The Regensburg Lecternary is certainly the most prominent and well-known of the 70 medieval manuscripts in Keble College’s collections. This liturgical book, for use in church services (‘the liturgy’), was produced about 1270 or a little later in that decade for a convent of nuns at Regensburg in Bavaria. The book is designed to contribute to the fulfilment of a basic responsibility of all ‘regular’ clergy, those who live in a community governed by a regula ‘rule’. The most basic commitment of such groups is to prayer, the praise of and supplication to God. This is fulfilled through multiple public services (‘offices’) every day. Among these, the first or dawn office ‘matins’ routinely includes a segment reserved for devotional reading, up to nine passages. This large book – about 17½” x 12” (a ‘normal’ contemporary private use book is about the dimensions of a page of A4) – was designed to fulfil this use. The size of the script used here and its careful clarity contribute to this function.

This was then a book for a public occasion, a service attended by all the nuns, and for public use, oral reading. It is too large to be portable and would have always had a fixed position, at the reader’s lectern in the conventual church. Such a fixed siting is evident to anyone who approaches it today from the most immediately palpable – and yet paradoxically most ephemeral – aspect of the book. This is the binding – an extraordinary complex of heavy wooden boards, tooled leather cover, and extensive metalwork: more weighty than the pages it surrounds. This structure not only protects the valuable and elegant contents but ensures the book’s immobility, its fixed devotional purpose.

It may beggar imagination to describe protective equipment weighing several kilos as ‘ephemeral’. But in the Middle Ages, binding was never a requirement of book-production, or of book-use. (Many surviving medieval books offer compelling evidence that they were never bound.)
Moreover, the binding on offer here is not original, but one affixed to the pages at least two hundred years after the contents were copied (although it includes materials that have been carried over from an earlier covering of some sort). This raises one issue to which I will return at the end: unlike mass-produced print-books of the last two centuries, every medieval book has a unique history, and one that involves substantial changes in its nature and its value.

The binding shows an elaboration consonant with the materials it surrounds. First of all, it is a ‘leather full chemise’. This does not simply cover the wooden boards, but engulfs all the edges of the book and is held in place, surrounding the whole, with leather straps and tooled metal clasps and pins; when closed, not even dust-motes will reach the pages. Moreover, this covering is elaborately decorated – the leather has been tooled with a pair of geometric designs, and all this surface ornament is further protected by weighty metal fittings – five raised bosses on each board, in each corner and at the centre – that prevent any abrasion of the ornament. These are extensively tooled, and the centre boss has an inscription revealing one aspect of the nuns’ devotion, ‘O maria hilf maria in dem himmel’ (Help me/us, heavenly Mary). This is a fitting accompaniment to a book to stimulate veneration, itself an object to be venerated, a thing of great beauty, produced in gratitude for and to supplicate divine succour.

The textual content of the volume so protected is reasonably standard. The book begins (ff. 1–6v) with a calendar, not written by the scribe who produced the remainder; this provides a quick at-a-glance guide to the church year, to the feasts to be celebrated on any date and some indication of the degree of elaboration each occasion will require. This prologue allows the reader to navigate the extensive cycle of readings to be presented on the appropriate
days throughout the church year (ff. 8–275v). An appendix (ff. 276–301) fulfils the supplication of the cover’s central boss and offers a cycle of readings for Saturdays, the day specially devoted to veneration of the Blessed Virgin. At the conclusion (ff. 301–7v), the main scribe adds readings for feast days he had previously omitted; as I will show in a moment, producing this volume, however ornate it is, was not a glitch-free operation.

