

**HOW WERE NEW SAINT'S FEASTS ADDED  
TO LITURGICAL MANUSCRIPTS?  
UNIFORMITY IN THREE DATED CARTHUSIAN GRADUALS  
FROM THE LOW COUNTRIES<sup>1</sup>**

Thomas Op de Coul (Utrecht)

The article 'Le calendrier cartusien', by Jacques Hourlier and Benoît du Moustier, has been of great importance for Carthusian studies for more than fifty years<sup>2</sup>. In the article, the calendar of the Carthusian order is presented, with annotations as to when feasts were introduced into the calendar, and which degree of solemnity was accorded to them. In spite of criticism from some notable scholars<sup>3</sup>, the article thus provides the researcher with an eminently useful and rich tool for dating Carthusian manuscripts. However, it would appear that subsequent researchers have often been too optimistic in using the article for dating liturgical manuscripts. At the heart of this optimism, it seems, lies an assumption about the Carthusian order that Hourlier and Du Moustier formulate: "Nous constatons pourtant que, dans les Ordres religieux très centralisés et fortement disciplinés, la transcription d'une fête nouvelle suit de peu son

---

<sup>1</sup> Both the research for and the writing of this article have greatly benefited from the helpful comments from Prof. J. P. Gumbert, Dr. Ulrike Hascher-Burger and Dr. Carol Steyn. Thanks are also due to Rutger Kramer for correcting the English of this article.

<sup>2</sup> Benoît du MOUSTIER and Jacques HOURLIER, « Le calendrier Cartusien », *Études Grégoriennes*, 2 (1957), 151-161.

<sup>3</sup> This criticism will be dealt with in section 4 of the present article.

adoption<sup>4</sup>.” The primary aim of the present article is to put this assumption to the test.

To do this, the sanctorales of three dated Carthusian graduals from the Low Countries will be analysed. This analysis focuses not only on those feasts that were present when the manuscript was written, but especially on feasts which were added to the manuscript by later hands. With this analysis, a date of origin will be deduced, and compared to the actual date of origin given in the manuscript (section 1). Additionally, the analysis will shed light on the main question, how accurate or efficient the Carthusians actually were in adding newly adopted feasts to their liturgical manuscripts (sections 2 and 3). In light of the conclusions reached, the article by Hourlier and Du Moustier will be critically revisited (section 4). Finally, an interesting side effect of analysing the sanctorales was the information it yielded about how long the manuscripts have been in use (postscript).

## 1. Dating dated manuscripts

Calendars and sanctorales can provide the scholar with very convenient methods to determine an approximate date of origin of the manuscript in which they are found. This method is succinctly, almost casually, formulated in Dubois and Lemaître’s *Sources et méthodes de l’hagiographie médiévale*: “On recherchera donc les saints inscrits de première main susceptibles de fournir un *terminus post quem*, et ceux inscrits en addition, fournissant un *terminus ante quem*<sup>5</sup>.” Together with the assumption quoted above, this method is put to great use by those studying Carthusian liturgical manuscripts<sup>6</sup>. The aim of this first

---

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 152.

<sup>5</sup> Jacques DUBOIS and Jean-Loup LEMAÎTRE, *Sources & méthodes de l’hagiographie médiévale* (Paris, 1993), 150 (italics in original).

<sup>6</sup> Examples abound in Augustin DEVAUX, *Graduel Cartusien: Introduction* [Analecta Cartusiana, 228] (Salzburg, 2008), 7-13. There, several Carthusian manuscripts are dated to very narrow margins indeed. A study that explicitly concurs with the assumption and uses it to date manuscripts is Olivier CULLIN, “Notations in Carthusian liturgical books: preliminary remarks”, in *The Calligraphy of Medieval Music* [Musicalia Medii Aevi, 1], ed. J. Haines (Turnhout, 2011), 175-194 (see 177). A most sophisticated and instructive example is Martin MORARD, « Dater par les calendriers ou se méfier des apparences. À propos de manuscrits de la chartreuse du Mont-Dieu », *Scriptorium*, 66/2 (2012), 337-381. Morard does not explicitly discuss the question at

section is, simply, to see what happens when we take three *dated* manuscripts and try dating them by this method.

Apart from this deliberate restriction to dated manuscripts, the choice of manuscripts was determined primarily by chronological and geographical aspects: all of them originated within a distance of less than one hundred kilometers from each other and within a time frame of 139 years. Moreover, the specific choice for graduals was made because they are relatively useful for analysing the actual effectuation of newly introduced feasts in liturgical books<sup>7</sup>. In Tables 1 and 2, a partial survey of saints in these three graduals is given.

In trying to date these three graduals, all relevant information that might be culled from them, including their place of origin, will be completely ignored for now – the following study will be based solely on the feasts included in the graduals. This exercise is clearly artificial, and might even seem somewhat tedious. Still, it seemed worthwhile to do so, in order to spell out the problems that actually arise when using just the method given by Dubois and Lemaître.

These problems already begin before analysing the graduals themselves. Looking through 'Le Calendrier Cartusien', it is clear that the whole idea of the Carthusian general chapter introducing new feasts at one particular moment in time is flawed. Firstly, the year of introduction of many feasts is not known exactly but only within a certain margin. Secondly, in innumerable cases, feasts were only allowed in a particular region or, for example, in nunneries. Many of those feasts were made obligatory only later, sometimes more than a century after their introduction. This fact alone makes the use of our method awkward, as will become clear once we start out working on the graduals.

The first example is a gradual from the Bibliothèque municipale of Courtray<sup>8</sup>. In this gradual, thirteen feasts may be found that clearly are later

---

issue in the present article. Jurij SNOJ, 'Graduals from the charterhouses Žiže (Seiz) and BISTRA (Freudenthal)', in *Cantus planus: Papers read at the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the IMS Study Group, Niederaltaich/Germany, 2006*, ed. B. Hagg and L. Dobszay (Budapest, 2009), 571-588, does point out that this method should be used with caution, 584.

