

Merete G. Andersen

The *Consuetudines canonice* of Lund

In the year 816, at the Council of Aachen, it was decided to introduce conditions similar to those at the Benedictine monasteries for priests serving at cathedrals. The result was the Rule of Aachen, *Institutio canonicorum Aquisgranensis*.¹ This Rule, however, was very liberal, and by that time the religious life at the chapters had decayed. This circumstance prompted the reform of canons in the 11th and 12th centuries, which attempted to restore the ancient ideals of *vita apostolica* and *vita communis* from the early Christian Church. The earliest reform centre came into being in 1039 at St Ruf, near Avignon in Southern France.² Other reform centres were: Marbach in the diocese of Basel founded in 1089;³ Rottenbuch in Freising, 1092;⁴ Springiersbach in Trier, 1107;⁵ and the Chapter of Salzburg in the 12th century.⁶ A rule, normally the Rule of St Augustine, was the normative basis for these reform centres. In addition, there were the Customs or *consuetudines*. The Customs of St Ruf⁷ had great influence on the later reform movement. They were the basis for the Customs of Marbach⁸ and the so-called Customs of Springiersbach-Klosterrath.⁹ From Scandinavia two customary manuscripts have survived: one is to be found at the University Library in Lund, Mh 6; the other is at the University Library in Uppsala, C 222. In this paper we shall deal with the customs in Lund, the so-called *Consuetudines canonice* (CC).

The *Consuetudines canonice* and the scholars

The manuscript Mh 6 from the University Library in Lund, which is one of its greatest treasures, is a composite manuscript. The Rule of Aachen and the CC plus some related theological treatises make up the greater part of this manuscript, but the scholarly interest is due to the fact that it contains a necrology for the Cathedral of Lund. While the historical parts of the manuscript have been edited over the centuries,¹⁰ the CC were first published by A. Hammar in 1868–69.¹¹ In 1908, E Jørgensen¹² was able to demonstrate that the CC were based on the Customs of Marbach and that these in turn were based on the tradition of Cluny. Jørgensen, however, only had access to the edition of the Customs of Marbach by E. Martène,¹³ which is based on a defective manuscript from the Benedictine monastery of Murbach in Alsace. In 1923, L. Weibull¹⁴ edited almost the whole composite manuscript, calling it *Necrologium Lundense*. Weibull's edition con-

tains the CC with reference to Martène's edition. The Rule of Aachen and the theological treatises were not edited, however, since they were well-known and had been edited either in *Monumenta Germanicae Historica* or in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*. In 1960, Weibull's edition was followed by a facsimile edition of the complete manuscript with an introduction by E. Kroman.¹⁵

The CC are only briefly discussed in Weibull's voluminous introduction to *Necrologium Lundense*. This is a pity, since the CC are a valuable source material regarding life at the Cathedral of Lund. Weibull emphasised, however, that the chapters about the election of the bishop and provost have no basis in the Customs of Marbach¹⁶ Later, in 1946, Weibull¹⁷ quoted several chapters of the Customs of Lund, especially concerning intercessory prayers and the special election regulations for the bishop and provost at Lund. Two years earlier, T. Schmid¹⁸ had discussed the part of the Customs dealing with the liturgy of the death of a canon. Schmid put forward the thesis that the CC were based on the Customs of Marbach and on those of Cluny, the latter being mediated via the monastery of All Saints at Lund, which was influenced by Cluny. Schmid tried furthermore to demonstrate that the CC were originally compiled for the Augustinian house of Dalby, near Lund.¹⁹

In 1965, J. Siegwart edited a new critical edition of the Customs of Marbach, based on the famous Guta-Sintram manuscript from 1154.²⁰ The edition contains a lengthy introduction, with the CC as a variant in the apparatus under the sign L. Siegwart developed the thesis put forward by Schmid. According to Siegwart, the CC were copied for the Augustinian house of Dalby and were adapted in 1140/45 by the Chapter of Lund in connection with a change of rule from Salzburg to Marbach. Siegwart also mentions that a certain Herman of Klosterrath made the Chapter of Lund acquainted with the Customs of Marbach.²¹

