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ABSTRACT

Liturgical interpretation is the application of the methods of patristic and medieval biblical exegesis to public worship. This thesis examines for the first time its importance in the religious culture of Scotland during a period of renaissance and reformation. The first section defines the genres and method involved with reference to the most popular liturgical commentary of that time, the *Rationale divinorum officiorum* of William Durandus of Mende (c.1230-1296). The reasons for the decline of this genre and its neglect by modern scholarship are then explored.

The central section of the thesis employs a wide variety of evidence, including material culture, to argue, firstly, that liturgical interpretation was a fundamental part of the culture of Catholic Scotland; secondly, that interest in it was a sign of commitment to Catholic reform. It is also argued that it had an important place in the education system and influenced the design and understanding of churches and their furnishings. Drawing upon inscriptions in liturgical commentaries, networks of clergy in Scotland committed to Catholic reform and the liturgy are identified. The ‘Aberdeen liturgists’ were the most significant group. Formed by Bishop Elphinstone of Aberdeen who was consecrated in 1488, it is shown that their influence lasted beyond 1560 and created a distinctive religious culture in the North-East.

The final section examines what happened to this intellectual tradition during the period of the Scottish reformations, both the Catholic reform associated with Archbishop Hamilton in the 1550s and the Protestant reform which triumphed in 1559-60. While interest in liturgical interpretation survived in Aberdeen after 1560, its use by Catholic writers declined in the later sixteenth century. A Reformed version of liturgical interpretation did, however, emerge combining an anti-commentary on the Catholic liturgy with the use of aspects of the medieval method to interpret the liturgy of the Reformed church. This can be found in official Protestant texts and, in its fullest form, in the 1590 sermons on the Lord’s Supper by Robert Bruce. This hitherto unnoticed genre demonstrates an important continuity across the Reformation divide. It suggests that ‘the Scottish Reformation’ is best seen as a phenomenon which was both Catholic and Protestant and that the reformers on both sides had more in common than they or subsequent historians allow.
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INTRODUCTION

1) The thesis and its scope

a. The question

This thesis will assess for the first time the importance of the method of liturgical interpretation, as found in the Rationale divinorum officiorum of William Durandus of Mende, in the religious culture of Scotland between 1488 and 1590. To do this it is necessary to define clearly the genre and method which will be called ‘liturgical interpretation’. Scottish evidence shows a close connection between interest in liturgical interpretation and commitment to Church Reform. It also reveals Protestant as well as Catholic versions of liturgical interpretation. The evidence thus dictates that this will also be a study of reform movements in the Scottish Church during this period, seen through the lens of liturgical interpretation, and so it will contribute towards a reassessment of the Scottish Reformation.

This will include new insights into broader questions: the strength of the pre-1560 Scottish Catholic Church; the source of the religious distinctiveness of the North-East of Scotland; the form of the ‘continuity that must have smoothed the path to change’ in the religious history of Scotland during this period;¹ the weakness of the standard Protestant-Catholic dichotomy; and the nature of the ‘Scottish Reformation’, which is still too often described in a teleological and denominational manner. Behind these issues is the question of how a study of one aspect of Scottish religious culture can assist the understanding of the transition in Europe from a common but polymorphous religious culture to confessional division.

b. Chronology and naming the period

In 1488 James IV was crowned King of Scots, William Elphinstone was consecrated bishop of Aberdeen and the first printed copy of the Rationale known to have been in Scotland was presented to Aberdeen cathedral. In 1590 Anne of Denmark was crowned Queen of Scots in a Protestant rite and a series of sermons on the Lord’s Supper by Robert Bruce, with extensive interpretation of the Reformed liturgy, were

¹ Margo Todd, The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland (New Haven, 2002), 85.
published in Edinburgh. 1590 was also selected by David George Mullan as the starting point of his important study of ‘Scottish Puritanism’ because it marked the beginning of a change in Scottish religious culture, the ‘pietist turn of the 1590s’, indicated by an increase in Scottish publications on piety.2 The century between these dates has been chosen for this thesis because it is the period within which most of the extant evidence of liturgical interpretation in Scotland is found. It also avoids stopping at the Protestant revolution of 1559-60, an historiographical choice which, while seemingly obvious because of the radical nature of the religious change, hides evidence of continuity. By 1590 most of the significant clerics studied who had been formed in the Catholic Church before 1559 had died and Scottish Roman Catholicism and Protestantism were changing their character. For Scotland, ‘the decade of the 1580s offers the best vantage point from which to assess the gradual disappearance of the world known to those alive in the 1480s’.3

In 1996 Ian Campbell wrote that ‘it surely needs to be asked why, when most branches of Scottish history now regard the period from c.1450 as ‘early renaissance’, its architecture is labelled ‘late medieval’ for almost another century’.4 Since then there has been more appreciation of the ‘renaissance’ character of such architecture but religion in Scotland before 1560 has retained the label ‘late medieval’, even in the best modern scholarship which uses a ‘long sixteenth century’ stretching back into the fifteenth.5 ‘Renaissance Scotland’ has been chosen to describe the period covered by this thesis to emphasise its cultural unity or continuity

despite the radical religious break of 1559-60. The concept ‘renaissance’ is much-debated but it is clearly appropriate to describe a Kingdom which produced the first renaissance coin-portrait outside Italy (on the 1485 James III Scottish groat), saw the composition of the polyphonic masses of Robert Carver, built renaissance buildings, imported and created renaissance art, and had close links with continental humanism, as shown by Erasmus’s dedication of his *Carmen de casa natalitia Jesu* (Paris, 1496?) to Bishop Elphinstone’s collaborator, Hector Boece.

c. Structure

The thesis is in three parts. Part A establishes that there is a tradition and a method in the Latin Church which is given the name ‘liturgical interpretation’. It defines its origins, genre, and history, and shows the importance of the *Rationale* as a compendium of the tradition. Noting the centrality of Augustine’s doctrine of signs, it outlines the theological and philosophical presuppositions of liturgical interpretation and demonstrates its method from an analysis of Durandus’s interpretation of vestments, church building and communion rites. It establishes its importance in the intellectual life of the late medieval and early modern West and briefly examines the decline in interest in liturgical interpretation in the early modern period, its neglect in modern scholarship and the recent revival of interest.

Part B investigates the presence and importance of the ‘Durandus tradition’ in Catholic Scotland between 1488 and 1560 and argues that liturgical interpretation was a fundamental part of Scottish religious culture, with interest in it often being a sign of commitment to Catholic reform. It begins with the study of networks of

---

6 The National Museum of Scotland begins its ‘Renaissance Scotland’ gallery in the 1480s.

scholars interested in liturgical interpretation, principally the ‘Aberdeen liturgists’ who were gathered by Elphinstone after 1488. It then makes thematic studies of education in schools and universities, the formation of clergy and the impact of liturgical interpretation on churches and their furnishings.

Part C aims to discover the place of liturgical interpretation in the programmes of the two reformations in Scotland, Catholic and Protestant, from the start of Archbishop Hamilton’s Catholic Reform in 1549 until the publication of Bruce’s sermons. It examines the nature of Reformed liturgical interpretation, its links with the Catholic version studied in Part B and its distinctive emphases. Comparisons are made with liturgical interpretation in England, Cologne and Geneva. The two chapters are thematic, covering official and controversial texts but there is also an investigation of how the use of the method by Catholic controversialists changed over time. Part C will also ask how the Aberdeen liturgists influenced Hamilton’s Reform, how they indirectly influenced the Protestant writers who attempted to reform their diocese and how long their influence lasted.

2) Historiography
   a. The recovery of rite and symbol

Éamonn Ó Carragáin’s 2005 book, *Ritual and the Rood*, brings together Anglo-Saxon literature (the *Dream of the Rood*) and material culture (the Ruthwell and Brussels crosses) and interprets them in the light of contemporary liturgy. It is an example of a rediscovery of liturgy in some recent academic work which uses pre-modern liturgical culture to integrate disparate disciplines whose methodologies had been forged in the modern world (literary studies, art history, liturgical studies, Anglo-Saxon history), thus transcending the narrowness of modern scholarship. In this method texts and material objects are no longer ‘literature’ or ‘art’ but rather aspects of the symbolic world of the liturgy, for example the two figures breaking a loaf carved on the Ruthwell Cross are not only related to the legend of the meeting of the hermits Paul and Antony but also to a contemporary liturgical custom at Iona and

---

the story of Jesus and the two disciples breaking bread at Emmaus (Luke 24:35). This thesis is also part of this rediscovery of liturgy. Chapter 5 in particular will show how this setting of material objects in the symbolic world of the liturgy is transforming the understanding of medieval churches in the work of architectural historians such as John Onians, Paul Binski and Kees van der Ploeg.

Chapter 1 will show that ‘liturgical interpretation’ was an important part of the world view of early, medieval and renaissance Latin Christianity. It will suggest reasons why it has been neglected in modern scholarship and why, more recently, it has begun to be recovered. One of the latter reasons is the ‘hermeneutical turn’ in modern continental philosophy associated with Georg Gadamer and Paul Ricoeur which has been used by Bridget Nichols and others to construct a ‘liturgical hermeneutics’. This thesis does not engage with such modern theorists but rather seeks to uncover the ancient and medieval methods of interpreting the liturgy (chapter 2) and how they were deployed in renaissance Scotland (chapters 3-7). In doing so it will be a study of the interpretation of the liturgy not of liturgical practice, although a study of Scottish liturgy is to be desired along the lines of Richard Pfaff’s book on England.

There is still no adequate introduction to the genre of ‘liturgical interpretation’ and so chapter 1 attempts to provide one with special emphasis on the history of Latin liturgical commentaries. Many of these are not yet available in critical editions and

---


few have been translated into modern languages (see Bibliography 3). The *Rationale* of Durandus was the most popular liturgical commentary in this period and so has been taken as the basic text, for example in the examination of method in chapter 2, but the thesis is an investigation of the genre as a whole and so liturgical interpretation is studied wherever it is found. Part A is a contribution to the recovery of this important genre as well as the essential ground for the study of liturgical interpretation in Scotland in Parts B and C. The latter has not been done before or even touched upon and so the main body of the thesis is a new study of a virgin area of Scottish history. The only comparable study of any part of Europe is Adolph Franz’s 1902, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter*.

*b. The problem of the Reformation*

The nature of the evidence has determined that this thesis is a study of both Catholic and Protestant reform movements through the lens of liturgical interpretation. One can thus speak of the ‘Scottish reformation’s, as scholars speak of ‘reformations’ elsewhere in Europe.\(^\text{13}\) At the same time their use of liturgical interpretation shows that these movements had much in common and so one may speak of them together as ‘the Scottish Reformation’.\(^\text{14}\) This raises questions about the nature of ‘the Scottish Reformation’, which is still generally held to be a Protestant phenomenon, and sites the thesis in the continuing debate about the Church in Scotland in the ‘long sixteenth century’.\(^\text{15}\)

The first question here concerns the strength of the Catholic Church in Scotland in the decades before 1560. The terminology used here is important. As noted above, to use ‘medieval’ for Catholic Scotland in the decades before 1560 is misleading. It is the legacy of a religious bias which saw Catholic Scotland as corrupt, backward-looking and ready to be overthrown by progressive and enlightened Protestantism,

\(^\text{13}\)As for example in Alec Ryrie, ed., *The European Reformations* (Basingstoke, 2006).


\(^\text{15}\)These questions will be discussed in the conclusion in the light of the results of this research.
and of a cultural bias which viewed Scotland as a backward state on the edges of European civilisation. From the beginning it was in the interest of both Protestants and Catholics to emphasise the weakness of the pre-1560 Scottish Church, to show that it needed replacing or to explain how true religion collapsed so easily. This view has remained remarkably tenacious but there have been tentative suggestions of a more positive view over the past few decades. The close association revealed in this thesis between an interest in liturgical interpretation and commitment to Church Reform, together with the continuing influence of the ‘Aberdeen liturgists’, will enable the strengths of the pre-1560 Scottish Church to be reassessed. This thesis is thus part of a tendency in Scottish historical and cultural studies which uses contemporary evidence to eradicate denominational myths, but there has been no paradigm-shift in Scottish history comparable to that caused by Eamon Duffy’s 1992 *The Stripping of the Altars* for the English Reformation. Many of the materials for a major re-evaluation have been assembled but the seminal work remains to be written. This thesis, which covers similar ground to parts of Duffy’s book but without its denominational slant towards ‘traditional religion’, is a contribution to such Scottish revisionism.

Gordon Donaldson’s *The Scottish Reformation* (Cambridge 1960) marked a turn in Scottish history from the Presbyterian view of the ‘Reformation’ towards serious historical study. It also marked a change of focus from understanding it in religious or theological terms to an analysis in terms of polity and politics. This ‘secular’ emphasis has continued to dominate in general and local studies. In 1994 Michael


Lynch noted that ‘curiously little research has been published on the pre Reformation Church since David McRoberts’s death in 1977’, and that ‘pre-1560 piety remains elusive, largely because of the fragmentary nature of the sources’. Some important works and significant theses on Catholicism and devotion in Scotland before 1560 have appeared since, but the footnotes to this thesis will show that much of the study of pre-1560 Scottish religion is still dependent on the work of McRoberts and his late colleagues in the Scottish Catholic Historical Association such as John Durkan (1914-2006), Leslie Macfarlane (1914-2006) and Mark Dilworth (1924-2004). Historical fashion, the fading of denominational history and the realisation that more can be done with the fragmentary sources has recently produced more interest in the explicitly religious history of the period. Margo Todd’s *Culture of Protestantism* uses social anthropological theories about ritual and sacred space to understand early Scottish Protestantism and uncover continuities with Catholic ritual. Other modern trends such as interest in lay piety and saints’ cults have also produced work on religion in this period, but they tend to stay firmly on one side or the other of 1560.

This thesis is part of this movement in taking religious and theological culture seriously but it also challenges the persistent legacy of denominational history in studying a single theme among both Catholics and Protestants across the events of

---


1559-60. It looks at the religious culture of Scotland before 1559 on its own terms, not seeking for the origins of the Protestant revolution, and then follows one theme from that culture as divisions in the Scottish Christian world harden into separate Churches. The evidence dictates that this is primarily a study of clerical and not lay religion, unlike Fitch’s 2007 study of Scottish devotion 1480-1560 and Todd’s study of Protestant culture. The thesis thus aims to contribute to a better understanding of the Catholic Church in Scotland before 1560 and to a re-thinking of the ‘Scottish Reformation’.

c. The end of a civilisation?
This thesis is similar to David Mullan’s 2000 book, *Scottish Puritanism*, as it is, at least in part, a theologically-informed study of networks of learned clerics; an examination of a theological theme deeply influenced by Augustine; a search for continuities and for commonality between groups usually seen in isolation; a transcending of traditional historiographical and denominational polarities; and a new way of looking at a ‘big date’ (1560 or 1638). Mullan also argues for a change of religious culture in Scotland around the year 1590. While this thesis questions the absolute dominance of 1560 as a barrier in Scottish religious history, it also raises the question of whether a decline in interest in liturgical interpretation is a sign of a significant change in religious culture at about the time suggested by Mullan.