<sup>7</sup> Richard William PFAFF, *New liturgical feasts in later medieval England* [Oxford theological monographs], (Oxford, 1970), 11.

<sup>8</sup> Courtrai (F), Bibliothèque Publique de la Ville de Courtrai, Fonds Goethals-Vercruysse, Cod. 41 (I,40).

additions. The earliest of these is that of the Compassion of the Virgin Mary, permitted within the Carthusian order in 1477, and made obligatory in 1486<sup>9</sup>. Analysing the other feasts in the sanctorale (i.e., all those feasts originally included when the gradual was written), the latest addition to be found there is the Conception of the Virgin Mary. As a matter of fact, this feast was permitted already in 1333, but its name was changed to ‘Sanctificatio’ in 1341, and changed back to ‘Conceptione’ in 1470<sup>10</sup>. In the gradual, the feast is given as ‘In conceptione beate marie’ (fol. 161v). As there is no sign of any editing of this name, it seems plausible that this gradual was copied after 1470, although it is possible that an older gradual, from which the scribe(s) probably worked, contained the earlier name of Conception. The penultimate feast in the first hand is the octave of the Visitation of the Virgin Mary, which was permitted in 1411, and made obligatory in 1468. With no further information, one would have to infer that the gradual was copied between 1470 and 1477/1486 – or, being more careful, between 1411/1468 and 1477/1486.

The second example is a gradual to be found in the Royal Library of Belgium in Brussels<sup>11</sup>. Compared to the previous example, many more feasts have been added to this gradual after it was produced: no less than twenty feasts can be found in the margins, here the earliest addition being the Presentation of the Virgin, permitted by the Carthusians in 1470 and obligatory since 1474<sup>12</sup>. The last introduced feast to be found in the first hand is that of the Visitation, a feast with a rather complex history within the Carthusian order. During the great schism of 1378-1417 in the Western church, the Carthusian order was split, as well<sup>13</sup>. In 1390, the feast of the Visitation was made obligatory for charterhouses

---

<sup>9</sup> MOUSTIER and HOURLIER, « Le calendrier Cartusien », 155. Note that from Table 1, it seems that Peter of Verona is earlier, yet this is not the case: only its commemoration was introduced earlier (before 1400); a mass for this feast was only introduced in 1586.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 161.

<sup>11</sup> Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale Albert 1<sup>er</sup>, ms. IV 86.

<sup>12</sup> MOUSTIER and HOURLIER, « Le calendrier Cartusien », 160.

<sup>13</sup> The schism resulted in there being two general chapters, one in the Grande Chartreuse (siding with the Avignon papacy), others in Florence and Seitz (siding with the Rome papacy). See Bernard BLIGNY, « La Grande Chartreuse et son Ordre au temps du Grand Schisme et de la crise conciliaire (1378-1449) », in *Amo te, sacer ordo Carthusiensis. Jan De Grauwe, passionné de l'Ordre des Chartreux* [Miscellanea Neerlandica, 38 / Studia Cartusiana, 1], ed. F. Hendrickx and T. Gaens (Leuven, 2012), 73-96].

siding with the Roman papacy only. In 1411, it was permitted throughout the Carthusian order; from 1468 it was obligatory<sup>14</sup>. With so many uncertainties, one would only be able to give a very rough approximate date of origin, between 1390/1411 and 1470/1474.

The third and last example is a gradual, also currently preserved in Brussels<sup>15</sup>. The situation here is slightly more complicated because a calendar is included, in contrast with the first two examples. In addition, this calendar does not only contain feasts with a mass (which would be logical, in a gradual) but also commemorations that do not have their own mass. Finally, as will be shown near the end of section 2, there is a large discrepancy between calendar and sanctorale. Looking at this manuscript in its entirety, the latest feast to be found anywhere in the first hand of the manuscript appears to be that of Ursula. This feast was allowed for Carthusian nuns in 1291, and was introduced for the whole order in 1352<sup>16</sup>. Searching for the earliest feast within the group of later additions in the manuscript, we find that of Anne, for which the mass was introduced in 1412<sup>17</sup>, or perhaps the Visitation, permitted in 1411 in the Carthusian order (but see above on complications with this feast). With all this, one could conclude that this gradual originated in the period between 1352 and 1411/1412.

After these initial analyses of the saints within these three graduals, it is time to see how the conclusions on the date of origin compare to the actual date (and place) of origin that is given in the graduals<sup>18</sup>.

---

<sup>14</sup> MOUSTIER and HOURLIER, « Le calendrier Cartusien », 157, write “oblig. dans l’obédience d’Urbain VI: 1390; perm: dans tout l’Ordre 1411; S oblig: 1468; abst: 1487.”

<sup>15</sup> Bruxelles (B), Bibliothèque Royale Albert 1<sup>er</sup>, ms. II 261.

<sup>16</sup> MOUSTIER and HOURLIER, « Le calendrier Cartusien », 160.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 158 : “TM : Peut-être ante 1174 en certains endroits ; dans tout l’Ordre T : 1400 ; M : 1405 dans l’obédience d’Avignon, 1412 dans l’Ordre entier ; C : 1554 ; S : 1569/71, pour les convers seulement jusqu’en 1582 ; D : 1917.”

<sup>18</sup> One could in theory doubt the given date in the manuscript; in these cases, however, there seems to be no evident reason to do so. On dated manuscripts and how to deal with them, see especially Jean DESTREZ and G. FINK-ERRERA, « Des manuscrits apparemment datés », *Scriptorium*, 12 (1958), 56-93 and *Les manuscrits datés : premier bilan et perspectives, Neuchâtel 1983* [Rubricae, 2], ed. Geneviève Grand, J.P. Gumbert, et al. (Paris, 1985).