Thanks to Siegwart's edition, E. Buus²² edited a critical edition with a bulky introduction. Seventy years had to pass from Jørgensen's identification of the CC as being based on the Customs of Marbach to Buus' study of the CC and their characteristic features. Buus concludes that the CC constitute an independent version of the Customs of Marbach, modelled exclusively on them, rather than on a combination of the Customs of Marbach and of Cluny, as scholars have believed.²³ Buus was also obliged to reject the Augustinian thesis advanced by Schmid-Siegwart. The CC were copied for the Chapter of Lund.²⁴ Furthermore, they are anti-Augustinian,²⁵ and are therefore not associated with the Rule of St Augustine but with the Rule of Aachen.

The *Consuetudines canonice* and the dating

On palaeographical criteria Weibull concluded that the CC must have been drawn up in the period from 1123 to 1136.²⁶ On the other hand, Siegwart has demonstrated that the Customs of Marbach were drawn up between c. 1122 and

1124 at the latest.²⁷ Buus believed this dating to be correct, adhering to Kroman's hypothesis that the composite manuscript *Necrologium Lundense* had been copied in 1123 in connection with the consecration of the crypt in Lund. Since it took time to draw up the controversial CC, Buus assumed that they had been copied as early as c. 1122. Thus the Customs of Marbach must also have been copied around 1122.²⁸ The CC apparently became the earliest version of the Customs of Marbach, some 30 years younger than the famous Guta-Sintram manuscript from 1154.²⁹ Even without Buus' new dating, the CC would be the earliest version of the Customs of Marbach, but in an independent version.

In a review of Buus' edition, G. Constable expressed doubts about Buus' early dating of the CC, and presumed them to be later than 1123.³⁰ In a new paper on the *Necrologium Lundense*, Buus responded to this by reverting to Weibull's dating – between 1123 and 1136.³¹ In a footnote, Buus also mentions that the later bishop Eskil was provost in Lund c. 1131–34 and that the CC may have been drawn up before, after or during his term of office.³² Here again, we have a vague dating of the CC. From the paper by his co-author, B. Ahlers Møller, however, the CC appear unquestionably to have been drawn up c. 1130.³³ The English summary bears this out.³⁴ Maybe Buus had the CC in mind when on the title-page he and his co-author dated the composite manuscript *Necrologium Lundense* to c. 1130 without support from the manuscript itself or from their own writings. In dating the CC, Buus steers a middle course: c. 1130 is approximately midway between 1123 and 1136.

As mentioned, the Customs of Marbach are dated to c. 1122–1124, but by rule-of-thumb we must assume that at least five years pass from the birth of a text to its diffusion and copying. If this is so, the Customs of Marbach would have come to Lund around 1130 at the earliest, not including the time required to draw up and copy the CC. In other words, the CC could not have been copied until the first half of the 1130s. But no rule without an exception, especially if we can spot a person who might have introduced the new text. Can we identify someone in the Lundensian milieu in the early 1130s who could have brought the Customs of Marbach to Lund? Indeed we can: Herman of Klosterrath.

Herman was the son of Embrico and Adeleida. As a young man he was admitted to the foundation of regular canons at Klosterrath, near Aachen, in the diocese of Liège. In 1124 and again in 1128 Herman tried in vain to be elected leader of Klosterrath. Thanks to archbishop Frederik of Cologne, Herman succeeded in becoming leader of the newly established foundation of canons at Dünewald near Cologne. But here too, Herman encountered resistance. Disappointed, he left Dünewald and went to Denmark, where, as stated in the *Annals of Klosterrath*, he entered the service of a bishop.³⁵

Herman presumably came to Denmark c. 1130, to take up service with archbishop Asser of Lund. Sometime before 1133, Eskil was appointed provost at the

MERETE G. ANDERSEN

Cathedral of Lund.³⁶ In 1134 Eskil left Lund to become bishop of Roskilde. He was no doubt accompanied by Herman, since mention is made of a certain Herman, capellanus to Eskil, in 1135.³⁷