This change is associated with a hardening of Protestant and Roman Catholic confessional identities and the emergence of distinct religious cultures as both sides moved away from their common inheritance in pre-1560 humanist and Catholic reform. The thesis does not engage with the ‘confessionalisation paradigm’ - that would require another work of comparable length - but it will raise the question of the emergence of confessional identities. The study of liturgical interpretation is relevant to the investigation of the continuing use of symbolic communication via texts and material objects, as seen in the continuing popularity in late-sixteenth and seventeenth century Scotland of emblem books, symbolic painted ceilings and even
Protestant religious iconography. A final historical theme to which the thesis will contribute, by studying the Aberdeen liturgists, is the emergence of the distinctive religious culture of North-East Scotland, noted by Donaldson, Mullan, Stevenson and Davidson. The thesis, while tightly focussed on a single theme, liturgical interpretation, will thus contribute to a number of debates in contemporary history.

3) Sources and method
This thesis uses a variety of sources interpreted by a variety of methods but it is held together by the close focus on liturgical interpretation. The sources include anything from Scotland which gives evidence of liturgical interpretation and evidence from outside Scotland that aids the understanding of these Scottish sources. This is the sole principle of selection. Texts include liturgical commentaries; school, university and liturgical books; ecclesial legislative texts; controversial works and sermons on the sacraments or liturgy; and any writing which concerns the liturgy. Material objects include books, churches and their furnishings. As this is a new study of a new subject it was originally feared that there would not be enough evidence to justify a thesis but so many sources were found that, when the best were selected, some had to be left out. One type of source not included is music, for example the liturgical significance of the number ten (the nine choirs of angels + redeemed humanity) in Roberts Carver’s early sixteenth-century ten-part mass based on chant from the feast of St Michael and All Angels.

The main method is the analysis of texts to discern their fundamental ‘grammar’ of liturgical interpretation. The examination of parts of the Rationale in Part A to discern the essential elements of this method or ‘grammar’ requires analysis of the epistemology on which it is based and of its deployment of the methods of medieval scriptural exegesis. Parts B and C use a close reading of a variety of primary sources,


educational, liturgical, official and controversial, to find the author’s method or ‘grammar’ of interpretation. Using the results of this analysis, connections between texts (and authors) are sought to discover genealogies of tradition and, in the case of the different editions of John Major’s commentary on the Sentences, there is also attention to developments within a text.

This is an historical study concerning religious texts, rites and objects, primarily interested in strategies of interpretation (intellectual history). There is thus a hierarchy of method with historical methods at the top. Any literary criticism is used for historical ends and historians’ questions are asked of theologians’ sources. At the same time it is impossible to understand the sources without some mastery of the methods of medieval and early modern theology, philosophy and biblical exegesis (historical theology), liturgiology, book history, architectural history and basic literary analysis.

The analysis is source-led and, as the sources include material objects as well as texts, appropriate methodologies are required. Firstly, as the use and transmission of books is central to this study, it uses some of the methods of the interdisciplinary subject of book history. These include the interpretation of renaissance marginalia, guided by the work of William Sherman, the investigation of how and where books were used and the study of provenance. This is particularly important in chapter 3. Secondly, as liturgy is performance more than text, the study of liturgical interpretation extends beyond the rite to the buildings and objects used for liturgical performance. Such material objects need to be ‘read’ like texts, in the light of the method of liturgical interpretation. This ‘reading’ uses a method deployed in the analysis of churches by some architectural historians, similar to the study of iconography in art history. The ‘grammar’ of symbolism in the objects can be discerned and related to other objects and buildings and to the various methods of interpretation given in texts. With buildings, one way of doing this is to attempt to ‘read’ the building through the eyes of one formed in a type of liturgical interpretation, as will be done in chapter 2.25

In chapters 3, 6 and 7 (and also to a lesser extent 4 and 5) there is a prosopographical analysis of social networks among the writers and book-owners studied, based on shared methods of interpretation, biographies and places of education, kin-relationships, ownership inscriptions in books and shared projects. This is not an application of sociological models of social network analysis but an aspect of evidence-led analysis. In doing this it is important not to impose preconceptions, for example how a Catholic would have thought. It is also important to be attentive to individual voices and their distinctive deployment of rhetorical and hermeneutical strategies. This rejection of preconceived categories such as ‘Protestant’ and ‘Catholic’ is important in the process of overcoming denominational views of the period. Following the results of Margo Todd’s application of a ‘ritual studies’ approach to early Protestant worship in Scotland which emphasised its liturgical character, in Part C Protestant worship and its interpretation will be studied in the same way as Catholic worship.

One general aspect of method is the use of comparison to seek evidence of continuity and change. This can assist the tracing of genealogies of tradition, even when these seem to come from unexpected directions, and it can be related to the social networks mentioned above. One can thus seek evidence of continuity beneath the radical changes of the Reformation and also evidence of change and discontinuity in Catholic views of liturgy. In making these comparisons it is important to view the period as a whole and not see ‘1560’ as an impenetrable barrier, just as it is important not to set up a barrier between ‘Protestant’ and ‘Catholic’. Comparison extends outside Scotland to continental and especially English examples, reflecting the close foreign contacts of Scottish divines. There is a danger in assuming Scotland was like England (in many ways Scotland had closer contacts with France and the Low Countries) but their common Latin Catholic and Reformed cultures mean that English examples can enable one to go beyond the scanty Scottish evidence, as shown in a recent study of pre-1560 monastic formation in Scotland.26

As this is the first study of this subject and, like Ó Carragáin’s book, unites a number of separate disciplines, one can expect it to develop a distinctive method for the study of liturgical interpretation. This will be discussed in the conclusion. The amount of extant evidence demands that this be a study of liturgical interpretation in Scotland alone, but its method could be applied to any western European country.
Part A

Liturgical Interpretation and William Durandus: Genre and Method.
Chapter 1. Liturgical Interpretation and Liturgical Commentaries.

Interpretation of the liturgy was an important mode of discourse in the literature of the early church and through the medieval centuries to the early-modern period. Many commentaries on liturgical rites were written in the Latin West and while a number of these have been translated into modern languages there is, as noted above, no adequate and substantial introduction to liturgical interpretation in English.\(^1\) There is also no generally accepted definition of the genre of liturgical interpretation and so this chapter will provide one by looking at its origins and at the history of the Latin commentaries in which it is found. The decline of interest in this genre in the early modern period and its neglect in modern scholarship will also be examined and reasons for these will be suggested. In the following chapter the method of liturgical interpretation will be described and discussed in detail using the most important medieval commentary, the *Rationale divinorum officiorum* of William Durandus.

1) Liturgy and interpretation.

Christian liturgy is the public worship of the church. In the middle ages it was known by terms such as *officia divina* and *ministerium divinum* while the Greek-derived word *liturgia* (English: ‘liturgy’) only came into general use in the West in the sixteenth century.\(^2\) In the words of the Roman Catholic theologian Cyprian Vagaggini (1909-99) liturgy may be described as: a complexus of verbal and

---

\(^1\) See Bibliography 3 and Introduction, 5.

\(^2\) Where the Septuagint uses λειτουργία and the verb λειτουργέω for the public worship of the Temple in Exodus 28:35, 28:43 and Numbers 4:33, the Vulgate uses officium and ministrare. This usage is also found in the Greek and Vulgate New Testaments, e.g. Luke 1:23, Hebrews 9:21. In the New Testament one can also see the roots of the application of these words to Christian worship, e.g. Acts 13:2, Hebrews 8:2, 8:6, cf. Didache 15:1 (*The Apostolic Fathers*, ed. Kirsopp Lake (London, 1912), i, 330-31). The Latin word *liturgia* is not in the *Glossarium Mediae et Infirmae Latinitatis* of du Cange and the only use recorded in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* is by Augustine, where it is a simple transliteration of the Greek (*In psalmum cxxxv enarratio*, 3; CCSL 40, 1959). A word-search of the entire *Patrologia Latina* revealed that this is the only use of the word in an original text, all other uses of *liturgia* are in the scholarly apparatus. In the Byzantine East the word λειτουργία, while retaining its general sense of ‘service’ and ‘worship’, also came to be used as a technical term for the eucharistic rite.
physical signs ordered to the worship of God and the sanctification of humanity. While liturgy uses words, it is much more than text. The physical signs include material objects and gestures as well as the space within which the rites are performed. Liturgy uses a vocabulary of signs as a means of mediation directed towards the human senses. Such communication operates in two directions: human worship of God is offered through these signs but entry into the symbolic world of the liturgy is a way of effecting that human transformation which Vagaggini calls ‘sanctification’. The signs are often simple in themselves - for example bread means nourishment - but they acquire a complex freight of meaning in the context of Christian Scripture and tradition. To enable fruitful participation, the symbolic nature of liturgy with its different layers of meaning demands an initiation into the meaning of the rites.

a. The origins of liturgical interpretation.

Liturgical interpretation had its origins in the Bible and it is impossible to understand patristic and medieval liturgical interpretation unless it is read in the context of the biblical culture that formed it. The idea of liturgical interpretation, that the external words, material objects and actions of Christian worship have an inner spiritual meaning, was found in the New Testament. Jesus took bread and said, ‘this is my body... do this in remembrance of me’ (Luke 22:19), and Paul said, ‘as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes’ (1 Corinthians 11:23-26). This link was made explicitly by Pseudo-Dionysius (c.500 CE) for whom the actions of Jesus at the Last Supper were an example and justification of the symbolic theology he used to interpret the liturgy. In these scriptural texts worship was related to the passion of Christ, but elsewhere the


emphasis was on the heavenly aspect of liturgy. The Letter to the Hebrews spoke of Jewish worship being according to a heavenly pattern revealed to Moses by God on Mount Sinai (Hebrews 8:5, Exodus 25:40) and Revelation 4-5 presented a celestial Christian liturgy. The objects and actions of Christian worship were also interpreted with regard to the way of life of those who take part; for example Paul, writing to the Corinthians, related the ritual practice of the Lord’s Supper to the duty to avoid idol-worship:

Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread... You cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons (1 Corinthians 10:17, 21).

Another interpretation of the eucharistic bread, again concerning the church, was found in the first-century Didache:

As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains and being gathered together became one, so may your church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into your kingdom.⁵

This mode of interpreting the liturgy is connected to the idea in the New Testament that Scripture (i.e. the Old Testament) had literal and spiritual meanings - ‘the letter kills, but the spirit gives life’ (2 Corinthians 3:6) - as in Paul’s interpretation of the story of Hagar and Sarah: ‘there is an allegory here: these women stand for the two covenants’.⁶ The centre of the spiritual meaning was Christological, as Christ said in the fourth gospel, ‘If you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote of me’ (John 5:46). This distinction between literal and spiritual meanings of the sacred text was fundamental for the early Christian scriptural exegesis which provided the method used in liturgical interpretation.

⁵ Didache 9:4, Apostolic Fathers, i, 322-23.

⁶ Galatians 4:21-31. This passage was foundational for Christian spiritual exegesis, Henri de Lubac, Medieval Exegesis: The Four Senses of Scripture, 3 vols [of 4] (Grand Rapids, 1998-2009), i, 1-9. The quotation from 2 Corinthians may actually indicate the contrast between the written law of the old covenant and the unwritten law of the Spirit in the new but in Christian history it was usually understood of the two levels of meaning of Scripture, Medieval Exegesis i, 19-27, as Augustine discovered from Ambrose, Confessions V.xiv (24), VI.iv (6) (CCSL 27, 71, 77).
All the basic aspects of Christian liturgical interpretation were thus present from the beginning: it was based on the methods of Biblical spiritual exegesis; it included literal interpretation and a spiritual interpretation primarily related to: a) the life of Christ and the mysteries of faith (allegory); b) our heavenly destiny (eschatology); c) our moral life (tropology). Modern scholars have often made a distinction between typology (good) and allegory (bad) in discussing liturgical interpretation.7 This distinction in Christian exegesis was formulated by the Lutheran theologian Johann Gerhard (1582-1637) and popularised in the middle of the twentieth century by the Roman Catholic theologian Jean Daniélou, but it reflected modern theological sensibilities and had no basis in Scripture or the writings of the early church.8 In studying pre-modern liturgical interpretation it is better to follow patristic and medieval ways of exegesis and not impose an alien schema.

From the foundation of the church liturgical interpretation was passed on and practiced, as in the example from the Didache, but there were also simple descriptions of liturgical rites such as those found in Justin Martyr and Egeria.9 A distinction between mere description and literal and spiritual interpretation of rites can be made. As the method of liturgical interpretation comes from early Christian exegesis, it was rooted in the application to Scripture of classical reading practices.10 It was, however, in the late fourth century genre of mystagogical catechesis that the proximate origins of a book-genre of liturgical commentary based on liturgical interpretation are found. Μυστάγωγία (mystagogia), derived from the Greek verb μυέω (to initiate into the mysteries) and related to μυστήριον (mystery), means ‘an

7 For example Rorem, Medieval Development, 30-33; Enrico Mazza, The Celebration of the Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of its Interpretation (Collegeville, 1999), 161.
9 Justin Martyr, First Apology, 61, 67 (SC 507, 288-92, 308-12); Peregrinatio Aëtheriae, 24-49 (SC 296, 242-318).
initiation into the mysteries’, and in early Christian usage it can mean either ‘the performance of a sacred action’, usually the sacraments of Christian initiation (baptism, chrismation and the eucharist), or ‘an oral or written explanation of the mystery hidden in Scripture and celebrated in the liturgy’. It is primarily in the latter sense that mystagogical catecheses, such as the De sacramentis and De mysteriis of Ambrose in the West and the homilies of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia in the East, explained the liturgy for those who had been recently baptised.

Theodore defined his work as mystagogue in these words:

> Every sacrament consists in the representation of unseen and unspeakable things through signs and emblems - such things require explanation and interpretation.

His main method of interpretation was to relate the parts of the liturgy to the events of the passion. This is again rooted in the New Testament, as Paul said:

> Do you not know that all of us who have been baptised into Christ Jesus were baptised into his death? Therefore we have been buried with him by baptism into death so that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we too might walk in newness of life.

In addition to its scriptural basis, Robert Taft has argued that this method was also rooted in the topographical system of passion symbolism of the Jerusalem liturgy, described by Egeria, which was constructed around the sacred sites. Concerning his method of interpretation, Theodore wrote:

---

12 Enrico Mazza, Mystagogy (New York, 1989); Edward Yarnold, The Awe-Inspiring Rites of Initiation: The Origins of the RCIA (Collegeville, 1994).
14 Romans 6:3-4.
In contemplating with our eyes, through faith, the facts that are now being re-enacted – that he is again dying, rising and ascending into heaven – we shall be led to the vision of the things that had taken place beforehand on our behalf.\textsuperscript{16}

His dominant method was thus the same historical-Christological allegory used by Paul in Romans 6: the liturgy allows one to participate in the saving events.\textsuperscript{17} Another key aspect of method was revealed here at the origins of the genre: not only is liturgical interpretation found in the Bible, the liturgy is also interpreted in the same way as the Bible. Taft writes:

‘Mystagogy is to liturgy what exegesis is to scripture; it is no wonder that the commentators on the liturgy used a method inherited from the older tradition of biblical exegesis’.\textsuperscript{18}

The methods of exegesis used were those with which the mystagogues were familiar and thus liturgical interpretation must be understood in the context of contemporary biblical culture.

\textit{b. Interpretation, genre and method}

The genre of liturgical interpretation has two parts, a type of treatise and a type of writing. The work of the mystagogues may be seen as the first steps towards a distinct genre of treatises commenting on the liturgy (book genre) and there is also a distinct style or genre of writing about the liturgy (literary genre), found in these treatises and elsewhere, which interprets it using contemporary methods of scriptural exegesis. Accurate terminology is required for both the book genre and the literary genre. For the first the title ‘liturgical commentary’ is taken for granted in, for


\textsuperscript{17} Theodore also looks forward to eschatological fulfilment, \textit{On the Lord's Prayer}, 71-3, 82-5. Theodore’s liturgical interpretation is usually called historical or Christological ‘typology’, for example Rorem, \textit{Pseudo-Dionysius}, 120, Andrew Louth, \textit{Denys the Areopagite} (London, 2002), 116, but in the light of criticism of the allegory/typology distinction it is best described as historical-Christological allegory.