Manuscript	Date surmised from sanctorale	Date and place of origin
Courtray, Bibl. Publ., ms. 41	1411/1468 – 1477/1486	1506, Sainte Marie Madeleine sous la Croix, Louvain <sup>19</sup>
Bruxelles, BR, ms. IV 86	1390/1411 – 1470/1474	1471, Notre-Dâme de Grace, Scheut <sup>20</sup>
Bruxelles, BR, ms. II 261	1352 – 1411/1412	1367, Douze-Apôtres, Liège <sup>21</sup>

As a matter of fact, the results are not too bad: two of the three graduals have been quite accurately dated using the saints in the manuscript, combined with what is known about the introduction of their feast within the Carthusian order. Only the gradual from Louvain was completed much *later* than expected.

## 2. Instruction and practice

Unfortunately, not all is well, as will become clear when probing more deeply into the saints present in these manuscripts. A first issue (a) emerges when taking a look at feasts, included by the scribes in the first hand. Secondly, and most importantly (b), attention will be given to those feasts that have been introduced in the Carthusian order, but cannot be found in the graduals, nor in the first hand,

<sup>19</sup> See *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque publique de la ville de Courtrai (Bibliothèque Goethals-Vercruyse et autres fonds)* [Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques de Belgique, 3], ed. Paul Faider (Gembloux, 1936), 35-36: “Liber domus beate Marie Magdalene sub Cruce in monte Caluarie fratrum Ordinis Cartusiensis in Louanio Leodiensis dyocesis prope capellam sancte crucis in parochia sci Jacobi apostoli supra biest. Hic liber partim scriptus est in domo silue sancti martini prope gerald montem eiusdem ordinis per Venerabilem fratrem petrum de Ascha aliquando vicarium, procuratorem et priorem eiusdem domus, partim vero hic in domo propria per religiosum fratrem arnoldum de calcar vicarium domus. Notulauitque religious frater Adrianus de Brouwershaven eodem tempore procurator eiusdem domus. Benedicantur a domino. Anno M Vc VI°.”

<sup>20</sup> See *Manuscrits datés conservés en Belgique*, ed. François Masai and Martin Wittek (Bruxelles, 1968-1991), part 4, 62-63 (item no. 523): “Anno domini M°.cccc°.lxxi°. xvii° die mensis maii. Finitum fuit hoc graduale quantum ad scripturam principalem per fratrem Hermanum de lochem in domo nostre domine de gratia prope bruxellam ordinis carthusiensis eiusdem domus primum professum sumptum vero ex domo silue sancti martini anno m°. cccc°. lvii°. Notatum vero per fratrem Johannem biest ibidem quintum professum. [...]”

<sup>21</sup> See *Ibid.*, part 1, 40 (item no. 62): “Neumata et psalmi post singulos introitus in hoc graduale signata fuerunt et scripta prout anno domini. m°. ccc°. lxxvii°. in domo cartusie seruabantur et cantabantur.” and, at the end of the manuscript, “Explicit graduale secundum ordinem cartusiensem. scriptum in domo montis omnium apostolorum. et completum anno domini m ccc lxxvij°. in mense julio”. See also *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque royale de Belgique, dl. 1 : Écriture sainte et Liturgie*, ed. J. Van den Gheyn (Bruxelles, 1901), 390-391 (item no. 623).

nor in later additions. A final section (c) deals with the later additions, especially those saints that are present in the graduals, in spite of the fact that they have not been introduced by the Carthusian order at any time.

a) In trying to ascertain the dates of origin of our three graduals in section 1, we already focused on the period in which the three graduals were actually produced. This has shed some light on the value of this method, but it is time to briefly see what can be learnt from these data regarding the principal question at hand: how quick were the Carthusians in implementing the instructions of the general chapter in their liturgical books? The feasts which were introduced in the order just before the graduals were written might give some information on this process.

The Liège gradual's last feast included in the first hand is that of Ursula, in 1352. The scribe, finishing in 1367, was thus at least aware of feasts introduced 15 years earlier. In the same manner, Scheut gives a timeframe of between 3 and 60 years. The situation with the Louvain gradual is somewhat more complicated because of the changing name of the feast of the Conception of the Virgin Mary (see above). As we now know that this gradual was finished in 1506, it seems very probable that the scribe knew about the latest name change in 1470, back to 'conceptione', 36 years earlier. However, given the disparity of these data and the limited selection of only three manuscripts, it is all but impossible to generalize and make positive statements. As will be seen presently, it is easier to determine which feasts the scribes were *not* aware of.

b) One of the most troubling aspects brought to light by the data in Table 1 is the fact that quite a lot of feasts were apparently forgotten, both when the graduals were written, and in the decades and even centuries during which they were used. First of all: one feast, that of Saints Felicissimus and Agapitus, looks as though it was forgotten in all our graduals. This must, however, be due to an error on Hourlier/Du Moustier's part. They note that this feast received its own mass from 1240/1250 onwards, but this can hardly be correct when one observes that it is also lacking in the printed Carthusian gradual of 1578<sup>22</sup>. This feast is, therefore, ignored in the counts that follow.

---

<sup>22</sup> *Graduale Ordinis Cartusiensis. Parisiis*, Ex Officina G. Chaudiere, 1578. The Bayerische Staatsbibliothek has digitised a copy of this printed gradual, available via <https://opacplus.bsb-muenchen.de/>.