In 1137 archbishop Asser died and was succeeded by his nephew, Eskil, who was familiar with the milieu at the Cathedral of Lund from his time there as provost. According to the Annals of Klostrerrath, Herman negotiated the purchase of a pallium for archbishop Eskil in 1138.³⁸ In connection with the election of Eskil to bishop, there was a minor reshuffling which left the bishopric of Schleswig vacant. Herman succeeded in getting himself appointed,³⁹ but the inhabitants of Schleswig would not accept him and elected someone else.⁴⁰ The bishop designate thus ended his days as a canon at Lund.⁴¹ He attended the consecration of the cathedral in 1145⁴² and died not later than the year 1151. The day of his death is entered in the necrology of the Cathedral of Lund under the 16th of January.⁴³

The Consuetudines canonice and the hand of the scribe

The CC (ff. 5v–57v) are written by one and the same hand: by Weibull called hand f (Kroman hand 4). This hand also wrote other parts of the composite manuscript of *Necrologium Lundense* including the religious treatises (ff. 83r–123v) and the list of prebends (ff. 2v–4r) which follows the copy of St Canute's deed of gift from 1085. Weibull argued that the first part of the list of prebends (ff. 2v–3v) was written in 1123 at the latest, the second part (ff. 3v–4r) after 1145.⁴⁴ This dating, however, is based exclusively on internal criteria that are open to question. Furthermore, hand f is responsible for some of the entries in the necrology. A few of these are datable – to the second half of the 1130s. Finally, hand f has also written: the entry of the deacon Benedict in the list of deacons (f. 177v), dated by Weibull-Kroman to 1145 at the earliest; the rubric that prefaces the fraternity bonds between the brethren at Lund and those at Viborg (f. 182v), dated by Weibull-Kroman to 1136. According to Weibull-Kroman, hand f was active for a long period, from c. 1120 until some time after 1145.⁴⁵

Weibull characterised the individual hands in the necrology. Hand f was the book-scribe's hand⁴⁶ which comes as no surprise since it also wrote the CC and the religious treatises.

It appears that the ligature & is significant for hand f, with its soft turn to the left in the down-stroke below the line. Precisely this ligature is characteristic of diploma hands from the region of Liège,⁴⁷ which means that hand f was penned by a person coming from this region. In my opinion hand f is identical with the hand of Herman of Klostrerrath, himself a native of the region of Liège. Hand f, then, is active from c. 1130 to c. 1151. Accordingly, Weibull's dating of the first part of the list of prebends must be rejected, and the CC must have been drawn up in the 1130s, prior to 1134 when Herman followed Eskil to Roskilde, i.e. in the first half of the 1130s.

In this context it must be mentioned that hand f also wrote liturgical books. In the Danish National Archives I have been able to find two small fragments of a lectionary (LE 23),⁴⁸ or more likely fragments of a missal, written by hand f, perhaps from the Cathedral of Lund.

The Consuetudines canonice and their origin

The manuscript Trier, Stadtbibliothek 2262/2208, contains the customary manuscript from Springiersbach from 1158.⁴⁹ It was discovered by F. Pauly, who mentions it for the first time in 1958, and later in his dissertation on the reform of Springiersbach.⁵⁰ According to Siegwart, we have here a copy of manuscript fragments from the 12th century.⁵¹ As it contains parts of the Customs of Marbach, it is included in Siegwart's critical edition under the sign T. Furthermore, it is included in Buus' critical edition under the sign M–T.

The manuscript in the Stadtbibliothek in Trier is especially interesting since, according to Buus, it contains common variants of the CC.⁵² We have no information about contacts or relationships between Springiersbach and Lund; on the other hand, we know that Lund and Ravengiersburg in the diocese of Trier had fraternity bonds.⁵³ How do we explain the introduction of a text from Springiersbach to Lund? Again, Herman of Klosterrath looms into view.