\textsuperscript{18} Taft, ‘Liturgy of the Great Church’, 59. Cf also Paul Meyendorff, \textit{St Germanus of Constantinople on the Divine Liturgy} (Crestwood, 1984), 24, ‘the mystagogues found a ready method for their commentaries [on the liturgy] in the long standing tradition of biblical exegesis, for already in the New Testament, Scripture is seen as having a literal and a spiritual meaning’.
example, the surveys of the genre by René Bornert and Roger Reynolds.\(^{19}\) That Reynolds uses ‘treatise on the liturgy’ in the title of his article for the same genre indicates that there is a certain terminological imprecision. A look at the titles of Latin liturgical commentaries suggests another possible title for the genre, ‘liturgical exposition’.\(^{20}\) Adolph Franz devoted the second part of his important 1902 work, *Die Messe im Deutschen Mittelalter*, to a study of medieval Latin *Messerklärungen* (explanations of the mass), which he also calls *Messauslegungen* (interpretations of the mass).\(^{21}\) The term *Liturgieauslegung* is less common in German, but as the liturgical commentaries discussed by Franz often explained other parts of the liturgy besides the Mass, the term ‘liturgical interpretation’ may be used in English for the style of writing.\(^{22}\) This style of writing is called by some commentators ‘liturgical allegory’, although this only applies to one aspect of interpretation and sometimes has a negative implication.\(^{23}\) To avoid confusion the more neutral title ‘liturgical commentary’ will be employed for the book-genre and the term ‘liturgical interpretation’ used for the literary genre and its distinctive method.\(^{24}\) The latter is a better description of the epistemological depth of the method than ‘liturgical exposition’ or ‘explanation’.

---


20 *Expositio* is used in the titles of works by Florus of Lyons, Hildebert of Le Mans, Hugh of St Cher, Denys the Carthusian, Gabriel Biel and Johannes Bechoffen, among others (Bibliography 3). Western commentaries are described as ‘liturgical expositions’ by Paul Rorem, *Pseudo-Dionysius*, 124.

21 Franz, *Die Messe*, viii-ix. *Auslegung* is used by German Biblical scholars for a broader, more interpretative type of exegesis than that indicated by the word *Exegese*, thus *Messauslegung* is better translated ‘interpretation of the mass’ rather than ‘exegesis of the mass’, although the latter is a valid English translation.

22 ‘Liturgical interpretation’ recalls the title of the most popular Byzantine commentary, the Ἑρμηνεία τῆς θείας Λειτουργίας (‘Interpretation of the divine liturgy’) of Nicholas Cabasilas. ‘Liturgical exegesis’ is another possible term but ‘interpretation’ better preserves the distinction in the previous footnote.


As seen from the indications of the contents of liturgical commentaries in Bibliography 3, they discussed almost all liturgical acts although many concentrated on only one. There was a series of major Latin commentaries which each covered most of the elements of medieval liturgy including those by Isidore, Amalarius, Rhabanus Maurus, Walfrid Strabo, Honorius, Hugh of St Victor, Sicard of Cremona and William Durandus. The audience for these was primarily clerical, not the lay audience of mystagogical catechesis.  

The survey of this literature by Roger Reynolds identified four different modes of interpretation used in the commentaries:

1) rubrical - a simple description of the rite.
2) historical - an account of its origins.
3) etymological - explaining the act on the basis of words used to describe it.
4) theological and moral - within which he distinguishes: a) allegorical; b) anagogical; c) spiritual; d) mystical; e) tropological; and, f) moral.

The distinction between ‘description’ and ‘interpretation’ already noted is present here. As the original method of liturgical interpretation was based on that of contemporary Biblical exegesis, a better working structure for this study is provided by rearranging these categories according to the quadripartite division of scriptural interpretation used in medieval exegesis. Whereas the patristic distinction of literal and spiritual exegesis was primarily based on the method used, the medieval quadripartite distinction was primarily based on content, for example tropological exegesis could be either literal or spiritual. It was summed up in the distich of Durandus’s contemporary, the Danish Dominican, Augustine of Dacia:

*Littera gesta docet, quid credas allegoria; moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia.*

---

25 Medieval translations of the *Rationale* of Durandus into French, German and Spanish imply some lay readership for these commentaries (although they could also have been for nuns) and liturgical interpretation was mediated to the laity by sermons, manuals and educational texts.

26 ‘The letter teaches what was done; allegory what you should believe; the moral sense what you should do; anagogy where you are going’, Augustine of Dacia (d.1282), *Rotulus pugillaris*, 1; A. Walz, ed., ‘Augustini de Dacia OP: *Rotulus pugilarius*, Angelicum 6 (1929), 256; A Vaccari, ‘*Auctor versuum de quatuor Scripturae sensibus*’, *Verbum Domini* 9 (1929), 212-14; Reynolds, ‘Treatises on
On this basis medieval liturgical interpretation included:

1) The literal sense, divided into:
   a) description of the liturgy,
   b) literal interpretation, including history and etymology.

2) The spiritual sense, divided into:
   a) allegorical interpretation (including Christological allegory),
   b) anagogical or eschatological interpretation,
   c) tropological or moral interpretation.

This way of defining modes of liturgical interpretation according to the principles of the quadripartite method of scriptural exegesis was explicitly mentioned by Amalarius, who took it from Bede’s commentary on the Old Testament Tabernacle, and also by Durandus whose use of it in his *Rationale* will be analysed in the next chapter.²⁷ Schnusenberg even argues that for Amalarius ‘the fourfold senses are not merely an external tool for the exegete or the liturgist but they are constitutive of creation itself’.²⁸ This methodological division became commonplace by the sixteenth century, as shown in the title of Johannes Bechoffen’s popular work of 1505, *Quadruplex missalis expositio: Litteralis scilicet: Allegorica: Tropologica: et Anagogica*.

²⁷ Amalarius, *Liber Officialis*, 1.19.2-16 (*Amalarii opera*, ii, 114-120), where he takes the fourfold exegesis from Bede’s *De tabernaculi et vasis eius*, 1.1.6; Durandus, *Rationale*, Preface 9-12. Christina Schnusenberg, *The Relationship between the Church and the Theatre, Exemplified by Selected Writings of the Church Fathers and by Liturgical Texts until Amalarius of Metz, 775-852 A.D.* (New York, 1988), 210, 228, claims that Amalarius was the first Western writer to apply this quadripartite exegesis to the liturgy.

²⁸ Schnusenberg, *Church and Theatre*, 215, with reference to Amalarius, *Liber Officialis*, 4.3.18-19 (*Amalarii opera*, ii, 419), ‘There we find the majesty of the Lord, how the uncircumscribed contains all things in himself... heaven, earth and sea and all things which are in them; in these there is not lacking the historical sense, the allegorical, the tropological, the anagogical’.
The similarity between liturgical interpretation and contemporary scriptural exegesis can also be seen where different commentators emphasised different aspects of method in their commentaries and wrote in a conscious tradition of interpretation. Apart from texts by original writers such as Amalarius of Metz and Bernold of Constance, ‘the vast majority of commentaries are largely repetitive, amassing layer upon layer of previous commentary on various cultic acts’.29 Durandus wrote in this synthetic manner which he derived from the development of the genre.

2) The genre of liturgical commentary

a. Pseudo-Dionysius: The first liturgical commentary

Although liturgical interpretation was developed in fourth and fifth century mystagogical catechesis, the seminal work for the book-genre was De ecclesiastica hierarchica of Pseudo-Dionysius (c. 500) which interpreted the rites of baptism, the eucharist, the consecration of myron, ordination, monastic profession and funerals.30 Although the authorship of the Dionysian corpus was disputed in the sixth century, from then until the fifteenth century the author was universally believed to be Paul’s Athenian convert (Acts 17:34) and this was not definitively refuted until the end of the nineteenth century. This gave the genre apostolic authority for many clerics and scholars during the period studied in this thesis, but the denial of first-century authorship by Lorenzo Valla (d. 1457), publicised by Erasmus, may have contributed to the suspicion of this genre among humanists.31

Dionysius deployed the methods of contemporary Biblical exegesis to interpret the liturgy; for example he used the same term, θεωρία (contemplation), to describe the inner meaning of the rites which Origen, Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia

29 Reynolds, ‘Treatises on Liturgy’, 625

30 ‘The influence of this Dionysian treatise was not so much in its contents... as in its format as a liturgical commentary. Just as the genre of biblical commentary has its own history as a form of literature, so too can scholars trace the history of liturgical commentaries’, Rorem, Pseudo-Dionysius, 118.

all used for the deeper meaning of Scripture. A novelty in the Dionysian method, however, was to relate rites to eternal truths in the context of a Neoplatonist system of procession from and return to the One, rather than to events in the life of Christ as Paul and Theodore had done. For Dionysius, even holy communion symbolised participation in the One rather than communion with Christ and his passion. This ‘timeless allegory’, can, although the Dionysian corpus is explicitly Christian, be compared to Neoplatonic theurgy as found in the *De mysteriis* of Iamblichus (c. 250-330). The Dionysian interpretation of the Bible and the liturgy was part of an ascent of the soul through perceptible symbols to their conceptual meanings and ultimately beyond all concepts to union with God who is beyond all knowledge. Material symbols and their interpretation were thus only a stage on the way.

Paul Rorem argues that the influence of this ahistorical method on later liturgical interpretation was limited, and it may rather be found not in allegory but in anagogical interpretations and in personal mysticism. The Dionysian corpus as a whole was central to the development of the Western mystical tradition. It was first translated into Latin in 827 by Hilduin of St Denis and a better translation was later done by John Scotus Eriugena (c. 815–877). Andrew Louth has claimed that the Latin West misread the Dionysian corpus by believing that it was mainly concerned with the individual ascent of the soul to God, whereas for Dionysius this ascent is always made through the symbols of the sacramental economy. Even the

---


34 Iamblichus’ method was based on a triad of types of worship: materialist; an intermediate use of perceptible phenomena as symbols; a perfect independence of matter. The intermediate form of worship is similar to the outlook of Christian liturgical interpretation. Dionysius makes frequent use of the word *theourgia* but one should not presume he means the same as the Neoplatonists, Louth, *Denys*, 13, 73-4.

35 ‘It is by way of the perceptible images that we are uplifted to as far as we can to the contemplation of what is divine’, Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, 1.2 (PG 3.373B).


38 Louth, *Denys*, 101-09.
description of Moses’ ascent of Mount Sinai in the *Mystical Theology* was presented in liturgical language and followed the shape of the eucharistic rite. Dionysius wrote in Greek and the genre of liturgical commentary developed on parallel lines in the Christian East and West. Only the Latin tradition, however, will be examined in this thesis as this was the tradition used in Scotland.

*b. Liturgical interpretation in the Latin West to Amalarius of Metz*

Although Latin liturgical interpretation begins with the fourth-century mystagogical texts of Ambrose of Milan, the seminal works of liturgical commentary are those of Isidore of Seville (d. 636). He drew on earlier patristic and canonical sources to produce the first Latin liturgical commentary, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, which commented on the office, mass, calendar, holy orders, monastic initiation and baptism. He also wrote the *Etymologiae* which examined the same liturgical topics in books six and seven from historical and allegorical perspectives as well as using etymology. These were widely read in the middle ages and had a great influence on later commentaries, especially their recurring emphasis on the meaning of words. After Isidore there were few other commentaries on the liturgy written until the Carolingian liturgical renewal. A significant composition was the *Expositio brevis antiquae liturgiae gallicanae* (c.700), falsely attributed to Germanus of Paris (c.500-76) but dependent on Isidore. This used the method of historical-Christological allegory associated with Theodore of Mopsuestia which was to be developed by Amalarius of Metz and remained central for the Latin tradition.

The Carolingian renaissance of the late eighth and early ninth centuries led to a renewed interest in exegesis. It was thus not surprising that the contemporary liturgical reforms, with their accompanying directives to know and understand the liturgy, produced a large number of commentaries on liturgical rites. Jungmann

---

40 The best study of the Greek commentaries is Bornert, *Commentaires byzantins*.
attributed the development of allegorical commentaries on the mass in the West in this period to the lack of comprehension of Latin and the process by which many of the prayers of the mass were said inaudibly so that the congregation could not hear.\textsuperscript{42} This is not, however, adequate as the commentaries were directed to a Latin-speaking clerical audience who were involved in liturgical performance. A better reason is simply the desire to understand the liturgy more deeply using the intellectual resources available.

The most influential Carolingian liturgical commentaries were produced by Amalarius of Metz (c.775-850), a pupil of Alcuin.\textsuperscript{43} His system of liturgical interpretation was explicitly based on contemporary scriptural exegesis, especially allegory, and on the theory of signs in Augustine’s \textit{De doctrina Christiana}.\textsuperscript{44} It is therefore right to say that for Amalarius liturgy was:

\begin{quote}
A complex arrangement of meaningful signs, some verbal, some nonverbal, all pointing to a historical, allegorical, tropological or eschatological reality beyond the immediate sensory perception of liturgical ceremony.\textsuperscript{45}
\end{quote}

Other contemporary commentators included Rhabanus Maurus (c.780-856) and his pupil Walafred Strabo (c.808-49), whose \textit{Liber de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum} used a predominantly historical (literal) method. This method was also used in the commentaries of the Lyonese clerics, bishop Agobard (779-840) and deacon Florus (c.810-60), who both attacked the allegorical method of Amalarius. As Amalarius had been made administrator of Lyons after bishop Agobard was forced into exile for opposing the Emperor, there were probably political as well as theological reasons for this dispute.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[42]{Jungmann, \textit{Mass of the Roman Rite}, i, 86.}
\footnotetext[43]{His works are collected in Hanssens, \textit{Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica omnia}. His most important work, the \textit{Liber officialis}, is extant in over 60 manuscripts.}
\footnotetext[44]{Amalarius explicitly stated that his method of liturgical interpretation was based on that in \textit{De doctrina Christiana}, \textit{Liber Officialis}, Preface 5 (Amalarii opera, ii, 20-21); Schnusenberg, \textit{Church and Theatre}, 195.}
\footnotetext[45]{Mary Alberi, review of Schnusenberg, \textit{Church and Theatre}, in \textit{Speculum} 65.3 (1990), 752-754, at 752.}
\end{footnotes}
The substance of the charge against Amalarius at the Synod of Quiercy in 838 was innovation in allegorical interpretation. Florus complained that he acted,

As though to him alone it had been given to establish mystical and allegorical meaning in the church, so that one who presumes to celebrate anything with simple and customary practice would be deemed a falsifier of the mysteries.  

Amalarius certainly did make creative use of allegorical interpretation, but it was the development of an existing method and he also used the other main modes of liturgical interpretation described above. This dispute may be seen as one within the tradition of liturgical interpretation concerning the limits of creativity and the relative importance of the modes of interpretation rather than as a conflict between liturgical interpretation and bare historical analysis.