As for those feasts that were forgotten or overlooked at the moment when the graduals were written: the scribes missed two in the Liège gradual, four in the Scheut gradual, and eight in the Louvain gradual (including the Compassion of the Virgin, which was added in a second hand, while the first scribe should have included it)<sup>23</sup>. A total of eleven feasts is affected, five of which are octaves. The scribe(s) of Louvain seem to have been especially sloppy, being responsible for four of those five missed octaves. Of the six remaining feasts, St. Lucy of Syracuse and the Presentation of the Virgin Mary are each forgotten once. Strangely, both Sylvester and the major feast of All Soul's Day cannot be found in either the Scheut or the Louvain gradual.

Next are those feasts, introduced *after* the graduals have been completed. Our attention therefore now shifts to additions in the margins of the graduals. The analysis is limited by, of course, the year in which the graduals were written, and, secondly, by the approximate year of the last addition in the margin. The Scheut gradual has done best, in missing only three feasts – unfortunately also missing out on the major feast of Transfiguration. Louvain is next, having overlooked eleven feasts. The situation in the Liège gradual is more complicated: sixteen feasts are missing in the sanctorale, and eight feasts and commemorations are missing in the calendar. However, eight of those sixteen missing feasts in the sanctorale *were* entered in the calendar – and, vice versa, three of the missing feasts in the calendar *are* present in the sanctorale. Thirteen feasts and commemorations are thus completely missing in the Liège gradual.

One possible assumption is nuanced by these numbers: that the scribes' accuracy decreased in time, being relatively precise when writing the gradual, and getting more careless as time went on. The Liège gradual seems to support such an assumption: extremely precise when written (only two feasts forgotten), and extremely careless after it was finished (thirteen feasts completely forgotten, many more inconsistently incorporated). The Louvain gradual, however, has a less extreme transition, from eight to eleven forgotten feasts. Finally, the Scheut gradual shows only a slight development, but in the reverse direction, having respectively four and three forgotten feasts.

---

<sup>23</sup> In the Liège and Louvain graduals, the feast of Francis of Assisi is not counted: it is only missing in the sanctorales, and a mass for Francis was only introduced in 1591, after the graduals were written.



A second possible explanation for missing feasts is the appearance of the printed Carthusian gradual in 1578: this might seem a logical moment after which the addition of feasts to manuscript graduals suffered. In the case of these three graduals, however, dramatic changes cannot be seen.

As a matter of fact, it is striking that there is hardly any order to be found in missed feasts: the three graduals rarely correspond to one another – although the Liège and Louvain sanctorales do share a string of missed feasts from 1586 onwards. Only two feasts were ignored by all: Joachim, father of the Virgin Mary, and, surprisingly, the octave of Bruno of Cologne, the founder of the group of hermits that would become the Carthusian order. Note also that the occurrence of added feasts in the three graduals do not show any consistency; only three feasts are consistently added in all manuscripts, the Compassion of the Virgin, Catherine of Siena and the Holy Name of Jesus – although the Liège gradual lacks these in its calendar.

c) Turning to the later additions in the manuscripts, the number of added feasts can be compared with the number of forgotten feasts in the same period, i.e., after the gradual was completed. It is clear that the Scheut gradual is quite accurate: it has 18 feasts added in the margins, with only 3 feasts missing. The opposite is the case in the sanctorale of the Liège gradual; here only 7 feasts have been added, with 16 missing ones. The Louvain gradual is the most evenly treated, with 11 feasts added and 11 missing. Once again, as in the last paragraph, it is impossible to discern any order; rather, the individual graduals seem to have had their own peculiar life – obviously depending on the monks that were involved in their composition and upkeep. And these monks clearly were not as flawless as was hoped by their superiors.

Indeed, these Carthusian monks seem to have been more deliberately diverging from the order's rulings, as well. In the countings presented so far, an interesting group of feasts has been included but deserves extra attention: those feasts that were never officially introduced by the general chapter of the Carthusian order (see Table 2). Apparently, although the general chapter has largely been dismissive regarding local saints<sup>24</sup>, charterhouses did feel free to

---

<sup>24</sup> Emmanuel CLUZET, *Particularités du sanctoral cartusien* [Analecta Cartusiana, 99:30] (Salzburg, 1994d), 115.

add them. As a matter of fact, it is known that some English charterhouses went to great lengths to celebrate feasts of certain local saints: they bypassed the general chapter altogether and obtained an indult from Pope Eugene IV directly in 1441<sup>25</sup>.

It is especially in the Liège gradual from 1367 that these local saints abound. Most striking is the fact that almost all these feasts are found only in the calendar, and not in the sanctorale - this in spite of the fact that several of them are given ranks in the calendar, which would make an entry in the sanctorale inevitable. Servacius, Hubertus, Leonardus, Egidius and Remaclus are indicated as having a mass ('missa'); The *Divisio apostolorum* is indicated as 'Cand', 'candelarum', the highest feast rank in the order. Yet no trace of these masses is found in the sanctorale. The Liège gradual thus is not only strikingly divergent regarding regulations from the general chapter, but also strangely inconsistent – of which we have seen more instances above.

### 3. The ideal of uniformity, and reality

By now, it has become clear that both assumptions and methods of some scholars dealing with Carthusian liturgical manuscripts, as well as the precision or fidelity of those Carthusian medieval scribes and correctors, are not as straightforward as one might wish – at least judging by the three graduals that have been analysed here. On the contrary, it is evident that the method so conveniently described by Dubois and Lemaître<sup>26</sup> is rather less convenient to actually use, and should be handled with caution indeed.