Klosterrath (Rolduc)⁵⁴ was founded in the year 1104, close to Burg Herzogenrath, northwest of Aachen, in the diocese of Liège, by priest Ailbert of Antoing on land made available by count Albert von Saffenberg. Ailbert was leader of the foundation until 1111 when, owing to internal strife, he was obliged to leave. The convent elected Richer from Rottenbuch in the diocese of Freising as his successor, a position he retained until his death in 1122. Archbishop Frederik of Cologne most certainly arranged the contact with Rottenbuch. Giselbert, a priest, was elected new leader, only to be dismissed the following year. The convent then sent for Bertolf from Springiersbach, but he too lasted only a year, returning to Springiersbach in 1124. One of the canons – our Herman – then competed for the position, but again the convent preferred a canon from Springiersbach, by the name of Borno. In 1126 and again in 1127 Borno tried to introduce the customs used at Springiersbach, but was opposed by the elder members of the convent. They brought the matter before the Pope, who ruled that the convent should use their own customs. Borno resigned and went to bishop Bucco of Worms. By this time the convent desired a leader that was content with things as they were. Herman again competed for the leadership, but the convent sent for Frederik, a brother of Richer of Rottenbuch, who was nevertheless dismissed in 1134. For the second time, the convent appealed to Borno from Springiersbach, who had in the meantime taken charge of the foundation of Lonning. He led Klosterrath until his death in 1137.

This brief outline shows that Klosterrath and Springiersbach were closely in-

MERETE G. ANDERSEN

terrelated. In the period 1123–1137 the convent of Klosterrath sent for a leader from Springiersbach on three occasions. We also learn that some customs which Borno wanted to introduce to Klosterrath were found in Springiersbach in 1126/27. Later on, however, the convent must have accepted these customs, the so-called Customs of Springiersbach-Klosterrath.⁵⁵ These were based on the Customs of Marbach, which were drawn up c. 1122 or at the latest 1124.

A scholar, S. Weinfurter,⁵⁶ has discussed how the Customs of Marbach may have come to Klosterrath. A manuscript of the Customs may have come to Klosterrath in 1123: provost Bertolf of Klosterrath (1123–24) had previously been leader of Frankental which was influenced by Marbach. Connections between Klosterrath and Marbach may also have been arranged via Rottenbuch since the first provost at Marbach, Manegold (c. 1094–after 1103), was a former dean at Rottenbuch, and Richer, the second leader of Klosterrath, also came from there. Perhaps the Customs of Marbach reached Klosterrath in the last months of Richer's life, i.e. in 1121/22.

We must imagine that, on his arrival in Denmark, Herman would have told about the new reform centres in Europe. He was then asked to get in touch with his former foundation of Klosterrath in order to borrow a manuscript of the Customs of Marbach. He may have received a manuscript copied from a manuscript from Springiersbach, or he may have got a manuscript direct from Springiersbach.

Summary

The *Consuetudines canonice* of Lund, which form part of the composite manuscript Mh 6 in the University Library of Lund, were drawn up and written in the scriptorium at the Cathedral of Lund in the first half of the 1130s. The Customs of Marbach form the basis for the *Consuetudines canonice*. The person who acquainted the Chapter of Lund with the Customs of Marbach was Herman from Klosterrath, a foundation of regular canons in the diocese of Liège. Herman is presumed to have arrived in Denmark c. 1130, where he ended his days as a canon of Lund. The *Consuetudines canonice* were penned by a scribe from the region of Liège. It is probable that Herman also copied the *Consuetudines canonice*. The origin of the *Consuetudines canonice* is a manuscript from Springiersbach in the diocese of Trier, which Herman may have acquired in his former foundation of Klosterrath or in Springiersbach.

Noter

- 1 A. Werminghoff, "Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Concils im Jahre 816", *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 27, Hannover & Leipzig 1902, pp. 605–675. J. Semmler, "Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Konzils im Jahre 816", *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 74, Stuttgart 1963, pp. 15–82.