Despite being condemned by this Synod, the method of Amalarius became immensely popular. The Liber officialis exists in over sixty manuscripts, Amalarius was quoted by Walafrid and almost all subsequent Latin liturgical interpreters, and his works were widely disseminated. Aspects of his interpretation of the mass entered two of the most important medieval texts, Gratian’s Decretum and Peter Lombard’s Sentences, and his commentaries were reissued in edited versions such as the eleventh century Liber quare and the Abbreviatio Amalarii of William of Malmesbury (c.1090-1143). Paul Rorem described Amalarius’s method as ‘bursting into full flower with little or no family tree’, but he was certainly formed in methods of exegesis by Alcuin. He was also probably influenced by Byzantine liturgical theology during his long visit to Constantinople in 813, as Florus claimed at Quiercy, and also by the works of Pseudo-Dionysius, which were put into Latin before the third edition of the Liber officialis by his fellow-student at the school of Alcuin, Hilduin of St Denis.  

46 Florus of Lyons, quoted in Allen Cabaniss, Amalarius of Metz (Amsterdam, 1954), 88.
47 See Bibliography 3 and chapter 2, page 69.
49 Schnusenberg, Church and Theatre, 176, 228; Rorem, Medieval Development, 25. Parts of two other Greek liturgical commentaries, the Mystagogia of Maximus the Confessor and the Ecclesiastical
The elements of Latin liturgical interpretation were thus all present in the Carolingian period: the main modes of interpretation taken from contemporary scriptural exegesis; a special interest in Christological allegory; an attention to etymology; an interest in the whole liturgical complexus; and the genre of liturgical commentary. Subsequent writings were simply a development of this tradition. The disputes about the Amalarian method reveal two perennial tendencies within this tradition, the allegorical and the historical, which came into conflict again in the sixteenth century.

c. Latin commentaries after Amalarius
After Amalarius there were many Latin commentaries on the liturgy, listed in Bibliography 3, mostly following his emphasis on allegory. The historical method of Walafrid and Florus was integrated with some allegorical interpretation in tenth-eleventh century works such as the *Expositio missae* of Remigius of Auxerre, the *Liber de divinis officiis* of Pseudo-Alcuin, the *Libellus* of Berno of Reichenau, the *Libellus de sacramentis* of Bonizio of Sutri and the *Micrologus* of Bernold of Constance. The popular *Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis* of the Paris Master John Beleth, written c.1160, also integrated historical and etymological interpretation with allegory. While modern liturgists have tended to prefer the historical method, the number of extant manuscripts shows that the Amalarian method was then more popular. Works in this style from the twelfth century include the sermons of Ivo of Chartres - parts of which entered the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard - the *De divinis officiis* of Rupert of Deutz, the *Gemma animae* of Honorius Augustodunensis, the *De sacramentis* of Hugh of St Victor, the *Speculum animae* of Pseudo-Hugh of St Victor and the *Mitrale* of Sicard of Cremona, a large and popular ‘summa’ of liturgical interpretation. Lothar of Segni (Pope Innocent III) wrote a widely disseminated commentary on the mass, the *De missarum mysteriis*, which concentrated on

*History* of Patriarch Germanus were translated into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius (c. 810-c. 878), but this was after the death of Amalarius, Deno J. Geanakoplos, ‘Some Aspects of the Influence of the Byzantine Maximos the Confessor on the Theology of East and West’, *Church History*, 38.2 (1969), 150-163.

50 Extant in over 180 manuscripts and first printed in 1533.

51 There are over 230 manuscripts of Hugh’s *De sacramentis*. 
Christological allegory and was used by most later commentators. Given that all commentators integrated the modes of interpretation in different proportions, it is best to see liturgical interpretation as one method rather than trying to discern between predominantly historical and predominantly allegorical commentaries.

This rich tradition and method of liturgical interpretation was rooted in central themes of patristic and medieval theology. The incarnation of God in Christ and the sacramental system that flowed from it provided the basic epistemological principle for all liturgical interpretation which rose above the literal sense. In the incarnation, sacraments and liturgy God speaks to humanity about divine reality in the only way it can hear, through symbols. Anthropologically the embodied human person is a creature designed to attain divine truth through symbols. The method is thus grounded in what Denys Turner describes as ‘a view of the created world common to nearly all forms of medieval Platonism: creation is, above all, to be understood as a ‘symbol’. As an epistemological principle, this is extended from the natural to the supernatural sphere so that Hugh of St Victor can write:

It is impossible to represent things invisible except by means of things visible; all theology necessarily must therefore make use of visible representations in the showing forth of the invisible.

This was true of natural theology but it is even more obvious ‘in the sacraments of grace and the flesh of the Word’. For Hugh and other liturgical commentators this was not just an aspect of theological method, it was a consequence of creation and the human way of knowing that ‘nothing invisible is capable of being described or known otherwise than in and through the representations of the visible’.

---


53 See chapter 2, pages 72-73.


55 Hugh, *In Hierarchiam Coelestem S. Dionysii Areopagitar*ae, 1.1. (PL 175.926D).

56 Hugh, *In Hierarchiam Coelestem S. Dionysii Areopagitar*ae, 1.1. (PL 175.927A).

Jungmann speaks of a crisis of allegorical liturgical interpretation in the thirteenth century caused by an epistemological shift from this Platonism to Aristotelianism, from seeing things as signs pointing to a higher meaning to studying the world of sense for its own sake.  

58 Albert the Great (1193/1206-1280) made a number of attacks on allegorical interpretation in his commentary on the mass, De sacrificio missae, for example saying that interpreting the kissing of the altar at the supplices in the canon as the traitorous kiss of Judas is ‘totally irreverent and to be abhorred by all the faithful’.  

59 This remained, however, a minority view and was again part of a dispute within the tradition. The ‘Platonist’ symbolic epistemology survived. As will be seen in chapter 4, the presence of liturgical commentary in the basic textbook of scholastic theology, the Sentences of Peter Lombard, meant that liturgical interpretation can be found in the commentaries on the Sentences and in the Summae of most scholastic theologians, for example in the Summa Theologiae of Thomas Aquinas (3a 83).  

60 There were, however, also dedicated treatises on liturgical interpretation, such as the Expositio missae of the Dominican Hugh of St Cher (d. 1263), and the thirteenth century also produced the definitive summary of previous tradition, the Rationale divinorum officiorum of Durandus of Mende.

d. William Durandus and his place in the tradition.

William Durandus the elder (c.1230-1296) was born at Puimisson in Languedoc.  

61 He received a doctorate in canon law from Bologna and entered the papal curia in the mid-1260s. For over twenty years he fulfilled many important offices in the papal

58 Jungmann, Mass of the Roman Rite, i, 113.

59 ‘omnino profanum est et omnibus fidelibus abominandum’, De sacrificio missae, 3.15.2 (Albert the Great, Opera Omnia, ed. Auguste Borgnet [Paris, 1890-99], xxxviii, 1-165, at 130).

60 Chapter 4, pages 141-44.

61 This follows the chronology given in Gy, Guillaume Durand, 25-6. His epitaph gives his name as Guilielmus Duranti but Durandus is also found in the medieval sources. Modern Anglophone scholars such as Thibodeau and Reynolds follow the French custom of using the form ‘Durand’, but the form ‘Durandus’, common among German scholars, is retained here because it was utilised in sixteenth century printed editions, is the traditional version in English used by Neale & Webb and Passmore and by some modern scholars such as Andrea Denny-Brown and, perhaps most importantly, it is more euphonious in English. Andrea Denny-Brown, ‘Old Habits Die Hard: Vestimentary Change in William Durandus’s Rationale Divinorum Officiorum’, Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies 39:3 (2009), 545-70. Thibodeau, The Rationale of William Durand of Mende (New York, 2007), 107, n.1.
administration, including being present at the second council of Lyons (1274) and having a major part in editing its decrees. In April 1285 he was elected bishop of Mende and resided in his see from July 1291 to September 1295. In 1294 his friend Benedetto Gaetani become Pope Boniface VIII and, when Durandus refused the Archdiocese of Ravenna, he recalled him to the papal states to govern the March of Ancona and the Romagna and raise an army to suppress an anti-papal Ghibelline rebellion. He failed and returned to Rome where he died on the feast of All Saints 1296, being buried in a splendid tomb by Giovanni di Cosma in Santa Maria sopra Minerva. His effigy is under a mosaic of St Dominic and the Madonna and child, to whom Durandus is being presented by Saint Privatus of Mende, and among his achievements the inscription mentions his authorship of the Rationale. He was succeeded in his diocese by his nephew, William Durandus the younger (1296-1328).

Durandus the elder’s literary work falls into two parts, legal and liturgical, both of which had great influence. Between 1271 and 1276 he completed the Speculum iudicale (‘the judicial mirror’) which is a clear explanation of procedure in secular and ecclesiastical courts. It became so popular in the courts and universities, as the number of extant manuscripts bears witness, that it gained for Durandus the title ‘Speculator’. His other major canonical works were the Breviarium aureum (Repertorium iuris canonici), a collection of legal opinions on disputed cases, and his commentary on the Council of Lyons which Boniface VIII included in the Liber Sextus (the sixth book of the decretals of the corpus iuris canonici).

When in Mende, he took his pastoral duties seriously and produced the Instructiones et Constitutiones (1292-3, revised in 1294-5), synodal statutes that formed a liturgico-canonical compendium to assist the formation of priests; he also produced

64 Repertorium aureum iuris canonici (Frankfurt, 1592). In sacrosanctum Lugdunense concilium sub Gregorio X, Giulemi duranti... Commentarius (Fano, 1569). Martin Bertram, ‘Le commentaire de Guillaume Durand sur les constitutions du deuxième concile de Lyon’, in Gy, Guillaume Durand, 95-104.
an edition of the pontifical (1292-5), the liturgical book of episcopal services, which was the direct ancestor of the Pontificale Romanum (1485) promulgated, with minor revisions, for the whole Roman Catholic Church by Pope Clement VIII in 1595. For the ordering of the services in his cathedral at Mende he revised the Ordinarium Ecclesiae Mimatensis (1291-3) and during his time as bishop he completed the Rationale divinorum officiorum. This is an explanation of the sacred rites, places and times of the Western Christian liturgy and is a synthesis of previous interpretation just as the Speculum is a synthesis of previous writings on legal procedure. It was circulating in its first redaction by 1286, reached its final form between 1294 and 1296, was transmitted in the universities by the pecia system and was the most copied liturgical treatise of the later middle ages with about 300 extant manuscripts. In 1459 at Mainz it was the fourth book to be printed in movable type and the first by a post-Biblical author; there were over 100 printed editions between 1459 and 1635, of which 45 were printed before 1501. One can compare this with two popular pastoral manuals from the high middle ages: the Manipulus curatorum is extant in 180 manuscripts and 119 pre-1501 editions and the Stella clericorum in 450 manuscripts and 59 printed editions.

The title of the Rationale divinorum officiorum revealed its subject. This is the divina officia, the ‘divine offices’, the liturgy or public worship of the church in all its aspects, and this defines it as a liturgical commentary. These words in the title were


traditional in liturgical interpretation, used for example in the title of the work by Remigius of Auxerre and similar to the *ecclesiastica officia* in the title of the liturgical commentary by Isidore of Seville. *Officium* meant a ceremonial observance in classical times and by the middle ages *divina officia* had a variety of liturgical meanings: any divine service, mass, the liturgical hours, prayer for the dead or sacred vessels and furnishings.\(^6^9\) The words thus covered the whole complexus of verbal and physical signs ordered to the worship of God and the sanctification of humanity which was the medieval Latin liturgy. The contents of the book are an interpretation in eight books of the various aspects of this complexus. Durandus was aware of much variety, allowed by law, in how the liturgy is carried out in different places. His aim, however, was to interpret ‘the rites that are more common and more ordinary’, something that gave his work its universal popularity.\(^7^0\) The books of the *Rationale* concern:

1) churches and their furnishings, consecrations and sacraments;
2) the orders of ministry;
3) vestments;
4) the order of mass;
5) the daily office;
6) the temporal cycle of the liturgical year and feasts of the Lord;
7) feasts of saints;
8) computation of the calendar.

The subject of the work was thus the entire *divina officia*, sacred rites, sacred time, sacred objects used in the rites and even sacred space in the sense of the places consecrated for the performance of sacred rites. Durandus’s method of interpretation will be examined in the next chapter but, as the *Rationale* was a digest of a tradition of interpretation, it used the same modes of interpretation noted above and was explicit about interpreting the liturgy using the fourfold method of scriptural

\(^6^9\) J.F. Niermeyer, *Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus* (Leiden, 1976), 737-8, ‘*officium*’.

\(^7^0\) ‘*Non enim uniuscuiusque loci specialia, sed communes atque usitatores ritus hic prosequimur qui communem non particularum doctrinam tradere laboramus*’, *Rationale*, Preface 13-14.
exegesis. The work is clearly part of a living tradition as in many places Durandus quoted from earlier authors and then went on to provide his own interpretations using the same method. He stated that its purpose was that:

The priests and prelates of the church, to whom it has been given to know these mysteries, as Luke testifies, who are the bearers and dispensers of the sacraments, must understand these sacraments and shine with the virtues they represent so that through their light, others may be similarly illumined.\(^{71}\)

The audience of the *Rationale* was therefore clerical. Like the *Instructiones et Constitutiones* it was part of a programme of clergy education, but its purpose was broader as the ‘illumination’ given by those formed in its method implied teaching and catechesis. Liturgical interpretation is indeed found in sermons and catechetical material for the laity and chapter 4 will explore its use in education.

e. Liturgical interpretation after Durandus

Although Durandus dominated the market for liturgical interpretation, works continued to be produced such as the fifteenth/sixteenth century *De canonum observantia liber* of Radulphus de Rivo, the *Expositio missae* of Denys the Carthusian, the *Canonis missae expositio* of Gabriel Biel, the *Quadruplex missalis expositio* of Johannes Bechoffen and the *Elucidatorium ecclesiasticum ad officium ecclesiae pertinentia* of Josse van Clichtove. One tendency in commentaries from this period was to try to reduce the many-layered symbolism to one system, whether this is the passion or the life of Christ in ‘40 works’ or ‘33 years’.\(^{72}\) This reduction of a method to a system may be seen as a sign of the decline of liturgical interpretation, as Taft does:

---

\(^{71}\) ‘Sacerdotes igitur et prelati Ecclesie, quibus datum est nosse mysteria, prout in Luca habetur, et sacramentorum portiores, et dispensatores existunt, sacramenta intelligere et a virtutibus que per illa significantur fulgere debent, ut ex eorum luce ceteri similiter illuminentur.’ *Rationale*, Prologue 3 (Luke 8:10).