In these three Carthusian graduals from the Low Countries, feasts appear without ever being allowed, but, more striking, many feasts, including major ones, have not appeared in these graduals in spite of their formal introduction to the Carthusian calendar. Whereas these observations, and the admonition given in the previous paragraph, would not raise an eyebrow when dealing with

---

<sup>25</sup> See E. Margaret THOMPSON, *The Carthusian order in England* [Publication for the Church historical Society, 3] (London, 1930), 264-266. A more detailed treatment of the relationship between the English Carthusians and the general chapter and its bearing on liturgical practice can be found in Joseph A. GRIBBIN, *Aspects of Carthusian liturgical practice in later medieval England* [Analecta Cartusiana, 99:33] (Salzburg, 1995).

<sup>26</sup> See note 4 above.

most liturgical manuscripts<sup>27</sup>, they should do so when dealing with manuscripts from a religious order like the Carthusians.

The Carthusian order is traditionally known for their extremely centralized organisation. This was effectuated through the well-known institutions of an annual general chapter, and regular visitation. Although they were not the first in using these, they were strikingly scrupulous in their execution<sup>28</sup>. Only decades after the birth of the Carthusian order in 1084, uniformity became one of the central concerns of both general chapter and visitation, and liturgy was of prime importance<sup>29</sup>. In addition, Carthusians are known for being very precise in copying and producing their books<sup>30</sup>. Finally, the Carthusian calendar's growth was strictly controlled from its earliest days. It was strikingly small compared with other monastic orders, and the Carthusians were very wary indeed of its growth, and especially of introducing local saints – they were not eager, even, to venerate saints from their own ranks<sup>31</sup>.

This image of the Carthusian order as strict and tightly controlled, however, is strongly idealistic in origin and famously captured in the phrase, “Cartusia numquam reformata, quia numquam deformata”. What is interesting, however, is how this idealism compares with daily life within a charterhouse<sup>32</sup>. It seems

---

<sup>27</sup> Especially after reading PFAFF, *New liturgical feasts in later medieval England*.

<sup>28</sup> See, especially, Florent CYGLER, *Das Generalkapitel im hohen Mittelalter: Cisterzienser, Prämonstratenser, Kartäuser und Cluniazenser* [Vita regularis: Ordnungen und Deutungen religiösen Lebens im Mittelalter, 12] (Münster, 2002), 205-313, on the history of and processes within the Carthusian general chapter, and Heinrich RÜTHING, «Die Wächter Israels»: ‘Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Visitationen im Kartäuserorden’, in *Die Kartäuser: der Orden der schweigenden Mönche*, ed. M. Zadnikar and A. Wienand (Köln, 1983), 169-183, on Carthusian visitation.

<sup>29</sup> See, for example, Hansjakob BECKER, *Die Responsorien des Kartäuserbreviers: Untersuchungen zu Urform und Herkunft des Antiphonars der Kartause* [Münchener theologische Studien, 39] (München, 1971), 33.

<sup>30</sup> See Belinda EGAN, ‘The Carthusians and textual uniformity’, in *Los cartujos en Andalucía* [Analecta Cartusiana, 150:1], ed. J. Hogg, A. Girard and D. Le Blévec (Salzburg, 1999), 185-199 and M.G. SARGENT, ‘The problem of uniformity in Carthusian book production from the Opus Pacis to the Tertia Compilatio Statutorum’, in *New science out of old books: studies in manuscripts and early printed books in honour of A. I. Doyle*, ed. R. Beadle and A. J. Piper (Aldershot, 1995), 122-141, the latter with abundant literature.

<sup>31</sup> On the saints within the Carthusian's calendar, see CLUZET, *Particularités du sanctoral cartusien*.

<sup>32</sup> Recently, Peter Thissen has dealt with this idealistic “master narrative” about the order and its link to contingent historical manifestations, in the realm of books, resulting in his forthcoming

clear that, at least in these three manuscripts, instructions from the general chapter did not always have the consequences that were intended. Up until now in this article, this incongruency has been silently explained by a lack of accuracy. Of course, one could look at this situation in other ways: the omissions or peculiar additions might have been a conscious decision, or the omissions might have been the result from a lack of interest in anything to do with change.

As for the first approach, a conscious decision to ignore or add certain saints might have been made to define a certain identity for one's charterhouse, especially regarding patron saints<sup>33</sup>. In our case, it is clear that patron saints do not have any bearing on the tendencies that were observed in the saints in our graduals. Apart from the fact that the most salient feature therein is rather disorder rather than any order (whether intended or not) only the charterhouse of Louvain is named after an individual saint, Mary Magdalene, whose feast is present in all our graduals. Scheut is named after the Blessed Virgin Mary, a central figure in the entire Carthusian order; Liège is named after the twelve apostles. The added feasts in the graduals that were not allowed by the general chapter, however, obviously are conscious decisions – decisions that reflect at least the geographical background of these three charterhouses. The Liège gradual, in particular, is graced with typical feasts of Hubertus (november 3<sup>rd</sup>), the first Bishop of Liège, and of Remaclus (september 3<sup>rd</sup>), another bishop, of Maastricht (NL) – both of whom were venerated in Liège<sup>34</sup>.

As for the second approach, it could be possible that in daily life, the Carthusian aversion to change of any kind might be stronger within a given charterhouse than the need for uniformity that was felt by the superiors of the order. It was already hinted at, above, that the Carthusians were very reluctant

---

book *Cel en wereld. Kartuziers en boeken in Roermond, 1376-1783* ('Cell and World. Carthusians and books in Roermond [NL], 1376-1783'). Similarly, the relationship between then aims to uniformity and reality within the Cistercian order is given as a major theme in Janet BURTON and Julie KERR, *The Cistercians in the Middle Ages* [Monastic Orders, (Woodbridge, 2011), 54-55.