The calendar offers particularly important details in assessing the book and its use. This is not any old lectionary, but one for very specific uses – and uses that oscillate, as is the case with all medieval books, between interests general or universal and those intensely local and specific. First, the calendar reveals what would be obvious from identifying the book with this Regensburg convent. This is not a ‘general use’ liturgical book but one attached to a specific, yet still widespread, situation – a book for Dominican use. Especially prominent in the calendar are services dedicated to the Spaniard St Dominic (1170–1221), the founder of the Order of Preachers (OPs or Dominicans). Dominic established his order, often called after their black cloaks ‘God’s black hounds’, between 1215 and 1217. The male members of his order were – unlike traditionally enclosed monastic clergy – explicitly to be active in the world. They were to wander in poverty while confusing and converting through public preaching heretics – the wary sheepdogs who drove wolves from the faithful’s fold. (The immediate target Dominic had envisioned were Cathar dualists, often committed to a notion of their personal perfection, that whatever they did, they could not sin – and especially prevalent in southern France and northern Italy.) The male order was heavily committed to argumentative outreach, and thus was theologically and intellectually aspirant. A second related focus of the calendar is veneration of St Augustine of Hippo; the rule Dominic established for
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his order was one always ascribed to this great father of the church (and one familiar to Dominic from his earlier service as an Augustinian canon in Osma).

Yet against this pan-European background (Dominicans are an order of the universal church), the calendar offers interesting particularities. A number of major celebrations enjoined here are intensely local. Thus, the calendar mandates elaborated readings for St Wulfgang; he was bishop of Regensburg 972–94 and an apostle to the Magyars. Similarly to be honoured are St Emmeram (the apostle to Bavaria, martyred in 652, and the dedicatee of Regensburg’s great Benedictine monastery), and St Elizabeth of Hungary (1207–31, patroness of another travelling mendicant group, the third order of the Franciscans) – and a sign of Regensburg continuing Wulfgang’s interest in the east – as well as its down-river Danube trade traffic to Buda.

Such an oscillation between the universal and particular also affects the book’s central text, its readings for saints’ days throughout the year. As I have already noted, Dominicans were an order given to intellectual debate – confutation of heretics – and probably the most intellectually distinguished organised group in the later Middle Ages (figures like Hugh of St Cher, Albert of Böllstadt – ‘the Great’, and a sometime bishop of Regensburg – and supremely Thomas Aquinas). This was a strongly and unusually centralised organisation, and from a very early date, committed to careful promulgation of their texts (see Rouse and Rouse). The liturgy to be followed by Dominicans was no exception.

In 1245, the general Dominican council, a sort of general congress, required a uniform liturgy, as opposed to multiple local uses, for the entire order. It took four years for a committee to produce such – and another five years of wrangling over the product for the order to reject it. At that point, the master general of the Dominicans, Humbert
of Romans, simply did the job and produced a model book from which all future copies of the order’s liturgy were to be derived. To this, Humbert affixed a prologue (not in Keble 49, which is but half the whole annual programme of readings – and must have originally had a companion volume):

This book is the Dominican lectionary, its excerpts constructed with care, corrected, punctuated, and divided into clauses. Nothing should be added or adjoined, nor anything diminished or taken away while copying it. And one should know that among the saints’ lives, sermons, and homilies here, occasionally some have been condensed, while others are transmitted in their exact words. The abbreviated ones are marked with the sign + at the opening. However, here and there, although rarely, a condensed account has been paraphrased, which is indicated by the sign T in that place. Scribes should beware, lest they leave out these symbols. But elsewhere everything is put down without either abbreviation or a notable change in the wording, and then there is no symbol placed at the head of the reading. One should also know that the authors’ names are placed by the readings’ titles; these are given according to the ascriptions found in the ancient books of various churches. But they shouldn’t be inserted into the lections or read aloud, unless it is a quotation from an author’s homily. Further, where the exact authors of saints’ lives could not be discovered, there’s placed by the start in the margin ‘from the acts of X’.
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As the translation perhaps inadequately indicates, this whole statement is provided in the passive voice of authority; the liturgy is scarcely presented as an authored text, although the preface insistently emphasises someone’s meticulous care in its production. One might note in particular the insistence upon marked punctuation and clause-division (the focus of one enduring contribution from Keble’s fellow and cataloguer, Malcolm Parkes). The book is to be copied with attentiveness to these minor signs; everything possible should be done to aid in careful public intonation of the reading.

A similar fastidiousness concerns contents, the marks ‘+’ and ‘T’ that every scribe is to ensure stand at the head of readings. Similarly, Humbert insists on the accuracy of his ascriptions, which author wrote what (and in cases of doubt, that fact specified). In the contentious situation in which this liturgy was constructed, these gestures might be construed as protecting the product from sophisticated, and potentially critical, readers in the Dominican general council.