\(^{72}\) The passion system is very common, for example it is used in Thomas Watson’s *Holsome and Catholyke Doctryne Concernyng the Seven Sacraments of Chrystes Churche* (1558). Franz, *Die Messe*, 609-10 (a mass-commentary from the Abbey of Andechs), 675 (Sermon 79 of the *Sermones dominicales* [1498] of Michael of Hungary).
The problem of later medieval liturgical allegory consists not in the multiplicity of systematically layered symbols, such as we find here and in patristic exegesis. The later one-symbol-per-object correspondence results not from the tidying up of an earlier incoherent primitiveness, but from the decomposition of the earlier patristic mystery-theology into a historicizing system of dramatic narrative allegory.\textsuperscript{73}

It may, however, also be a sign of its success, a sign that a complex clerical mode of thinking is being simplified and repackaged for popular devotion and clerical education. In the later middle ages liturgical interpretation was used in popular catechetical works and sermons, for example the \textit{Meditations} of William Bonde in England and the German examples studied by Franz.\textsuperscript{74} This will be explored in chapters 4 and 6. Other examples of the method’s popularity include the image of the ‘Mass of St Gregory’, which gives visible expression to the idea of the mass as passion-drama, and the \textit{De tristitia Christi} of Thomas More, an allegorical meditation on the passion rooted in interpretations of the mass.\textsuperscript{75}

Liturgical interpretation also came to change the structure of the mass as well as interpreting it. Jungmann noted that ‘certain rites were inserted to make the sacred drama more potent’, such as hiding the paten under the corporal at the offertory to signify the hiding of Christ’s divinity in his passion, the five signs of the cross at the doxology of the canon to signify the five wounds and the bringing forward of the comingling of the consecrated bread and wine (a symbol of the resurrection) so that the ‘\textit{Pax Domini}’ which follows appears as the greeting of the risen Christ.\textsuperscript{76} When new rites were introduced for other reasons they were immediately taken into the system of allegorical interpretation, for example the elevation of the host after the consecration at mass, which became customary from the thirteenth century, was understood in the context of the historical-Christological mode of interpretation as

\textsuperscript{73} Taft, ‘Liturgy of the Great Church’, 73-4.


\textsuperscript{76} Jungmann, \textit{Mass of the Roman Rite}, i, 118-19.
the lifting up of Jesus on the cross. Here a development in dogmatic theology (the definition of the moment of transubstantiation) caused a development in liturgical practice, which then caused a development of liturgical interpretation. The general impression of the state of liturgical interpretation in Europe on the eve of the Reformation, not least from the number of editions of the Rationale, is one of great vitality and capacity for organic development. Part B will test this thesis in Scotland.

3) The subsequent neglect of liturgical interpretation

If this general impression of vitality is true, two questions arise concerning the subsequent history of liturgical interpretation. The first concerns the reasons for the decline of interest in it in the early modern period and the second the reasons for its neglect by modern scholars.

a) Early modern decline in interest in liturgical interpretation

Concerning the first, editions of the Rationale of Durandus show that it retained its popularity in the early decades of Tridentine Catholicism but also suggest a decline in interest around the middle of the seventeenth century. The last two early modern editions were in 1632 and 1672 and this loss of interest is symbolised by Durandus’s beautiful tomb being removed in 1671-72 from its chapel in Santa Maria sopra Minerva when Cardinal Camillo Massimi redecorated the chapel in the baroque style for Pope Clement X Altieri. There had always been enemies of allegorical liturgical interpretation, such as Florus and Albert, but the proximate roots of this decline may be found in the early sixteenth century when it came under sustained attack from both humanists and Protestants. The ‘spiritualism’ of Erasmus used the same Platonic epistemology that underlay allegorical interpretation but subverted it by

37 Jungmann, Mass of the Roman Rite, i, 116; ii, 206-9.

38 See p.32. It was rebuilt high on the wall just outside the chapel on the south wall of the south transept but the lower half of the mosaic was lost, David Butler, ‘Orazio Spada and his Architects: Amateurs and Professionals in Late-Seventeenth Century Rome’, Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 53.1 (1994), 61-79 at 77. The tomb was restored by Camillo Ceccarini in 1817, at the start of a century which was to see a revival of interest in the Rationale: Stephen Mark Holmes, “‘Defyle not Chrysts Kirk with your Carrion’: William Durandus (c.1230-96), a Medieval View of Burial’, in Monuments and Monumentality across Medieval and Early Modern Europe. Proceedings of the 2011 Stirling Conference, ed. Michael Penman (Donington, 2013), 212-23, at 17-18.
devaluing material symbols and ceremonies and being suspicious of all material things as obstacles to true worship, as he said in the *Enchiridion* (1503):

In this alone can you establish perfect piety, if you always try to progress from visible things, which are usually imperfect or indifferent, to the invisible.⁷⁹

Martin Luther wrote in his *Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520) that ‘in our day the expounders of the mass play with the allegories of human rites and make it a joke.’ He goes on to attack Dionysius and Durandus:

In the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, what does this Dionysius do but describe certain churchly rites and play round them with his allegories without proving them? The same is done among us by the author of the book entitled *Rationale divinorum*. Such allegorical studies are the work of idle men - do you think I should find it difficult to play with allegories round anything in creation?... who has so weak a mind as not to be able to launch into allegories?⁸⁰

It is thus not surprising that the sixteenth century was a time of crisis for liturgical interpretation, despite its popularity.

Among Roman Catholics who were not influenced by the humanist critique, it is reasonable to suppose that liturgical interpretation was preserved as part of the system of worship attacked by Protestants. Jean-Étienne Duranti’s new liturgical commentary first published in Rome in 1591, *De ritibus ecclesiae catholicae*, defends and interprets Catholic church-buildings and the rites of mass and the divine office. The introduction to the 1592 Cologne edition explicitly says that it fills a gap

---


⁸⁰ ‘At qui nunc missam exponent, in allegoriis humanarum cerimoniarum ludunt et illudunt’; ‘Ita in *Ecclesiastica hierarchia* quid facit, nisi quod ritus quosdam Ecclesiasticos describit, ludens allegoriis suis, quas non probat? Quale apud nos fecit, qui librum edidit qui *Rationale divinorum* dicitur: oiosorum hominum sunt ista studia allegoriarum. An putas mihi difficile esse in qualibet re create allegoriis ludere?... Et quis tam tenuis ingenii, qui allegoriis non queat periclitari?’; Martin Luther, *Babylonian Captivity of the Church*, 2.77, 7.5 (WA, vi, 526, 562).
in controversial literature because, while there have been many defences of Catholic theology against the Protestants,

Few, however, are they who lift a hand to defend the sacred ceremonies and rites which holy mother church uses in prayers and sacred solemnities.\textsuperscript{81}

Duranti does this by relentless quotation of Scripture and the Fathers to show the antiquity of the liturgy, but he also frequently refers to liturgical commentaries and, while his work is predominantly historical, he does include allegorical interpretations, for example that at mass the introit symbolises the first coming of Christ and the subdeacon symbolises John the Baptist.\textsuperscript{82}

Duranti was killed by the ultra-Catholics of the Ligue and his work was not the harbinger of a new generation of liturgical commentaries. Why did interest in the genre decline? The post-Tridentine systematisation of liturgy into a series of official Roman liturgical books with the continuance of a limited number of other rites tolerated by the Papal Curia might have produced an official digest of liturgical interpretation along the lines of the ‘one-symbol-per-object’ systematisation criticised above by Robert Taft. The official \textit{Roman Catechism} (1566), however, covered the eucharist by emphasising: the minimal form needed for the moment of consecration; the real presence of Christ under the accidents of bread and wine; the sacrifice of the mass; the effects of and obligation to holy communion; and the reason why it is given under the form of bread alone. Apart from brief references in these sections, the liturgical rite is ignored except in the final paragraph:

The sacrifice [of the mass] is celebrated with many solemn rites and ceremonies, none of which should be deemed useless or superfluous. On the contrary, all of them tend to display the majesty of this august sacrifice, and to excite the faithful when beholding these saving mysteries to contemplate the divine things which lie concealed in the eucharistic sacrifice. On these rites and ceremonies we shall not dwell, since they require a more lengthy exposition than is compatible with the nature of the present work; moreover

\textsuperscript{81} Reprinted in the Lyons 1594 edition, fo. 3v.

\textsuperscript{82} Lyons 1594 edition, pages 280 and 283-84.
priests can easily consult on the subject some of the many booklets and works that have been written by pious and learned men.\(^{83}\)

The genre of liturgical commentary was thus pushed to one side and the impression given that the liturgical rites were a splendid display which directed attention to the simple sacramental action underneath, in this case transubstantiation and the representation of Christ’s sacrifice. This liturgical minimalism gave no sense that the symbolism of the rites themselves was a mediation of the divine mystery. Given this, it is not surprising that liturgical interpretation fell from favour in the century after Trent and liturgical commentary became for Roman Catholics the study of rubrics, an aspect of canon law.\(^{84}\) The close connection between liturgical interpretation and canon law found in Durandus and other commentators was thus replaced by the reduction of the former to a small part of the latter.

Timothy Thibodeau has argued that liturgical interpretation can only flourish when spiritual exegesis of the Bible also flourishes.\(^{85}\) The essential ground of this flourishing is the symbolic epistemology of the medieval world-view where it is a rule of the creation that things invisible can only be accessed via things visible. For most of the writers mentioned above this was associated with a Christian Platonism. It survived the challenge of scholastic Aristotelianism by coexistence: for example Gabriel Biel placed traditional interpretation of the Ordo missae side-by-side with an exposition of the theology of transubstantiation. This could result in liturgical interpretation being marginalised, as in the Summa Theologiae of Thomas Aquinas where, although the commentary on the ordo missae was an integral part of 3a q.83, it was only one of the eleven questions on the eucharist.\(^{86}\) Liturgical interpretation could not, however, flourish in modernity which, as Denys Turner says, ‘supplanted

\(^{83}\) Catechismus Romanus (Antwerp 1572), 2.4.65, page 264.

\(^{84}\) Roger Reynolds, ‘Guillaume Durand parmi les théologiens’, 160; Mazza, Celebration of the Eucharist, 181. See chapter 6, pages 210-211.


\(^{86}\) See chapter 4, page 144. This may be compared to Hugh of St Victor’s De sacramentis Christianae fidei, a ‘proto-summa’ of the previous century where the traditional method of interpretation is the main way of studying the sacraments.
the view of the world as a web of symbolic representations with the view of the world as a mechanical system of interacting efficient causes’. It is probably this that best explains the lack of interest in liturgical interpretation symbolised by the dearth of new editions of the *Rationale* after the mid-seventeenth century.

A new manifestation of the genre, however, emerged in England at this time in the form of commentaries on the *Book of Common Prayer* influenced by Durandus, such as *A Rationale or Practical Exposition of the Book of Common Prayer* (1657) by Anthony Sparrow and *A Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England* (1710) by Charles Wheatly, which both went through numerous editions. This is a warning against seeing liturgical commentary as a purely Roman Catholic genre and it means it is not unexpected that Part C will discover a Reformed version of liturgical interpretation. While the 1775 Madrid edition of the *Rationale* suggests that sympathy for liturgical interpretation had not died in the Roman Catholic world, there was a renewal of interest among Catholics and Anglicans during the medieval-inspired religious revival of the 19th century, as illustrated by the Naples edition of 1859, the French translation of the whole *Rationale* published in Paris in 1854 and the English part-translations of 1843 and 1899. The eclipse of medievalism and the rise of unsympathetic fashions in theology, however, led to another decline in interest.

*b. Liturgical interpretation in modern scholarship*

This has strayed far from the period 1488 to 1590, but in order to understand that period better one should ask why modern scholarship has largely ignored the system of liturgical interpretation, which book-history shows to have been so important at the time. The first critical edition of the *Rationale* appeared as recently as 1995-2000; there have been only a few works in French and German and little in English beyond the writings of Reynolds and Thibodeau. Liturgical interpretation is only mentioned in passing in major studies of worship in medieval and early modern England and Europe such as Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi* (1991), and Eamon Duffy, *The Stripping of the Altars* (1992), and the few doctoral studies have concentrated on

---

the text of liturgical commentaries or their importance for art-history. In 1980 Robert Taft wrote in defence of the genre of liturgical commentaries because ‘Medieval liturgical commentaries, sometimes disparagingly referred to as “allegories”, are not our most esteemed theological literature today.’ He gave a list of distinguished scholars who shared this negative view including Otto Demus, John Meyendorff, Alexander Schmemann and Hans-Joachim Schulz. To these can be added Louis Bouyer, Hans Anscar Reinhold, Paul Rorem, and Enrico Mazza. Even Andrew Louth, who has written perceptive commentaries on this genre in the East, criticises the ‘arbitrary individualism’ of ‘the elaborately allegorical interpretations of the ceremonies of the liturgy found in the Western Middle Ages’. In 1993 Timothy Thibodeau felt it was still necessary to pen a passionate defence of the method in advance of the publication of his edition of the *Rationale*. In it he rightly discerns that hostility to allegorical interpretation on the part of a scholar goes together with suspicion of patristic spiritual exegesis and an attitude that affirms ‘typology’ against ‘allegory’:

It is important to note that when they used a symbolical or figurative method of explaining actions and prayers of the divine offices, allegorists such as Durand did not transplant something alien to the liturgy. The progression


89 Taft, ‘Liturgy of the Great Church’, 45, 70.


91 Louth, *Denys the Areopagite*, 115.

92 Thibodeau, ‘*Enigmata Figurarum*’.\"
from scriptural to liturgical allegory was natural, since in the case of the
divine offices, the liturgy consisted chiefly of texts from Scripture. It is not
surprising, then, that patristic methods of biblical exegesis would also be
applied to the liturgy.\footnote{Thibodeau, ‘Enigmata Figurarum’, 79.}

The problem is that minds formed in the rationalist disciplines of scientific critical
exegesis or neo-scholasticism, as were most Christian scholars of the first half of the
twentieth century, would find it hard to enter into the rich symbolic world of
liturgical interpretation. They do not share its epistemological presuppositions. It
may be easier for contemporary scholars influenced by an aspect of the intellectual
tendency known as ‘post-modernism’, as Turner wrote in 1995:

In this respect at least, ‘post-modernity’ has returned to an older idea in
conceiving of the world as a text to be read by means of an adequate
hermeneutic rather than as a system of causes to be explained.\footnote{Turner, The Darkness of God, 104.}

The task of the scholar, however, is to step behind academic and religious prejudices
and attempt to read early texts on their own terms and through the eyes of those who
received them in subsequent ages. It is with this in mind that the method of liturgical
interpretation will be investigated in the next chapter.
Chapter 2. The Method of Liturgical Interpretation used in the *Rationale divinorum officiorum* of William Durandus of Mende

The *Rationale* of Durandus was the main liturgical commentary in the late medieval and early modern period and transmitted in an encyclopaedic manner much of the previous tradition of liturgical interpretation. Using the *Rationale* and its interpretation of the church building, vestments and communion rites, this chapter will define the essential elements of the method of liturgical interpretation. This will enable the different uses of it to be identified in the Scottish evidence discussed in the remainder of this thesis.

1) Augustinian roots: the purpose and method of the *Rationale*

a. Ratio and scriptural exegesis

Medieval scriptural exegesis, with its quadripartite division, provided the basic method of the *Rationale* and Durandus devoted more than a third of its Prologue to explaining it. In this discussion Durandus only distinguished between scriptural and liturgical exegesis on the grounds of their subject, the Bible or the *ecclesiastica officia*, not on any difference of method. This implied that the truth accessed by the method is the same in each case and that Scripture and liturgy both mediate divine revelation. The method was based on the belief that liturgy has an inner meaning, identified with the word *ratio*, which gave his book its title.

The word *Rationale* is appropriately used as the title of this book, because, just as ‘revelation and truth’ were written on the *rationale* of judgement that the high priest of the Law bore on his breast, so too this work describes and makes plain the *rationes* of the different elements in the divine offices and

---


2 The use of *Rationale* for this type of book seems to have been an invention of Durandus. Although John Beleth’s earlier commentary on the liturgy was called *Rationale divinorum officiorum* by the early printed editions and the *Patrologia Latina* (PL 202), the critical edition shows that the title is not original (CCCM 41A, 1). It was probably adopted in imitation of Durandus.
their true nature which the prelates and priests of the church should faithfully preserve in the treasure-chest of their heart.  

