very physical divide. It seems that, for Dominican nuns as well as friars, uniformity in liturgical practice served not only a practical purpose, but also a spiritual one, joining them in spiritual and ritual unity with the Dominican Order as a whole.
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