<sup>33</sup> This aspect has been put to great use in Herman Mulder, 'Cameracenses nihil servant de sancto Frederico: The Windesheim calendar in the dioceses of Utrecht and Cambrai', *De Gulden Passer*, 89/1 (2011), 7-29, although dealing with the very different context of the Windesheim Congregation. I thank Dr. Ulrike Hascher-Burger for pointing me to this publication.

<sup>34</sup> Hermann GROTEFEND, *Zeitrechnung des deutschen Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (Aalen, 1970), vol. II.1, 108; vol. II.2, 117 and vol. II.2, 160.

indeed in adding saints to their calendar; the feast of Saint Bruno is a case in point, as its celebration was only authorized more than four hundred years after his death. This reluctance of the general chapter could of course very well trickle down to individual priors, being not very inclined to accept change, let alone instruct a monk to actually make additions to a liturgical manuscript<sup>35</sup>.

#### 4. 'Le calendrier cartusien' and its sources

It is time, however, to shift attention from those scholars using 'Le calendrier cartusien' and the scribes of the manuscripts they study, to the article itself. In spite of its importance, it has also received criticism of both Hansjakob Becker and James Hogg. Both point out that errors are too prominent in 'Le calendrier cartusien', and that the material should be once again checked against the sources<sup>36</sup>. One error was probably encountered above (see the opening paragraph of section 2b), and the writer of these lines, having intensively worked with the article, can only concur with Becker and Hogg. Two problems seem to be especially paramount.

Most disappointing is the inconsistent reference to the sources on which 'Le calendrier cartusien' is based. The most important published statutes (from the *Consuetudines* of around 1116/1127 to the *Nova Collectio Statutorum* of 1581) are indicated, in addition to the earliest calendar from 1134<sup>37</sup>. Apart from

---

<sup>35</sup> This line of thought was suggested to me by Dr. Carol Steyn, private communication, d.d. 22 september 2012. At this point, I should mention the thought-provoking article D.F.L. CHADD, 'Liturgy and liturgical music: the limits of uniformity', in *Cistercian Art and Architecture in the British Isles*, ed. C. Norton and D. Park (Cambridge, 1986), 299-314, in which similar issues within the Cistercian order are observed; see esp. 306-307 and 310-314.

<sup>36</sup> BECKER, *Die Responsorien des Kartäuserbreviers: Untersuchungen zu Urform und Herkunft des Antiphonars der Kartause*, 48, note 280; James Hogg, *Die ältesten Consuetudines der Kartäuser* [Analecta Cartusiana, 1] (Berlin, 1970), 16, note 1.

<sup>37</sup> This 'earliest calendar' is given in A. DEGAND, « Chartreux (liturgie des) », in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie Chrétienne et de liturgie*, ed. F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq (Paris, 1913), 1045-1071, col. 1051-1053 (only those feasts given in the first hand; later additions are not indicated). Meanwhile, however, Becker has pointed us to a yet earlier calendar, carO, not used by Hourlier and Moustier and still awaiting detailed consideration. See BECKER, *Die Responsorien des Kartäuserbreviers: Untersuchungen zu Urform und Herkunft des Antiphonars der Kartause*, 49 and 333; a black and white facsimile is given in Hansjakob BECKER, 'Gottesdienst und geistliches Leben: 25 Jahre Liturgiereform in der Kartause', in *Kartäuserliturgie und Kartäuserschrifttum: Die Kartause: Liturgisches Erbe und konziliare Reform* [Analecta Cartusiana, 116:5], (Salzburg, 1990), 7-19, 355-360.

these, however, years given to feasts are overwhelmingly lacking any indication as to which, or what kind of source they are based on. In the note preceding the calendar in the article, Du Moustier does give some idea of which sources were used, especially the ordinances of the general chapters, which were, at that time, not yet published<sup>38</sup>.

In the same note, Du Moustier also mentions that “quelques missels et bréviaires”<sup>39</sup> were used. With what has been seen in the preceding pages, this should cause one to be slightly disconcerted. If scholars are using information of the article to date liturgical manuscripts, while the same information has been partly culled from (unspecified) liturgical manuscripts, one is dangerously close to circular reasoning – apart from the potential uncertainties in the liturgical sources themselves.

To be clear, the importance of ‘Le calendrier cartusien’ is not to be underestimated; on the contrary, it has been put to great use in these very pages. One should give the large majority of facts in the article the benefit of the doubt, albeit with a healthy dose of caution. Meanwhile, it would be very worthwhile following up on Hogg’s and Becker’s advice, and taking a fresh look at the development of the Carthusian calendar. The chartae of the general chapters, especially, are extremely important in relation to the contents of Hourlier’s and Du Moustier’s article<sup>40</sup>. I would strongly suggest that in such research, however, statutory sources should be kept strictly separate from liturgical ones. Although only three graduals have been looked at in this article, I think it can be safely stated that, even within religious orders as centralised and disciplined as the

---

<sup>38</sup> James Hogg has heroically taken the task at hand to facilitate the publication of the surviving charters of these general chapters; the series (*Analecta Cartusiana* 100:1-...) has, at the moment of writing (2013), reached more than forty volumes already.

<sup>39</sup> MOUSTIER and HOURLIER, « Le calendrier Cartusien », 153.

<sup>40</sup> The author of the present article is currently working on an extended analysis, review and expansion of the contents of ‘Le calendrier cartusien’. Ideally, this would result in an online presentation of the development of the Carthusian calendar, with every item linked to the relevant source. During my research for the present article, however, I was unaware that Martin Morard was working on exactly the same, although apparently not aiming at an online publication. In his ‘Dater par les calendriers’ (see note 6), Morard presented an updated version of ‘Le calendrier cartusien’. His calendar, however, includes developments only until the late 18<sup>th</sup> century, and is silent about the early calendar discovered by Becker (see above, note 37). A collaborative effort would be expedient.