The purpose of the *Rationale* was to uncover these *rationes* using the methods of scriptural exegesis and Durandus began the Prologue by explaining that this is a spiritual activity involving prayer and is rooted in a theological epistemology where true reality is in heaven and may be accessed through the interpretation of visible signs:

Whatever belongs to ecclesiastical offices, objects and ornaments is full of divine signs and mysteries... *ratio* cannot be given for everything handed down to us by our ancestors, but because any one of these things that lacks *ratio* must be uprooted, I, William, bishop of the holy church of Mende by the indulgence of God alone, knock at the door, and will continue to knock until the key of David deigns to open it for me, so that the king might bring me into his wine-cellar in which the celestial model shown to Moses on the mountain shall be revealed to me so that I can discuss clearly and openly each thing among the ecclesiastical offices, objects and ornaments, and describe their *rationes* and what they signify or represent, according to that which has been revealed... to the praise and glory of the Trinity.  

The word *ratio* has been left untranslated because it occupies a wide semantic field, obscured by the usual translation ‘reason’. The field includes ‘calculation’, ‘account’, ‘theory’, ‘explanation’ or ‘principle’ as well as various technical legal meanings, but in theological Latin it can also refer to the inner and spiritual meaning of a thing which corresponds to its prototype in the mind of God, as in Augustine’s teaching on

---

3. ‘Sane liber iste Rationalis vocabulo descriptur. Nam quemadmodum in rationali judicii quod legalis pontifex ferebat in pectore scriptum erat manifestatio et veritas, sic et hic rationes varietatum in diuinis officiis et earum veritas describuntur et manifestatur quas in scrinio pectoris sui ecclesiarum prelati et sacerdotes debent fideliter conservare’, *Rationale*, Prologue, 16. The oracular ‘breastplate of judgement’ described in Exodus 28 and 39 is called *rationale judicii* in the Vulgate, from the Septuagint, τὸ λόγεῖον τῶν κρίσεων.  

4. ‘Quaecumque in ecclesiasticis officiis, rebus ac ornamentis consistunt, diuinis plena sunt signis atque misteriis... Licet igitur non omnium que a maioribus tradita sunt ratio reddi possit, quia tamen quod in hiis ratione caret exitirpandum est, idcirco ego Gulielmus sancte Mimatensis Ecclesie, sola Dei patientia dictus episcopus, pulsans pulsabo ad ostium, si forte clauis David aperire dignetur, ut introducet me rex in cellam uinariam in qua michi supernum demonstretur exemplar quod Moysi fuit in monte monstratum; quatenus de singularis que in ecclesiasticis officiis, rebus ac ornamentis consistunt, quid significent et figurent, eo ualeam reuelante clare et aperte disserere et rationes ponere... ad laudem et gloriam Trinitatis’, *Rationale*, Prologue, 1.
the *rationes seminales* in creation and the *rationes aeternales* in the divine mind.\(^5\) This recalls the Greek patristic doctrine of the ‘natural contemplation’ of the *λόγοι* (*logoi - rationes*) in created things and Scripture which was taught in Latin by John Scotus Eriugena and is said by Schnusenberg to have influenced Amalarius.\(^6\) In a review of Schnusenberg’s work, Mary Alberi claims that *ratio* in Amalarius meant only ‘a rationally ordered system of signs within the liturgy, all pointing to the events of sacred history’, or ‘the intellectual ability which analyses his system of liturgical signs’, but even if this is so Durandus went further.\(^7\) While his use of *ratio* at times appears to mean simply a description of the parts of the liturgy (‘*rationes ponere*’ in Prologue 1 can simply mean ‘give an account of’), Durandus prayed to be able to interpret the liturgy according to its inner meaning in the mind of God and his references to spiritual exegesis of Scripture and Moses’ vision of the heavenly prototypes of the liturgy of the Old Law suggests that he had the theological meaning primarily in mind when using ‘*ratio*’.

**b. Significare, figurare and polysemy**

Durandus’s aim was thus to describe the *rationes* of the liturgy ‘and what they signify or represent’ using the rules of contemporary scriptural exegesis as his method. This hermeneutical practice was described by the verbs *significare* and *figurare* and their use in later texts becomes an indicator of the presence of liturgical interpretation.\(^8\) *Significare* was an important verb for Augustine, both in his Platonic belief that created things are signs of the divine will manifested in creation and in his definition of allegory, ‘*Allegoria dicitur, cum aliquid aliud videtur sonare in verbis et aliud in intellectu significare*’.\(^9\) Durandus also followed Augustine in noting that

---

\(^5\) Allan D. Fitzgerald, ed., *Augustine Through the Ages* (Grand Rapids, 1999), 252, 697-98.


\(^7\) Mary Alberi, review in *Speculum* 65.3 (1990), 752-754, at 753

\(^8\) The fifteenth-century liturgical commentator Gabriel Biel also uses the verb *mysticare*, Biel, *Canonis misse expositio*, 80F, (Gabrielis Biel Canonis Misse Expositio, 5 vols, eds Heiko A. Oberman and William J. Courtenay [Wiesbaden, 1963-76], iv, 6).

\(^9\) ‘It is called allegory when something seems to mean one thing in words yet signify another in the mind’, Augustine, *In psalmum ciii enarratio*, 1.13 (CCSL 40, 1486). Kirstin Faupel-Dreves, *Vom rechten Gebrauch der Bilder im liturgischen Raum* (Leiden, 2000), 72, 91.
this method is not monolithic; any part of the liturgy may have more than one meaning within the limits of the method which are defined by Scripture and Christian tradition:

> Often in this work different senses of interpretation are employed of the same thing, passing from one sense to another, and the diligent reader shall be able to observe how this happens. Just as no one is prohibited from employing diverse exceptions or defences in legal proceedings, neither should anyone be barred from using a variety of explanations in the praise of God, with the faith always being preserved.¹⁰

This polysemy (one thing having several meanings) was rooted in Augustine’s teaching on scriptural exegesis, although Augustine emphasised more firmly the primacy of the meaning intended by the original author (something more easily done with a written text):

> Sometimes not just one meaning but two or more meanings are perceived in the same words of Scripture. Even if the writer’s meaning is obscure, there is no danger here, provided that it can be shown from other passages of the holy Scriptures that each of these interpretations is consistent with the truth... Could God have built into the divine eloquence a more generous or bountiful gift than the possibility of understanding the same words in several ways, all of them deriving confirmation from other no less divinely inspired passages.¹¹

Durandus’s contemporary Thomas Aquinas accepted this and grounded it in the divine authorship of Scripture:

---

¹⁰ *In hoc autem opere plerumque circa idem diuersi sensus adhibentur et de uno sensu ad alium transitur, quemadmodum lector sedalus liquido poterit intueri. Sicut enim nemo prohibetur diuersis exceptionibus uel defensionibus uti, sic etiam nec diuersis in laudem Dei expositionibus, salua fide*, Rationale, Prologue, 12.

¹¹ *Quando autem ex eisdem scripturae uerbis non unum aliquid, sed duo uel plura sentiuntur, etiam si latet, quid senserit ille, qui scrispit, nihil periculi est, si quodlibet eorum congruere ueritati ex alis locis sanctarum scripturarum doceri potest... nam quid in diuinis eloquuis largius et ubernius potuit diuinitus prouideri, quam ut eadem urba pluribus intellegantur modis, quos alia non minus diuina contestantia faciant adprobari?*, Augustine, DDC, 3.84-85. He gives similar teaching in Book 12 of the *Confessions*, 12.23 (32) – 12.32 (43), although both there and in 12.18 (27) he emphasises that seeking the original author’s meaning is the prime task of the exegete (CCSL 27, 233-241, 229-30).
Since the literal sense is that which the author intends, and since the author of Holy Scripture is God, who by one act comprehends all things in his intellect, it is not unfitting, as Augustine says in book 12 of the Confessions, if, even according to the literal sense, one word in Holy Scripture should have several senses.\textsuperscript{12}

Durandus’s reference to the celestial prototype of the liturgy seen by Moses suggests that he held the same position concerning liturgical interpretation. His method presupposed that authentic truth is in the heavenly realm and has been revealed to humanity through the symbolic world of the Bible and the liturgy. To access this truth an adequate hermeneutic is required to interpret the ‘symbolic grammar’ in which it is expressed. It is also necessary to be open to a diversity of interpretations because the truth is always greater than that which participates in it. It is partly for this reason that the Rationale, like the Speculum, was a compilation.

c. Augustine and the doctrine of signs

Kirstin Faupel-Drevs has shown that Durandus’s method of liturgical interpretation was rooted in the teaching on signs in Books 2 and 3 of Augustine’s De doctrina christiana, although he did not, like Amalarius, state this explicitly.\textsuperscript{13} This is not surprising as Augustine’s teaching on signs was foundational for medieval hermeneutics and exegesis in general, but it had a particular relevance to interpreting the symbolic world of the liturgy. For Augustine, ‘a sign is a thing which of itself makes some other thing come to mind, besides the impression that it presents to the senses’.\textsuperscript{14} There are natural signs (signa naturalia), as smoke signifies fire, and given signs (signa data) which living creatures give to each other to show what is in their minds (2.2). Language is the prime example of given signs but all the senses are invoked by the signs used in Scripture (2.7) just as they are in liturgy. In speaking of

\textsuperscript{12} ‘Quia vero sensus litteralis est, quem auctor intendit, auctor autem sacrae Scripturae Deus est, qui omnia simul suo intellectu comprehendit, non est inconveniens, ut dicit Augustinus XII confessionum, si etiam secundum litteralem sensum in una littera Scripturae plures sint sensus’, ST 1a. q.1 a.10.

\textsuperscript{13} Cf Rationale 4.42.25. See chapter 1, page 27. Faupel-Drevs, Vom Recten Gebrauch, 71-94. References to the book and section of DDC are given in the text.

\textsuperscript{14} ‘Signum est enim res praeter speciem quam ingerit sensibus aliud aliquid ex se faciens in cogitationem venire’, DDC 2.1 (Augustine, De Doctrina Christiana, ed. and tr. R.P.H. Green [Oxford, 1995], 56).
signa data used in divine revelation Augustine said that God has used complex imagery as well as plain words because of the way humans learn:

No one disputes that it is much more pleasant to learn lessons presented through imagery, and much more rewarding to discover meanings that are only won through difficulty.¹⁵

The basis for the distinction between plain words and complex imagery was a division between literal signs (signa propria) and metaphorical signs (signa translata). For the Augustinian tradition this grounded the distinction between the literal and spiritual sense in exegesis (2.32-33). Signa translata, as in allegory, were simply where ‘one thing is to be understood by another’ and such signs required interpretation.¹⁶

The main method used in this interpretation was comparison with the things of nature and revelation. For this one needed a knowledge of languages, the natural world, numerology, history and the liberal arts, and also a generous attitude to secular sciences because ‘a good and true Christian should realise that truth belongs to his Lord wherever it is found’.¹⁷ The secular sciences were used to interpret Scripture but the prime source for comparison was found within divine revelation itself, in Scripture (2.31) and the regula fidei (3.3). Reason had an important part to play in this but Augustine warned that it was much safer to operate within Scripture (3.86). The work of interpreting Scripture required one to pray for understanding (3.134) in the same way that Durandus prayed to see ‘the celestial model shown to Moses’ in order to interpret the liturgy according to the mind of God. At the same time the method used in this interpretation was anthropologically appropriate. Augustine said it was more pleasant and rewarding and Durandus said that it ensured that the sacred teaching symbolised by the rites ‘will be held more firmly and more faithfully in our

¹⁵ ‘Nemo ambigit et per similitudines libentius quaeque cognosci et cum aliqua difficulitate quaesita multo gratius inveniri’, DDC 2.13, cf. 2.9 (Green, 62, 60).

¹⁶ ‘Aliud ex alio faciunt intelligi’, DDC 3.133 (Green, 192). Faupel-Drevs, Vom Recten Gebrauch, 88.

¹⁷ ‘Quisquis bonus verusque Christianus est Domini sui esse intellegat ubicumque venerit veritatem’, DDC 2.72 (Green, 90).
memory’.

This was because it used material symbols. Liturgical interpretation, with its use of physical as well as verbal signs, was seen as particularly apt as a way of learning and knowing for the human person who is both physical and spiritual. The way the method works will best be seen by examining how Durandus interpreted examples of sacred space, objects and actions: the church-building, vestments and communion rites.

2) Aspects of method 1: interpreting the church and vestments
The church building formed the background for most of the rites, persons and times discussed in the Rationale and it was itself interpreted in the first chapter of the Book 1, ‘On the church building and its parts’, although the altar, dedication rite and furnishings are discussed in subsequent chapters. Vestments were interpreted in Book 3, after the discussion of the various orders of clerics who wear them in Book 2. Following Innocent III, Durandus identified six vestments common to priest and bishop, which will be discussed here, and nine proper to the bishop alone (3.1.7).

a. The structure of the sections
The structure of Durandus’s text reveals his method. The chapter on the church building was based on elements from the first book of Sicard’s Mitrale, expanded by extracts from Pseudo-Hugh’s Speculum, the Historia Scholastica of Peter Comestor, the Gemma animae of Honorius, the Liber de exordiis of Walafrid, Bede’s commentary on Luke, the works of Isidore, and original commentary by Durandus (marked as ‘none’ in Table 2.1, below). This juxtaposition of sources was a result of Durandus’s recognition that one thing can bear a variety of different interpretations. Truth is found more by gathering fragments than by judging between different propositions (the scholastic method). Gabriel le Bras has argued that Durandus’s method in compiling the Speculum judicale was similar to that of the medieval encyclopaedist Vincent of Beauvais (c.1190-ce.1264) in his Speculum maius, and Thibodeau says that the same is true of the Rationale.

18 ‘Ut tenacius et fidelius memorie teneatur’, Rationale, Prologue 6.

### Table 2.1: Main Sources of *Rationale 1.1 De Ecclesia* by paragraph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31. Ps-Hugh</td>
<td>32. none</td>
<td>33. none</td>
<td>34. Walafrid, Isidore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. none</td>
<td>40a. Ps-Hugh</td>
<td>40b. none</td>
<td>41. Ps-Hugh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42a. <em>Mitrale</em> 1.4</td>
<td>42b. none</td>
<td>43. <em>Mitrale</em> 1.4</td>
<td>44. none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. none</td>
<td>46. Bede</td>
<td>47. Gemma</td>
<td>48. <em>Mitrale</em> 1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. none</td>
<td>50. none</td>
<td>51. none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within this encyclopaedic structure the method of exposition was spiral not linear, as in the Johannine writings in the New Testament: the same subjects are returned to again and again, each time with new meaning added.\(^{20}\) At the same time there was

also a linear progression in his chapter on the church-building, from etymology and the Old Testament origins of the church, to the material building, to the main features in the building, to the other buildings around it and to behaviour in the church, ending with a short canonical appendix. The chapters on the six priestly vestments in Book 3, part of ‘the longest sustained discussion of vestments in medieval theological writing’, followed the same spiral method while dealing with each vestment in turn.21 The starting point here was Innocent III’s *De missarum mysteriis* and each chapter, apart from that on the amice, begins with a moral interpretation of the vestment related to the life of the priest who wears it and ends with a Christological interpretation, both taken from Innocent. These were supplemented by liturgical and canonical texts together with extracts from Amalarius of Metz, Bruno of Segny, Rupert of Deutz, Honorius of Autun, John Beleth, Sicard of Cremona and William of Auxerre.