But given that the Dominican master-copy, Humbert’s approved exemplar, survives, one can measure the fastidiousness of the Regensburg scribe at reproducing it. He is utterly punctilious in offering a useful rhetorically marked punctuation and scrupulously provides ‘+’ and ‘T’. But other aspects of the production are a bit less carefully responsive to the order’s rule: a number of readings vary from those enjoined in the order’s exemplar (including the life of Dominic on offer), and many of Humbert’s author-headings are varied and, rather frequently, expanded. It’s possible that the scribe did not have access to the final approved exemplar but some in-transit version (Parkes’s view in his catalogue), but equally plausible that he might have been adjusting the order’s central model to meet local conditions and uses.

Simply consider the ‘+’ and ‘T’ markings. While these may have been politically useful for Humbert in the fraught
situation in which he compiled the model lectionary, the logic for reproducing these signs apart from that original moment is a little opaque. Yet in the Regensburg context, with its expansive textual identifications, such marking might be construed as invitational. Specifications additional to those of the order’s master-copy would have required additional research, surely in a local library. In effect, they convert the book into a library catalogue; they offer an invitation to the Regensburg nuns – toward private devotional reading, seeking further or fuller examples of analogously edifying spiritual materials. Rather than an inert hunk trotted out for matins, the book might interact more actively with the nuns’ devout practices, encourage them in a further action of reading, always in ‘regular’ contexts seen in itself as a form of prayer.

But of course – and my readers will undoubtedly be chafing that I have delayed discussing it for so long – the most arresting local enhancement in the Regensburg Lectionary is its illustration. The book is outstanding because of the extraordinary profusion of visual materials – sixty-two images in all, like the calendar, graded in importance (not one for every occasion). Anyone who has seen the book, or reproductions derived from it, has been struck by the extensive provision of figures that appear to float upon their gold grounds.

In the main, the illuminations are what are known as ‘historiated champs’ at the head of appropriate sections of the text. (Manuscript decoration is always hierarchical, and the individual readings within each feast are usually divided from each other by large and fairly ornate red- and blue-ink capitals.) In a champ, the first letter in the reading is painted in blue with magenta bordering or in-fill. The images appear within the blue outline of the letter, ‘historiated’ because always offering narrative subjects germane to the saint and
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his/her orally presented account, placed on their gold grounds. The scribe is responsible for none of this work; he has frequently left ‘guide-letters’ in the margins (an instruction for what capital should be painted, as in the left margin, p. 11) for all decoration, lesser initials as well as the illuminations.

Such illustrative marking represents a devotional act: this decorative detail answers an imperative that God should be offered things of beauty, an acknowledgement of His perfection – and a hope that the presence of such imagery stimulates equally moving prayer. Equally, this expensive addition to the text – painters do get paid – functions as a sumptuous charitable act of the donor (of which more in a moment), dispensing with funds in the interests of holiness. But one might ask, given the public lectern-use of the book, how functional such a supplement is.

The lectionary has been made to be read at a public ceremony, the matins service celebrated by the whole convent. The only person physically proximate enough to appreciate the full display is the reader (who has got other serious visual business, following the text and the rhetorical markers of clause and pointing). At best, the other celebrants see only a reflected gleam from the lection’s opening page, highlighted by the shimmer produced by the candles that would have made the book legible to the reader. Moreover, the book’s images appear never to have been readily visible; a substantial number of them – and inferentially, all of them originally – still are beneath small silken covers. These are a further tribute to opulence – the material is an exotic eastern import – but equally a refracted one. Like the veil of the Jerusalem temple, the silks communicate numinousness, but a numinousness distanced, unapproachable, a contribution to awe.

The silks communicate numinousness, but a numinousness distanced, unapproachable, a contribution to awe.
I pause for a moment over the book’s most striking image, one of the two full painted pages (f. 7), an elaborate rendering of the Crucifixion. This is a frontispiece, situated between the opening calendar and the lections proper – and thus an image never on the corporate display I have been describing. In this instance, particularly given its intricacy, the image implies that the book itself might have been used by the Regensburg sisters as a devotional object – a visual stimulus or mnemonic that both excited their pity and awe at the suffering Jesus and offered them instruction in emulating or following His way. Perhaps the book was open here for them to see as they processed into their church for matins, then the pages turned to find the lections for the day.