Carthusians, the addition of a new feast to a liturgical manuscript did not always occur shortly after it was adopted by the order.

### **Postscript: The lifespan of liturgical manuscripts**

An interesting side effect of the analysis of added feasts to dated liturgical manuscripts is the information it gives about their life and usage. Although the only information that is absolutely sure is the date of origin, it is possible to speculate reasonably about the length of time that these manuscripts have stayed in use.

Starting with the dates of origin, it should be noted that all three graduals in this article have been completed shortly after the foundation of the charterhouses they were intended for. The Scheut gradual was finished in 1471, thirteen years after the charterhouse of Notre-Dame de Grace had been incorporated in the Carthusian order in 1458 and fifteen years after the first monks started living there, in 1456. The Liège gradual was finished in 1367, only seven years after its foundation in 1360. The Louvain gradual from 1506, finally, was completed fifteen years after its foundation but only two years after it was incorporated in the Carthusian order.

The many additions to the sanctorales of the three graduals are evidence for their continued usage. But how long were they used? Simply looking at the last feasts that appear in the manuscripts, one is confronted with these 'ages': Scheut, 1471-1607, 136 years; Liège, 1367-1597, 230 years; Louvain, 1506-1679, 173 years. It can be noted that all manuscripts' last sign of life appear in the decades around 1600, which might link this lack of usage to the appearance of the the printed gradual from 1578. An exception, however, is the *Missa tempore belli*, which was added to the back flyleaf of the Louvain gradual. Similarly, another fifteenth-century gradual, from the charterhouse of Roermond, has the feast of Philip Neri (introduced in 1690) added to the sanctorale<sup>41</sup>.

The appearance of the printed Carthusian gradual apparently did not completely or quickly stop Carthusians from using their manuscript graduals.

---

<sup>41</sup> Preserved in St. Hugh's Charterhouse of Parkminster (England), ms. bb.6 (A.6). On this gradual, see my article 'The life of a fifteenth-century Carthusian gradual from Roermond (NL)' (forthcoming in *Tradition et transformation : Les Chartreux dans l'Europe médiévale et moderne* [Analecta Cartusiana 306]).

One wonders how the general chapter proceeded in disseminating the newly printed graduals, and with which instructions. Recently, a manuscript gradual from the charterhouse of Zelem (Diest) was found, written between 1580 and 1583<sup>42</sup>. It is clear that it was produced in a great hurry, when the monks had to flee from their charterhouse because of war. Apparently, at that moment, they had no printed gradual at their disposal yet.

---

<sup>42</sup> Averbode Abbey (Belgium), ms. IV 132. Thanks to Tom Gaens for information on this interesting gradual. More can be found on the Cartusiana website:

<http://cartusiana.org/?q=node/3508> (accessed 19 september 2012).



**Table 1: Added and missing feasts in three graduals**

- 1) This and the following table *only* include those feasts that were either added in a later hand – or feasts that were entirely forgotten, although they should have been present, according to the rulings of the superiors of the Order. This table does *not*, therefore, give a complete survey of feasts that can be found in the three manuscripts (a complete survey is available via the author).
- 2) The table is organised chronologically, so that one can see, in the second and third column, the development of the Carthusian calendar of saints – and its effects on the contents of the sanctorales of the graduals, in the last four columns. The chronology is determined by years in which feasts were made obligatory (in contrast with only being allowed). Note that this chronology is somewhat compromised to avoid repetition of feasts like that of Francis of Assisi.
- 3) The year of introduction of the last feast added in a second hand is treated as the last event about which anything can be said: feasts ‘missing’ after that can be interpreted as evidence for the end of the practical use of the gradual and are thus ignored.

[empty cell]: Included in the first hand

+ : Added in a second hand

? : Unclear whether it is a first or second hand

- : Should have been included or added, but is missing

o : Lacking in the sanctorales because they have no mass

Abbreviations are identical to those used by Hourlier and De Moustier<sup>1</sup>: Com=Commemoration; T=feast of 3 lessons, excl. mass; M=with mass; TM= feast of 3 lessons, incl. mass; C=Chapter feast, incl. mass; D=feast of 12 lessons, incl. mass; S=Solemnity, incl. mass; perm=permitted; oblig=obligatory.

---

<sup>1</sup> Benoît du MOUSTIER and Jacques HOURLIER, “Le calendrier Cartusien”, *Études Grégoriennes*, 2 (1957), 151-161.

Date	Feast	Year of introduction	Rank	Bruxelles, BR, ms. II 261		Bruxelles, BR, ms. IV 86	Courtrai, Bibl. Publ., ms. 41
				Calendar	Sanctorale		
2 nov	All Souls' Day	1116-1127	M		-	-	
2 jul	Martinian and Processus	1132-1134 / 1468	T / Com	+	0	0	0
22 aug	Assumption BVM, Octave	1132-1134	D				-
6 oct	Faith ( <i>S. Fides</i> )	1132-1134 / 1515	T / Com	-	0	0	0
30 dec	Sylvester	Before 1222	M			-	-
6 dec	Nicholas	Before 1222 / 1468 <sup>2</sup>	D / C	+			
2 jan	Stephen, Octave	1240-1250	M				-
3 jan	John the Evangelist, Octave	1240-1250	M				-
4 jan	Holy Innocents, Octave	1240-1250	M				-
6 aug	Sixtus	1240-1250	M			-	
6 aug	Felicissimus and Agapitus	1240-1250	M	-	-	-	-
25 nov	Catherine of Alexandria	1240-1250	TM	?			
13 dec	Lucy of Syracuse	1240-1250	M		-		
4 oct	Francis of Assisi	1249 / 1591 / 1597	T / C / D		-	+	-
29 apr	Peter of Verona ( <i>Petri, mart.</i> )	Before 1400 / 1586	T/D		-	+	+
26 jul	Anne	1412	M	+	+		

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 161, write: "T: I [=1132-1134, TodC]; D: ante 1222; C: 1468; confirm: 1586; D: 1597."