*b. The literal sense*

The literal sense provided the essential basis for Durandus’s liturgical interpretation, as it does with medieval scriptural exegesis. The chapter on the church-building begins by distinguishing between its corporeal (literal) and spiritual meanings: the physical building and that which it signifies - the ‘living stones’ of the congregation (1.1.2; cf. 1 Peter 2:5). In liturgical interpretation there were two aspects to the literal sense, description and interpretation. While Book 4 has much description of the rite of mass, here the physical building is not described although there is a long discussion of names for the church (1.1.2-4) taken from the *Mitrale* and Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiae*. This moves from etymological consideration of words like ‘church’, ‘catholic’, ‘*kyriaka*’ and ‘oratory’, to a more spiritual reflection on scriptural images such as ‘Zion’, ‘body of Christ’, ‘virgin’, ‘mother’, ‘harlot’ and ‘city’. These words and images were taken without distinction from both parts of the Bible as Durandus saw Scripture as a unity. As the church-building was a symbol of the invisible church, this section on names provided a mini-treatise in ecclesiology.22

---


The structure of the commentary on the priest’s vestments was also based on the literal sense. Each chapter begins with a description of the physical act of putting them on before mass, for example:

The priest or bishop who is about to celebrate takes the amice and covers his head with it... there are two strings with which the amice is tied across the chest... the amice is drawn tightly around the neck.23

This provided the cantus firmus of the interpretations, but even this was more than a merely practical ‘getting dressed’ as from the ninth century it was accompanied by set prayers which reminded the priest of the symbolic interpretations of the vestments.24 It was usually done at the altar and was thus a public ritual, as shown by extant meditations for the laity on the meanings of the vestments they would have seen being put on and by the vestment chests near individual altars recorded in medieval inventories.25 In the iconographical scheme common to illustrated medieval manuscript copies of Jean Golein’s French translation of the Rationale there was usually a miniature of the priest vesting at the altar at the head of Book 3.26

c. The spiritual senses

Spiritual interpretation used the physical church or vestments to raise the mind to the things of God. Everything was thus potentially symbolic and could be read allegorically, as is seen in the example of the weather-cock on the church roof (1.1.22). Using Pseudo-Hugh, Durandus compared the cockerel to a preacher: he wakes in the night (the world) to awaken those who sleep (in sin) and announce the

23 ‘Episcopus seu sacerdos celebraturus assumit amictum, quo caput tergitur... due cordale quibus amictus ante pectus ligature... amictu quoque collum stringitur’, Rationale 3.2.1-2; and for the other vestments, 3.3.1; 3.4.1; 3.5.1; 3; 3.6.1; 3.7.1.
24 Jungmann, Mass of the Roman Rite, i, 276-90; Timothy Thibodeau, William Durand on the Clergy and their Vestments (Chicago, 2010), 34.
coming light (of glory); he wakes himself first by asceticism before preaching to others. Attention was then turned to the metal bird which faced the wind (resisting the ungodly), sat on an iron rod (orthodox teaching) and was at the highest point of the church (proclaiming Christ, like the title written above him on the cross). This last showed the tropological interpretation turning into a Christological reading while the ‘coming light of glory’ was anagogical. The metal bird was thus read like the words of scripture, its literal sense was the animal and both the animal and its metal representation were read spiritually according to the three spiritual senses.

The vestments gave a good example of polysemy with Durandus weaving together a number of different allegorical schemes. The moral interpretation seems to have been the earliest, being found in the ninth-century vesting prayers, and it concerned the virtues needed by the priest, for example: the amice symbolised chastity because it was tied tight over the chest and kidneys and also restraint in speech because it went round the throat; the whiteness of the alb signified purity and its tight fit reminded its wearer to avoid looseness of life; the linen of the alb needed to be beaten to become white which symbolised the bodily mortification required to attain purity; the chasuble, which covers all, symbolised love. The authors Durandus drew on here, Amalarius, Bruno of Segni and Innocent were all associated with reform movements which emphasised clerical celibacy. There was also another tropological scheme relating to spiritual combat, taken from John Beleth and based on Scripture (2 Corinthians 10:4 and Ephesians 6:11-17), where the priest vesting was like a warrior putting on armour, for example: his amice was a helmet; his alb a breastplate; his stole a spear; and his chasuble a shield (3.1.3-4).

There were two clear layers of Christological allegory. The oldest was taken from Innocent and related to the Incarnation and the Christian’s incorporation in Christ, for example: the amice symbolised Christ’s Godhead hid in flesh, because it was like

---

27 The kidneys, renes, were traditionally seen as the seat of desire. This interpretation is also found in the vesting prayer for the cincture: ‘Praecinge me, Domine, cingulo puritatis, et exstingue in lumbis meis humorem libidinis; ut maneat in me virtus continentiae et castitatis’ (Gird me, O Lord, with the girdle of purity, and extinguish in my loins the moisture of lust, that the virtue of continence and chastity may abide in me), Legg, Tracts on the Mass, 132.
the cloud that overshadows the head in various scriptural texts; the alb was the whiteness of the Transfiguration and the new garment put on in baptism; the stole was the cross because it was crossed on the breast and also Christ’s obedience unto death; and the maniple was Christ enjoying his reward in heaven as God even while he works for it on earth as man. This system of Christological interpretation had analogical elements and was closely linked to the moral interpretations: for example the tropological and analogical symbolism of good works and future reward attached to the maniple in the moral interpretation was here applied to Christ.\textsuperscript{28} The second scheme of Christological interpretation was given no source in the apparatus and was probably created by Durandus. It involved a direct identification of the vestments with items linked to Christ in his passion: the amice was the veil put over his face; the alb the robe Herod put on him; the cincture the whip by which he was scourged; the stole the rope that tied him to the column; the maniple the rope that tied his hands; and the chasuble the purple robe put on him by the soldiers. Amalarius in the ninth century had interpreted the order of mass as a representation of the events of the passion and Aquinas taught that the priest at mass acts ‘in the person of Christ’, so it is not surprising that by the end of the thirteenth century the priestly vestments came to be closely identified with Christ in his passion.\textsuperscript{29} It is also not surprising, given the strong devotion to the passion in the later middle ages, that this latest layer of Christological symbolism in the \textit{Rationale} seems to have become the most popular by the early modern period.

These layers of interpretation are mixed together in a ‘spiral’ form and an examination of the interpretation of the stole (3.5) will show that the method worked primarily by comparison and allusion with both secular and sacred things, in this case mainly using the shape, use and name of the item. The stole hung round the

\textsuperscript{28} These interpretations play on the word \textit{manipulus} which also means a bundle or sheaf, as in Psalm 125:6b, ‘\textit{venientes autem venient in exultatione portantes manipulos suos\textquoteright}', a text given the eschatological interpretation of carrying bundles of good works into heaven by Augustine, \textit{In psalmum cxxv enarratio}, 14 (CCSL 40, 1855).

\textsuperscript{29} Aquinas, \textit{ST} 3.83.1 ad 2 and ad 3. Mazza says of Amalarius’s commentary that, ‘in the rite the priest follows the order of events of the passion... during mass we are present at the drama of the passion, which unfolds before our eyes as the rites gradually succeed one another’, \textit{The Celebration of the Eucharist}, 166.
neck like a yoke and symbolised the yoke of Christ; the priest kissed it before putting it on signifying his submission to this yoke; it was crossed on the breast signifying both the priest’s imitation of Christ’s passion and his journey from the active to the contemplative lives; it was held at the waist by the cincture to warn the priest to fight lust; its length symbolised perseverance and number-symbolism meant that its two ends signified prudence and temperance or that the priest must live between good and bad fortune. Using scriptural comparisons, the stole was related to the white robe of the patriarchs (called ‘stola’ in the Vulgate); the innocence of the Patriarchal age meant that it symbolised innocence, specifically that which Adam lost which is the theme of the vesting prayer; it also represented the cords by which Jesus was tied to the pillar of his scourging.  
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d. The unity of the two Testaments

Durandus quoted from both parts of the Bible indiscriminately because a key presupposition of his method was the unity of Old and New Testaments. In discussing the church-building he explained this principle:

Whatever the synagogue received from the Law, the church now receives through grace from Christ... changing it into something better.  

He goes on to outline a direct continuity in the divinely revealed plan from the heavenly prototype shown to Moses on Sinai, to the Tabernacle, Solomon’s Temple and finally the Christian church-building:

From both Tabernacle and Temple our church takes its form, in whose outer part the people listen and pray; in the sanctuary the clergy pray, preach, offer praises and minister.  

30 ‘Redde mihi, Domine, obsecro, stolam immortalitatis, quam perdidi in praevaricatione prumi parentis: et, quamvis indignus accedo ad tuum sacrum mysterium, merear tamen gaudium sempiternum’ (Give me, I beg you Lord, the stole of immortality which I lost by the transgression of the first parent, and although I am unworthy to come unto your holy mystery, may I nevertheless merit everlasting joy), Legg, Tracts on the Mass, 132.

31 ‘Quicquid autem Synagoga per legem accepit, hic nunc Ecclesia a Christo... et in melius commutavit’, Rationale 1.1.4. Thibodeau translates ‘et in melius commutavit’ as ‘replacing it with something better’ but as well as this meaning, *commutare* can have the less intense meaning ‘to change’ or ‘transform’. This latter better fits the context. Cf chapter 5, page 157.
How deeply Durandus’s system was based on the unity of the two Testaments is revealed in a passage anticipating Reformation disputes where he responded to ‘certain heretics’ who rejected vestments because they are not found in the New Testament and Christ and his disciples did not wear them (3.1.14). He replied simply by quoting Ezekiel 44:16-17 on the necessity of wearing sacred vestments in the coming Temple. His exegetical hermeneutic was that the whole Bible is simply one book which is authoritative in the church when read in the light of Christ and the principles of spiritual exegesis. He thus made no attempt to engage with these heretics on their own ground that only the New Testament can be used to regulate the life and worship of the church.
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e. Looking at a church through the eyes of one formed in the method

The cleric formed in the world-view of the Rationale would instinctively come to see the building in which he spent much of his day in such symbolic terms. He would be reminded daily of the mysteries of the faith, of his goal in heaven, and of the moral life he should be living, and sometimes the decoration of the building seems designed to support this memory. Looking at the building through the eyes of one formed in the method of Durandus can give an impression of how this would work.

35

Standing outside the church and looking upwards, the circle of the dome surmounted by a cross recalls the mind to the perfection of the catholic faith. The towers represent the preachers and prelates who defend the church while their pinnacles

32 ‘Ab utroque vero, scilicet a tabernaculo et a templo, nostra materialis ecclesia formam sumpsit, in cuius parte anteriori populous audit et orat, in sanctuario vero clerus orat, predicat, iubilat et ministrat’, Rationale 1.1.5.

33 Thibodeau, William Durand on the Clergy, 140, n.422, thinks they are the followers of Arnold of Brescia (c.1100-1154).

34 Although his response is in a sense ‘inadequate’, it is not, as Denny-Brown argues, ‘evasive’; Durandus simply operates in a different thought-world to that of the heretics, ‘Old Habits Die Hard’, 562. See the discussion of the ‘scriptural principle of worship’ in chapter 6.

35 This section is based on a practical session at the AHRC-funded conference ‘Explaining Supernatural Nature’ held at the University of St Andrews in April 2010. To avoid cluttering the text, all the following three paragraphs are based on Rationale 1.1 and references are only given to places outside this chapter. This interpretation of the church building will be explored further in chapter 5.
represent the mind of the prelate directed to higher things (one thinks of the statue of a bishop high on the tower of Elgin cathedral). The roof suggests charity which covers a multitude of sins and the tiles which repel the rain are like the knights who protect the church from pagans (at Chartres Cathedral there are stained glass windows of donors in armour, high up in the chancel). The windows likewise prevent harmful things from entering but as they admit light they symbolise the Scriptures (images from which were often represented in stained glass) which hinder vice and admit the light of God into the faithful heart symbolised by the church. One sees here how the symbolism is fluid; the sacrifice on the altar is the heart, but so is the whole church. The windows are also the five senses which should keep out vanities and let in the spiritual gifts. In a medieval church they are narrow on the outside but broad within, which represents the breadth of the spiritual sense compared to the literal. The two pillars on either side of the window represent the double commandment of love, as liturgical interpretation is attentive to numerology. Having looked upwards, one then enters by the door which is Christ (John 10:9) and also the apostles (Christ and the apostles are carved above the central door of the royal portal at Chartres).

Crossing the threshold is thus a significant process, marking the entrance into sacred space. Durandus treated elsewhere of the font as means of entry into the church (6.83.25), but here it is the atrium which signifies Christ and entry into the celestial Jerusalem. The church thus symbolises the heavenly city but it is composed of spaces of increasing sanctity culminating in the altar which signifies Christ and has a whole chapter to itself (1.2). The spaces in the building teach various things. They are related to the orders in the church in this order of sanctity: the nave is the married, the choir the continent, and the sanctuary is the virgins. The church-building is also the human body: the chancel is the head, the sacrifice on the altar is the heart, the transepts the arms and the nave the rest of the body. Cross-shaped churches teach one tropologically to deny oneself by taking up one’s cross and round ones show allegorically that the church encompasses the whole world and anagogically that one

---

36 Durandus has no interpretation of the holy water stoups that were sited by the entrances of many medieval churches but it is clear that making the sign of the cross with holy water on entering the church could be interpreted as associating entry to the church with baptism and Christ, McRoberts and Holmes, *Lost Interiors*, 122.
will pass from the circle of the world to the circle of eternity. The church/outside divide signifying heaven/earth is repeated within the church where the same division is symbolised by the screen dividing the altar from the choir. One would have thought the rood screen would have fulfilled this function, but Durandus discusses it simply as a platform for proclaiming the Scriptures and writes primarily for clerics whose main liturgical space was the sanctuary and choir. In the nave which the clerics would have passed through to choir and altars, the four walls are the four gospels or four cardinal virtues, their height is tropologically virtue and anagogically the hope of redemption, and their foundation is faith. The pavement is humility or the poor in spirit and it also represents the labours of the common people (*vulgus*) who stood in the nave. With them, the knights on the roof and the clergy in the sanctuary and choir, the building symbolises all three orders of Christian society. The columns are the bishops or the evangelists and recall the silver columns of the Temple. However many there are, they are the seven pillars of the house of wisdom (Proverbs 9:1) which are the sevenfold grace of the Spirit that should fills the bishops. They have bases which are the apostles, pillars which are the bishops, heads which are the bishops’ minds, and capitals (sometimes carved with scriptural scenes) which symbolise the words of Scripture. Churches such as the Sainte Chapelle in Paris which had statues of the twelve apostles on their pillars were clearly following in this tradition, especially if they were associated with the twelve consecration crosses (1.6.29).³⁷

Durandus thus provided a complete symbolic vocabulary for reading the church building in accord with the spiritual exegesis of the Bible, interpreting his subject in literal (etymological), allegorical (Christological), tropological and anagogical terms. As the high parts of the building represented minds raised to God, the building itself was used to raise the mind to virtue, heaven and the mysteries of faith. It was also seen as a microcosm, being compared to the human body, the heavenly Jerusalem, the ordered society of Christendom and the whole cosmos. This presumed a highly symbolic way of looking at the world and a continuity of attitude between reading the Bible and regarding one’s surroundings.