Crucifixion images are, of course, ubiquitous – even so, as introductory images in liturgical books. But, to continue my theme, this must also be seen as another bit of Regensburg localism; the Dominican sisters who used the book belonged to a house ‘zum heiligen Kreuz’ (dedicated to the Holy Cross). The image appears to me a carefully developed composite. It elaborates an utterly commonplace scene, the crucified Jesus flanked by Mary (to the left) and John the favoured apostle, into whose care he commends his mother at John 19:26–27. Indeed, the painter offers this common depiction much later in the lectionary; the image prefacing the readings for the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross on 14 September (f. 201) exactly echoes the scene here, down to the colouring of the garments and the gestures of the central figures. In the frontispiece this commonplace is fitted within a considerably more elaborate, and more instructional, scene.
This offers a doubled modelling for the Regensburg Dominican nuns. The scene is framed not simply, as conventionally, by Mary and John on either side, but a sequence of other figures. Conjoined figures float upon the gold ground in the air on either side of the cross. And Mary and John share space at the foot of the cross with a pair of figures whose position balances two similar figures supported upon nothing and penetrating the pictorial frame above the cross’s transverse bar.

The first set of additional figures might be seen as offering an explication of Christian – and probably specifically Dominican Christian – history generally. On the left, Faith (Fides) catches the blood emanating from Jesus’s side, with its spear-wound, in a chalice. To the right, a blindfolded Synagoga (misbegotten Jewish temple worship – one sometimes must accept medieval anti-Semitism, however beautifully portrayed, as what it is) is driven away by an angel. Here the central Christian sacrifice is presented as initiating a new order of reverent faith, yet this is equally an order founded, as were the Dominicans, upon antipathy to doctrinal error. (It’s worth noting parenthetically that in the legendary accounts of this wounding, the blood falls upon the eyes of the blind knight Longinus, who has inflicted this torment – and restores his sight, while granting him not just remorse for this atrocity, but faith as well.)

The other four figures are presented as nimbed maidens in garb ultimately derived from classical models, presentations of the virtues as nobly robed women. They manipulate the tools of the Crucifixion, conventionally known as the ‘arma Christi’ (weapons associated with Christ) and subject to their own devotion, one that calls for an outpouring of pious sorrow at the wounding to which the Saviour was subjected in fulfilling his mission. But although they inflict his pain, these figures emphasise the divine qualities that
underwrote Jesus’s submission to such torment. Above, Mercy (Misericordia) and Wisdom (Sapientia) drive the nails into the crossbar and reflect the second person’s capacity to empathise with sinners and the divine wisdom he personifies and that impels that forgiveness. At the foot, Obedience (Obedientia) drives the third nail and The Bride (Sponsa) wields the spear. In his suffering, Jesus showed his obedience to the Father’s providential will, and he did so because of his loving longing for his bride, conventionally the church.

Yet equally, and it is this localised appeal to the viewer that renders the image truly, multiply, and stimulatingly devout, these figures joyously inflicting torment are self-referential. They also refer to the imitative, conjoining suffering that should be the devotional life-act of the Dominican nun. Here the two grounded figures are perhaps most revelatory. The Church may conventionally be ‘bride of Christ’, but the committed nun, withdrawn from the world, is such a figure par excellence. And the most basic feature of the enclosed life, from Benedict’s Rule onwards (and just consider Humbert of Romans mandating the reproduction of his punctuation), is obedience to authority. The fundamentally inimitable motivations underlying world-transforming sacrifice are in turn to form emulative guides to the Regensburg nuns.