- 2 A. H. Duprac, "Un Joyau de l'Église d'Avignon", *La vita comune del clero nei secoli XI e XII. Atti della Settimana di studio; Mendola settembre 1959*, Milano 1962, vol. II pp. 115–128 (*Miscellanea del Centro di Studi Medioevali* 3). A résumé of Y. Lebrigand's dissertation of St: Ruf is now accessible, see Y. Lebrigand, "Origines et première diffusion de l'Ordre de Saint-Ruf", *Le monde des chanoines* (XI^e–XIV^e s.), (*Cahiers de Fanjeaux* 24), Toulouse 1989, pp. 167–179.
- 3 F. A. Goehlinger, *Historie de l'abbaye de Marbach*, Colmar 1954.
- 4 J. Mois, *Das Stift Rottenbuch in der Kirchenreform des X.–XII. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Ordens-Geschichte der Augustiner-Chorherren*, München 1953 (*Beiträge zur altbayerischen Kirchengeschichte III. Folge. Bd. 19*).
- 5 J. Pauly, *Springiersbach. Geschichte des Kanonikerstifts und seiner Tochtergründungen im Erzbistum Trier von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Trier 1962 (*Trierer Theologische Studien* 13).
- 6 S. Weinfurter, *Salzburger Bistumsreform und Bistumspolitik im 12. Jahrhundert. Der Erzbischof Konrad I. von Salzburg (1106–1147) und die Regularkanoniker*, Köln & Wien 1975 (*Kölner Historische Abhandlungen* 24).
- 7 A. Carrier, *Coutumier du XI^e Siècle de l'Ordre de Saint-Ruf en usage à la cathédrale de Maguelone*, Sherbroke en Québec 1950 (*Études et Documents sur l'Ordre de St.-Ruf* 8). The manuscript however is not from the 11th century as mentioned by Carrier, but from the 14th century. See moreover D. Misonne, "La législation canonique de Saint-Ruf d'Avignon à ses origines. Règle de Saint Augustin et coutumier", *Annales du Midi* 75, Toulouse 1963, pp. 471–489.
- 8 J. Siegwart, *Die Consuetudines des Augustiner-Chorherrenstifts Marbach im Elsaß (12. Jahrhundert)*, Freiburg 1965 (*Spicilegium Friburgense* 10).
- 9 S. Weinfurter, *Consuetudines canonicorum regularium Springiersbacenses-Rodenses*, Turnholt 1978 (*Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis* XLVIII).
- 10 See the scholarly survey by L. Weibull (footnote 14).
- 11 A. Hammar, "Consuetudines Canonicae, Lunds domkapitels äldsta statuter". *Samlingar till Skånes historia, fornkunskap och beskrifning. Tidskrift utg. av Föreningen för Skånes fornminnen och historia genom M. Weibull*, Lund 1868–69, pp. 1–28.
- 12 E. Jørgensen, *Fremmed Indflydelse under den danske Kirkes tidligste Udvikling*, Copenhagen 1908 (*Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskabs Skrifter* 7. R. Hist. og Fil. Afd. I. 2), pp. 146–47, 179–81.
- 13 E. Martène, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, Antuerpiæ 1737, pp. 843–888, or the edition of Venice from 1788. – The manuscript used by Martène is now lost, see A.-G. Martimort, *La documentation liturgique de Dom Edmond Martène*, Città del Vaticano 1978, p. 512 No. 1135 (*Studi e testi* 279). Supplement in *Ecclesia Orans* 3, Roma 1986, pp. 81–105.
- 14 *Necrologium Lundense*, ed. L. Weibull, Lund 1923.
- 15 *Necrologium Lundense*, ed. E. Kroman, Copenhagen 1960 (*Corpus Codicum Danicorum* vol. I). Also edited with an English introduction.
- 16 Weibull 1923, *op. cit.*, pp. XIII–XIV.
- 17 L. Weibull, "Skånes Kyrka från äldsta tid till Jacob Erlandsens död 1274", *Lunds Domkyrkas Historia*, vol. I. 1145–1536, Stockholm 1946, pp. 143–356, especially pp. 182–186.