Date	Feast	Year of introduction	Rank	Bruxelles, BR, ms. II 261		Bruxelles, BR, ms. IV 86	Courtrai, Bibl. Publ., ms. 41
				Calendar	Sanctorale		
23 feb	Matthias, Vigil	1420	Com	+	0	0	0
4 dec	Barbara	1397 perm / 1463 oblig	TM	?	-		
2 jul	Visitation BVM	1411 perm / 1468 oblig	S	+	+		
9 jul	Visitation BVM, Octave	1411 perm / 1468 oblig	D	+	-	-	-
21 nov	Presentation BVM	1470 perm / 1474 oblig	S	+	+	+	-
	Compassion BVM <sup>3</sup>	1477 perm / 1486 oblig	S	-	+	+	+
6 oct	Bruno	1515	S	+	-	+	+
13 oct	Bruno, Octave	1545 / 1633	TM / D	-	-	-	-
18 jan	Chair of Saint Peter	1558	TM	-	-	+	+
19 mar	Joseph	1567-1568	S	+	-	+	+
7 mar	Thomas Aquinas	1568	C	+	-	+	+
13 jul	Silas	1580 <sup>4</sup>	T	-	0	0	0
6 may	Catherine of Siena	1462 perm / 1581 oblig	TM	-	+	+	+
20 sep	Eustace	1581 <sup>5</sup>	T	-	0	0	0

<sup>3</sup> Celebrated on the Saturday after the octave of Easter; from 1487 onwards on the Saturday after Passion Sunday.

<sup>4</sup> Transferred to 13 July, in 1580; from 1132-1134 found on 28 November, also as T. It is on this date that we find St. Silas in the calendar, in the first hand.

<sup>5</sup> Transferred to 20 September in 1581; from 1116-1127 found on 2 November, also as T. It is on this date that we find St. Eustace in the calendar, in the first hand.

Date	Feast	Year of introduction	Rank	Bruxelles, BR, ms. II 261		Bruxelles, BR, ms. IV 86	Courtrai, Bibl. Publ., ms. 41
				Calendar	Sanctorale		
4 nov	Vitalis and Agricola	1581 <sup>6</sup>	T	-	0	0	0
7 dec	Ambrose	1581 <sup>7</sup>	C	+		+	+
6 aug	Transfiguration of the Lord	1582	S	-	+	-	+
2 apr	Francis of Paola	1586 <sup>8</sup>	D	-	-	+	-
10 sep	Nicholas of Tolentino	1586	D	-	-	+	-
13 jun	Anthony of Padua	1589	D	-	-	+	-
14 jul	Bonaventure	1589	D	+	-	+	-
5 oct	Placidus	1589	T	-	0	0	0
12 nov	Didacus of Alcalá	1589	T	-	0	0	0
19 sep	Januarius	1589 / 1592 <sup>9</sup>	T / D	-	-	+	+
4 aug	Dominic, confessor	1591 / 1597	C / D	+	-	+	-

<sup>6</sup> Transferred to 4 November in 1581; from 1132-1134 found on 27 November, also as T. It is on this date that we find St. Vitalis and Agricola in the calendar, in the first hand.

<sup>7</sup> Transferred from 4 April to 7 December in 1581. On 4 April, it had a mass since before 1222. In ms. II 261, it can still be found on 4 April, in the first hand.

<sup>8</sup> These next three feasts have a strange history, having been revoked as early as 1597 (confirmed in 1599), Moustier and Hourtlier, 'Le calendrier Cartusien', 156 and 159.

<sup>9</sup> This feast was also revoked in 1597 (confirmed in 1599), *Ibid.*, 159.

Date	Feast	Year of introduction	Rank	Bruxelles, BR, ms. II 261	Bruxelles, BR, ms. IV 86	Courtrai, Bibl. Publ., ms. 41
				Calendar	Sanctorale	
20 mar	Joachim	1592 / 1597	S / TM	(-) <sup>10</sup>	-	-
4 jan	Holy Name of Jesus	1597	S	(-)	+	+
26 jun	Anthelm	1607	D		+	-
25 aug	Louis IX	1623	D			-
31 jul	Ignatius of Loyola	1669	D			-
	Missa tempore belli	1679				+

<sup>10</sup> Strictly speaking, the last event in the calendar is the addition of Saint Dominic in 1591; missing feasts after that date have no weight of evidence (see the third point in the introduction to this table). In this case however, the missing feasts are given, because of the sanctorale's last event of 1597.

**Table 2: Added feasts not included in the Order's official calendar**

At four places, the calendar of ms. II 261 has been used as a necrologue. The following dates can be found there: *Tricenarium Regine* (4 march), *Maternus episcopus* (16 april), *Tricenarium episcopi Perpetui* (26 apr) and *Obiit dompnus Bernardus* (7 june). The feast of 'Divisio apostolorum', was never introduced in the Order but is found in the first hand of this gradual.

+ : Added in a second hand

1 : Added by the first hand

[empty cell] : Not included

Date	Feast	Bruxelles, BR, ms. II 261		Bruxelles, BR, ms. IV 86	Courtray, Bibl. Publ., ms. 41
		Calendar	Sanctorale		
8 jan	Gudule			+	
13 may	Servacii epi	+			
22 jun	Acacii et soc.	+			
24 jun	Rumoldi			+	+
15 jul	Divisio apostolorum	1	1		
1 sep	Egidii abb	+			
3 sep	Remacli epi	+			
3 nov	Huberti epi	+			
6 nov	Leonardi	+			