This reading does not entirely exhaust the local reach of this affecting image. Beneath the image, in otherwise blank space, kneel two colourfully clothed figures, identified by labels as ‘Sophia’ and ‘Gebehard Comes’ (duke of Grögling-Hirschberg). Such figures are called ‘orants’ (pray-ers), and they are demonstrating their devotion to the image. Gebhard’s seat Grögling is about twenty miles
west of Regensburg, and he must have been a local lord at least munificently supportive of the nuns – if the image does not imply that he is the figure whose support for them commissioned, and paid for this devout (and useful day-by-day) offering. Such personalised, and extremely local figures – the book’s initial audience enclosed within its pages – occur repeatedly throughout the production. The majority of these are images of the Regensburg nuns themselves, identifiable by their black capes: Otilia and Juta (f. 8v), Hailwigis (f. 61), Tuta (f. 64v), Dimut (f. 71), and so on. Many are identifiable in surviving convent muniments as corresponding to real persons of the 1270s. They are joined by male figures, some monastic (perhaps confessors to the nuns?), some lay (less august supporters of Heilige Kreuz than Gebhard?). Their positioning adjacent to single specific images implies that these might represent individuals dedicated to the models offered by those saints in whose ‘presence’ they kneel. Whatever the universalism of Dominican liturgy, the lectionary persistently celebrates, indeed convokes, a devout local community.

One such figure – here repeated, although usually through additions to existing descriptive tags of the sort I have been quoting – is Margaret, routinely in additions ‘Hungarie’ (of Hungary). These images place the volume within a further localised Dominican-nun-cult. Margaret (1242–71), like her aunt Elizabeth, whom I have mentioned above in discussing the calendar, was another Hungarian princess who turned to religion, rather than marriage, and became a Dominican nun of exemplary sanctity. Persistent local efforts at her canonisation ran through the 1270s, contemporary with the production of this book. (These were unsuccessful; she was only canonised by Pius XII.) But again, these repeated images speak to local enthusiasms, in this particular case ones ignored or rebuffed by central authorities.
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Margaret’s most prominent depiction in the lectionary is associated with its second full-page image. This, at f. 235v, introduces the feast of All Saints (1 November). As is reasonably traditional in this calendar location, it depicts Last Judgement, Christ in glory with his saints, and in the lower margin, excluded from the heavenly frame, the dead rising and sinners escorted to Hell. The holy company are arranged through four ranges of figures, apparently chronologically disposed, from Moses at the top left down to contemporary figures at the foot. Added, here within the frame of the image, at the foot are two orants, Margaret again and a ‘prepositus Heinr’ de Öting’ (?). He is surely yet another local figure, and although ‘prepositus’ usually refers to an abbot (the figure is wearing white, not a monastic habit), I suspect he might be Heinrich von Rottenegg, bishop of Regensburg from 1277.

Much of my account has emphasised the sumptuousness of the lectionary, the elegance and the artistic quality of the whole. As I have noted in passing, this includes the monumental and extremely painstaking script of the main scribe. As a final look at the book per se, I want to qualify these perceptions somewhat. One major – and completely insoluble – qualification should be introduced immediately: my description of the book as an annual cycle of readings is, as I hinted once above, slightly inaccurate.

For the lectionary is only half an annual cycle. The church has always counted time in two ways. There is what one might call ‘normal time’, the fixed round of celebration, the major feasts like Christmas (fixed as to date), Easter (moveable, depending on moon and equinox), the 20th Sunday after Trinity (dependant on Easter, but always one a year). This forms the temporale, the offices for ‘normal time’. But there is a second cycle, that formed by special occasions, the days reserved for celebration of particular saints, the sanctorale. Keble’s lectionary deals only with the latter (which
is why it does not include Humbert of Romans’s note, which appears at the head of the temporal cycle). The surviving book must have had a companion volume, and we have no idea whether it was a true twin of this one, perhaps equally opulent, or not. Given that Keble’s volume enshrines a new order-wide Dominican command and had to be produced to meet new specifications, the first option would seem the more likely, and in a place like Regensburg, likely to have involved the same team as evidenced here.

Although opulent, the book is subject to occasional – and often reasonably predictable – sloppiness in production. For example, in discussing the contents near the start, I singled out ff. 301–7v as providing texts the scribe should have copied earlier, and had not. The two omitted celebrations are those for Dominican friar and preacher Peter of Verona/Martyr (murdered by contract in 1252 by the disgruntled north Italian Cathars he was attempting to convert – and still the record-holder for shortest trip from corpse to canonisation) and for the Crown of Thorns. Both are central to the Dominican office and both appear as occasions for special devotions in the calendar at the head of the manuscript. I think the most likely cause of their delayed appearance here was a simple mistake; the scribe twice returned to his copying a heading too far along in his exemplar and simply left out intervening materials.