- 18 T. Schmid, "Beiträge zum mittelalterlichen Kultleben", *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 58, Romae 1944, 50–87.
- 19 Schmid, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
- 20 Siegwart, *op. cit.*
- 21 Siegwart, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
- 22 *Consuetudines Lundenses. Statutter for kannikersamfundet i Lund c. 1123*, ed. E. Buus. Mit einer deutschen Zusammenfassung, Copenhagen 1978.
- 23 Buus, *op. cit.*, p. 102.
- 24 Buus, *op. cit.*, pp. 11 sqq., 103 sqq.
- 25 Buus, *op. cit.*, p. 39–40.
- 26 Weibull 1923, *op. cit.*, p. XIV.
- 27 Siegwart, *op. cit.*, p. 30–31.
- 28 Buus, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
- 29 Buus, *op. cit.*, p. 26.
- 30 Review by G. Constable in *Speculum* 54, Cambridge, Mass. 1979, p. 874.
- 31 E. Buus, "Necrologium Lundense", B. Ahlers Møller & E. Buus, *Herre – vasker du mine fødder? Mandatumliturgien i Marbach og Lund. Studier i håndskriftet Necrologium Lundense* (o. 1130). With English Summary, Copenhagen 1987, pp. 7–83, especially p. 33.
- 32 B. Ahlers Møller & Buus, *op. cit.*, p. 71 footnote 119.
- 33 B. Ahlers Møller, "Mandatumliturgien i Marbach og Lund", Ahlers Møller & Buus, *op. cit.*, pp. 84–202, especially p. 94.
- 34 Ahlers Møller & Buus, *op. cit.*, p. 203.
- 35 Ch. Dereine, *Les Chanoines réguliers au diocèse de Liège avant saint Norbert, (Académie Royale de Belgique. Classe des Lettres et des Sciences Morales et Politiques. Mémoires. Collection in-8°. Tome 47. Fasc. 1)*, Bruxelles 1952, pp. 198–201.
- 36 *Diplomatarium Danicum* I R 2, Copenhagen 1963, No. 56.
- 37 *Diplomatarium Danicum, op. cit.*, No. 64.
- 38 *Diplomatarium Danicum, op. cit.*, No. 72.
- 39 *Diplomatarium Danicum, op. cit.*, Nos. 77, 88, 89.
- 40 *Diplomatarium Danicum, op. cit.*, No. 91.
- 41 Weibull 1923, *op. cit.*, p. 114.
- 42 *Diplomatarium Danicum, op. cit.*, Nos. 88, 89.
- 43 Weibull 1923, *op. cit.*, p. 52.
- 44 Weibull 1923, *op. cit.*, p. XXXV.
- 45 Weibull 1923, *op. cit.*, pp. XCVII–XCVIII. Kroman, *op. cit.*, pp. XIX–XXVI.
- 46 Weibull 1923, *op. cit.*, p. LVIII.
- 47 J. Stiennon, *L'écriture diplomatique dans le diocèse de Liège du XIe au milieu du XIIe siècle. Reflet d'une civilisation*, Paris 1960 (*Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège. Fasc. V*), Fig. 197–199 pp. 198–200.
- 48 E. Albrechtsen, *Middelalderlige Håndskriftfragmenter. Aftagne fragmenter. Omslag om lensregnskaber*, Copenhagen 1976, p. 52.
- 49 F. Pauly, "Die Consuetudines von Springiersbach", *Trierer theologische Zeitschrift* 67, Trier 1958, pp. 106–111.

- 50 Pauly 1962, *op. cit.*
- 51 Siegwart, *op. cit.*, p. 95.
- 52 Buus, *op. cit.*, p. 40.
- 53 Weibull 1923, *op. cit.*, p. LXIII.
- 54 See Weinfurter 1978, *op. cit.*, pp. VII–X. W. Gärtner, "Das Chorherrenstift Klosterrath in der Kanonikerreform des 12. Jahrhunderts", *Zeitschrift des Aachener Geschichtsvereins* 97, Aachen 1991, pp. 33–220.
- 55 Weinfurter 1978, *op. cit.*, pp. XVI–XVII.
- 56 Weinfurter 1975, *op. cit.*, pp., 265–266.