Fairly persistent evidence for this kind of inattentiveness appears throughout the book. (I would describe this as ‘pardonable’: there is a huge amount of text, a meticulously painstaking script, and a superabundance of detail, the punctuation for example, to attend to.) The manuscript has a fair number of sporadic marginal corrections, usually red-boxed, in which the scribe makes good smaller omissions in copying. (He did carefully ‘proofread’ and correct his text against his source.) Virtually all these correct errors analogous
to skipping between headings, the scribe’s omitting phrases in repetitive passages. For example, on f. 40v, he dropped the noun ‘solatio’ after its modifier ‘angelico’; on f. 90, where two consecutive phrases ended with ‘archam’, he overlooked the second usage and had to supply its phrase marginally. (Other corrections appear here in the illustrations at pp. 5, 8, 11 [twice], and 13.)

On at least two occasions, the scribe appears to have messed up a leaf so badly that it required full-scale replacement, in this case by his partner, who had copied the calendar. One of these removed leaves, f. 116, still appears in the book, as the front end-paper or pastedown that anchors the leather covering to the inside of the board. One can see only one side of it, of course, and although that page has two not very neat corrections, it is scarcely unsightly, and the reason for its excision and replacement remains obscure. But neither of the replacement leaves is exactly pristine either. In both cases, the calendar scribe didn’t heed carefully the remaining portion of the book, and at the foot of the replaced f. 116v, he had to supply an extra line in the lower margin so that the text would run continuously. In contrast, on f. 138v, he wrote too much and had to cancel a line and a half of text his partner had already copied at the top of f. 139. (A second rejected leaf, not identical with the second replacement, f. 138, appears as the pastedown at the rear.)

A little more seriously, the main scribe was not always punctilious about his headings (or ‘rubrics’, because they are
traditionally provided in red ink). These signals, equivalent to modern chapter titles, are essential to lectionary use, because the individual lections, up to nine of them on some occasions, do not form consecutive pieces of the church service but are interspersed with other materials not reproduced in a lectionary. The rubrics tell the reader where to stop, to allow the choir to chant a psalm or the like. But in three substantial blocks of text, two of them ordinally important celebrations (ff. 133–37v, the octave of St Dominic; ff. 171v-79, the octave of St Augustine; and ff. 187–92), the scribe provided no rubrics whatever. Later hands had to offer marginal notes and accompanying red bars within the text to indicate the breaks between segments; in the last example, on ff. 186v and 189v, this is provided by fifteenth-century hands offering directions in German (as is another note in the added materials, f. 307). Clearly, the volume was in use for a long time, and initial production difficulties were still causing readers problems two centuries after the fact.

This continuing use (and adjustment) leads to my conclusion. The Regensburg Lectionary’s history involves complicated negotiations between European-wide standards and local practices and interests. But it is equally true of this, or any other book, that such an historical narrative of interchanges around a volume does not simply stop with the close of the Middle Ages. The book’s history, and the inflections to which it is subject, is ongoing. Here one might consider the first known owner after the book was last...
observed in Regensburg in the mid-nineteenth century. This was Sir Thomas Brooke, a connoisseur of illuminated books and a prodigious collector. For him, none of those resonances that had made the book live among the Regensburg community are apt to have been operative. It was something beautiful (and expensive), an object not primarily of devotion but of aesthetic appreciation. On Sir Thomas’s death in 1908, the cream of his prestigious collection, including the Regensburg Lectionary, along with 40 other manuscripts and several hundred volumes of printed material, was inherited by his brother, Canon Charles Edward Brooke, who in turn bequeathed them to Keble.

This benefaction to the young College, along with that of Canon Henry Liddon and others, enabled Keble to gain an enviable reputation as a place where manuscripts were studied. Several early members went on to distinguished careers as manuscript scholars and for over thirty years the College was home to an international expert in this area, Malcolm B. Parkes (lecturer and fellow, 1961–1997), various of whose students have gone on in turn to become leaders in this field of study.

Now, in its current iteration as digitised files available online, the Regensburg lectionary enters a new historical situation. Transferring this unique hand-written 13th century book to digital format helps to preserve the original for posterity and, at the same time, opens it up to a global audience in ways that its creators and original users could not have imagined.
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