3) Aspects of method 2: interpreting the communion rites

a. Structure and method

Book 4 of the *Rationale* is a commentary on the mass and shows how the method of interpretation is applied to the performance of a sacred action. Its structure was again based on the literal sense and description of the rites and prayers alternates with their interpretation. Durandus was attentive to regional variations in liturgical practice (49.3; 50.4; 51.1, 3, 18-19, 24; 52.3-4; 53.1; 54.3; 55.3; 56.2; 58.1; 59.10) and to historical development, noting when a practice described in his sources was obsolete (53.3; 54.2; 59.9), but his aim was to comment on what was common to all rites (Prologue 13-14). The *fontes* in the critical edition reveal that the literal description was taken in part from Durandus’s own *Instructiones* of 1292-3 which postdated the first version of the *Rationale* (1286) and only slightly predated the final redaction (1294-6). The *Instructiones* and *Rationale* were thus two parts of the same programme of liturgical education for the clergy.

The heart of this programme was the spiritual interpretation of the mass as a comprehensive dramatization of the passion of Christ. Each part of the *ordo missae* represented a stage in the passion narrative of the Gospels, thus giving a practical means for what the Scottish poet William Dunbar called ‘having his passioun in memorie’. This emphasis on Christ’s passion was characteristic of late medieval devotion and, simplified, became part of lay devotional practices at mass as found in William Bonde’s early sixteenth century English tract, *Meditatyons for goostly exerçye in the tyme of the masse*, which explains why ‘the processe of the masse representyd the verey processe of the Passyon off Cryst’. The spine of this

---

38 He has a particular interest in liturgical practice in Rome (49.3; 51.16, 24; 52.3-4; 53.12-13; 54.4-6, 9; 58.2). All references to the *Rationale* in this section are to Book 4 unless otherwise noted, thus for example ‘Rationale 4.56.2’ is given as ‘56.2’.

39 There are only a few short passages from Amalarius in the *fontes* but this whole system was based on his work, mediated by Innocent and others. Schnusenberg, *Church and the Theatre*; Christina Schnusenberg, *The Mythological Traditions of Liturgical Drama: The Eucharist as Theater* (New York, 2010).


interpretable strategy in the *Rationale* was again taken from the *De missarum mysteriis* of Innocent III which was quoted at the start of most chapters. An examination of parts of the section on the communion rites (4.49-59), the conclusion of this passion-drama from the resurrection to the ascension, will show how Durandus’s method was applied.

*b. Rising from the tomb: allegory and passion-drama*

After Christ was crucified in the canon of the mass, as represented by the priest extending his arms in the form of a cross (43.3), the ‘silent’ prayer of the priest after the Our Father represented the silent Christ in the tomb (49.3). There is a clear comparison or association here of the silence of the priest and the silence of the tomb caused by the previous interpretation of the canon as crucifixion. The prayer the priest said silently was one of three at this point and in it three apostles were named, so these triads were associated with the three days Christ was in the tomb (49.4-5). This web of associations was organised around the passion-story but was flexible. Durandus knew that this silent prayer was said aloud on Good Friday in Rome and so he expanded the interpretation to include this as a representation of Christ preaching in the underworld (49.3).

While the crucifixion was symbolised at a fixed point in the mass, the resurrection was signified almost in passing by the lifting of the chalice at the *per omnia* (51.12) and again by receiving communion (54.14), just as in the gospel narratives the resurrection itself was a hidden event presented in stories about the empty tomb and appearances. The rite was read as a symbolic performance of the gospel but it did not slavishly follow the gospel chronology. After Christ had symbolically risen, the three days in the tomb were again symbolised by the three signs of the cross over the chalice at the peace (51.15) and the episcopal blessing before communion was said to commemorate the dead Christ bringing blessings to the underworld (51.24). This

---


42 Chapters 50-53 and 55-59 begin with Innocent.
chronological disjunction shows that the vocabulary of number symbolism was more important than temporal sequence, something given theological grounding in the fourth-century prayer Unde et memores after the consecration. In it the priest offered the mass in memory of the passion, resurrection and ascension of Christ, making all these mysteries present not in chronological order but in memory and power.\footnote{Unde et memores, Domine, nos servi tui, sed et plebs tua sancta, eiusdem Christi, Filii tui, Domini nostri, tam beatae passionis, necnon et ab inferis resurrectionis, sed et in caelos gloriosae ascensionis’ (Therefore, Lord, we your servants and also your holy people remember the blessed passion, the resurrection from the underworld, and also the glorious ascension into heaven of the same Christ, your Son, our Lord).}

The tomb, symbolised by the cup of the chalice, was at the centre of a series of interpretations from the various gospel narratives as the numbers, objects or people suggest them; the ‘grammar’ of how these interpretations are deployed is like a game of association. With the chalice representing the tomb and the slightly concave paten interpreted as a heart open in love, the deacon and subdeacon who handle these vessels were the two Marys who came to the tomb with loving hearts in Matthew 28 and the priest who receives the paten was Christ receiving their love (50.1). Loose associations of shape and action are thus deployed to form a scene from a resurrection play. The subdeacon held the paten veiled and so he also represented Nicodemus who came to Jesus secretly in John 3 and reappeared at his burial in John 19 (51.15); when the subdeacon folded the paten veil and put it down, it was the folded face-cloth found in the tomb in John 20 (50.2); when the priest kissed the paten and chalice, he symbolised the women kissing the feet of the risen Christ in Matthew 28:9 (50.3-4); when the deacon uncovered the chalice and looked into it, he was the angel rolling the stone from the tomb in Matthew 28:2 (51.1). A fold, a kiss and an uncovering were used by Durandus and his sources to recall similar things in the gospel.

These interpretations existed within the context of a dramatic Easter liturgy which included the two liturgical dramas of Easter day. These arose from the Amalarian tradition and enacted the main stories used by Durandus: the Quem quaeritis was performed at the start of mass or the end of matins and portrayed the dialogue of the
angel and the three Marys (Rationale 6.88.5); the Peregrini was performed at Vespers and acted out the Emmaus story. There were also the procession before Easter mass symbolising the apostles going to Galilee to see Christ (6.88.2-3) and various liturgical texts which told of the visits to the empty tomb: the solemn singing of the resurrection gospels; the Easter sequence Victimae paschali laudes; and the five antiphons taken from Matthew 28:1-5 sung throughout the Easter octave. To one who lived in this rich thought-world of the Latin liturgy and understood its symbolic language, Durandus’s interpretations would not have seemed arbitrary despite the sometimes loose comparisons involved.

c. The end of the mass and the last days: anagogical interpretation

Although eschatology was found throughout Book 4, Durandus taught that ‘the end of mass represents the end of the world’ (57.9) and this was associated with Christ’s ascension into heaven which prepared the way for the redeemed to follow. As well as Christ’s resurrection (54.14), receiving communion also symbolised Christ’s ascension (because he ate with his disciples before he ascended, 54.3) as did the priest’s departure to the sacristy at the end of mass (59.8). One aspect of the interpretation of the last part of the mass was a dramatic representation of the ascension story in Luke 24 and Acts 1: the postcommunion prayers represented the apostles persevering in prayer after the ascension (57.2); the deacon singing Ite missa est was the angel speaking to the disciples after the ascension; the response Deo gratias was the apostles returning to Jerusalem with joy and praising God in the Temple (57.6, 7); and the last blessing was Christ’s last blessing before the ascension (59.2-4). The last blessing also signified the sending of the Holy Spirit by the ascended Christ because it was given by sign and word just as Acts records the Spirit coming with wind and fire (59.2-4). Ascension and Pentecost are the beginning of the age of the church, the last days, and this allegory became firmly anagogical when the departure of the people at the end of mass was said to represent humanity entering heaven (59.10). Likewise, as in Durandus’s symbolic vocabulary the right horn of the altar symbolised the Jews (55.3), the priest’s moving there to say the postcommunion prayer was interpreted as a sign of Paul’s eschatological teaching in

Romans 11 that all Israel will be saved (57.3). The chalice was allegorically Christ’s tomb but eschatologically a symbol of the joy of heaven (51.2) because Scripture speaks of the chalice as intoxicating (Psalms 22:5 and 35:9). The same method of comparison and association was used for both the allegorical and anagogical senses, just as it was for the tropological. It is perhaps because of this emphasis on resurrection and the future that there are few connections to the rites of the Old Testament. The unveiling of the paten in 50.1 recalled the unveiling of the Law in Christ and thus the unity of the two Testaments, the taking up of the host was related to the Old Testament priests taking the shewbread (51.3) and the Agnus dei was related to the Old Testament sacrifice of a lamb (52.1), but this is all.

d. Transforming the priest: tropological interpretation and theology

Part of the purpose of liturgical interpretation was to transform those who performed the liturgy, as seen in the interpretation of the vestments, and this was stated explicitly in the bishop’s words during the ordination rite to one about to be ordained priest:

Understand what you do; imitate what you perform; as you celebrate the mystery of the death of the Lord, look to mortify yourself from all vice and every evil desire.\(^{45}\)

The commentaries were designed to help the priest do this by educating his mind and giving him reminders of this mystery. In the communion rites, kissing the paten reminded him to ask for peace of body and soul (50.3); the ascending kisses on the chalice reminded him that the power of the sacrament leads on by an interior ascent of virtue to heavenly joy (50.4); when he stood upright he should be lifting up his heart and mind to God (51.11); the ablution reminded him of his unworthiness (55.1); and kissing the altar should remind him to believe firmly and aim at union with the actions and persons of the rite (57.1, 59.8). In addition to the fundamental meditation on the mass as passion narrative - ‘the mystery of the death of the Lord’ - chapter 51 gave a bewildering variety of things for the priest to think upon as he

\(^{45}\)Agnoscite quod agitis; imitamini quod tractatis; quatenus mortis Dominicae mysterium celebrantes, mortificare membra vestra a vitiis et concupiscentiis omnibus procuretis’, Andrieu, Pontifical roman, iii, 366.
broke the host: the church, predestination, the Trinity, the wounds of Christ and the saints.

In addition to this moral education of the priest, the liturgical interpretation of the communion rites also assisted his theological formation. The episcopal blessing before communion reminded him that Christ anticipates us with his grace, which comes both before and after our actions: this recalls the Augustinian doctrine of *gratia preveniens* and *gratia subsequens* (51.23). The interpretation of the three-fold singing of the *Agnus dei* brought to mind the Augustinian theology of fall and redemption: Christ came to free us from the fault (*culpa*) and punishment (*poena*) of original sin and then, having repaired the damage, to raise us to the fullness of grace (52.3). Similarly the three ablutions of the priest at mass were related to the cleansing of original sin (*peccata originalis*), the guilt of original sin (*peccata criminalis*) and venial sin (*peccata venialis*) (55.2). The categories of scholastic theology were brought into liturgical interpretation by a method which used association with number and order – the blessing which comes before recalls the grace which comes before. It was, however, in his discussion of the consecrated host, its breaking and its being given in holy communion that the interpretation of Durandus touched most closely on subjects that were to be hotly debated in the sixteenth century. The results of his method reveal that his priorities were not those of the polemicists of that age.

*e. Communion, transubstantiation and a kiss*

Durandus applied his method to the liturgy as it existed in his time. Book 4 has little interest in the act of receiving communion and chapter 54 on communion was called ‘on the communion of the priest’ because in the thirteenth century the laity received communion infrequently and often only the celebrant communicated. Lay-communion is passed over swiftly as a symbol of the meals of the risen Christ with the disciples (54.3). Even the priest’s communion was not interpreted as his own participation in the sacrament but as a sign of the future restoration of bodies and souls (54.2). Current liturgical practice is revealed when the frequency of communion is discussed in the chapter on the kiss of peace. Durandus said that because ‘today’ Christians only receive communion three times a year, or sometimes
only at Easter, as a substitute, ‘on every day the kiss of peace is given for the ministry of unity’. He was able to deploy the method of liturgical interpretation to present a developed symbolic theology of this liturgical development, derived from the meaning of the kiss in society and Scripture and influenced by discussion of the spiritual significance of the kiss in popular commentaries on the Song of Song such as that of St Bernard. Durandus noted that the kiss was a sign of intimate union joining flesh to flesh, spiritualised in Scripture to mean a union of charity and a sign of peace and reverence (53.6, 10). He was aware of disorder both at the literal level, the danger of carnal embraces during the liturgy (53.9), and in the spiritual order, as with the kiss of Judas in Gethsemane (53.6). The kiss of peace in the eucharist was interpreted as a replacement for the absent act of lay communion by relating the kiss as secular sign of reconciliation to: the reconciliation effected by the sacrifice of Christ (53.4); charity and unity restored between humans and angels (53.5); the union of Christ with humanity (53.10); and even the union of the two Testaments (53.11). All things effected by the eucharist. Durandus thus used comparisons within a basic ‘vocabulary of symbol’ to justify a change in liturgical practice by assimilating the meaning of the sign of peace to the meaning of holy communion.

The Rationale was thus mainly concerned with allegorical interpretation of the rites not the presence of Christ in the sacrament. While accepting concomitance, the doctrine that the whole Christ (body, blood, soul and divinity) is present under the appearances of both bread and wine (41.27; 51.17; 54.13), Durandus gave symbolism (sacramentum) at least as much weight as the theological reality (res):

Even if the blood of Christ may be in the consecrated host, it is not there sacramentally because the bread signifies the body not the blood and the wine the blood not the body’.

46 ‘Singulis diebus osculum pacis daretur pro ministerio unitatis’, Rationale 4.53.3. Miri Rubin, Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture (Cambridge, 1992), 74-76.

47 A similar use of allegory to justify changes in practice in Rationale Book 3 is analysed by Andrea Denny-Brown in ‘Old Habits Die Hard’.

48 ‘Etsi enim in hostia consecrate Christi sanguis sit, non tamen est ibi sacramentaliter, eo quod corpus non sanguine, et vinum sanguine significat et non corpus’, Rationale 4.54.13.
The extension of the feast of Corpus Christi to the whole Latin church in 1264 was a sign of widespread devotional and theological interest in the real presence in Durandus’s day, but his method was taken from an earlier age and the great development of eucharistic devotion, together with the Protestant Reformers’ reaction against it, lay in the future. Durandus’s method, emphasising symbol rather than substance, worked on a different level from the sub-Aristotelian theology of transubstantiation taught by his contemporary Thomas Aquinas (1225-74). Durandus only briefly discussed transubstantiation in his ‘eleven miracles concerning the body of Christ’ (41.16-27) and in answering questions such as whether the water in the chalice is turned into Christ’s blood (4.42.6); it may be assumed that this subject was left to the standard contemporary texts of scholastic theology. As seen in the interpretation of the kiss, Durandus was, however, aware of the development of church practice over time. He attributed the move from frequent to infrequent communion both to an increase in the number of Christians and to a departure from Christ’s original command to ‘drink from this, all of you’ (53.3) and he even hinted that communion should be received under both kinds when discussing why each species should not be consumed immediately after it is consecrated (54.13).

This interest in symbolism was also reflected in Durandus’s concern for the signification of the matter of the sacrament: bread and wine mixed with water. This was something that could be obscured if the emphasis was on transubstantiation when they were believed to cease to be bread and wine. In the section ‘On the offering of the priest’ he compared the bread to the shewbread of the Old Testament (4.30.5-7) and commented on the host’s roundness which signified Christ who has no beginning or end (4.30.8). He discussed the etymology of panis and vinum and used this to ground allegory: for example ‘panis’ was said by Isidore to be from the Greek ‘pan’ meaning ‘all’ and thus represented our whole life (4.30.15). Wine was said to signify (designat) the blood of Christ and Durandus considered three interpretations

49 Durandus mentions the institution of the feast at Rationale 6.115.6., although it was not universally celebrated until the turn of the century, Rubin, Corpus Christi, 176-81.

50 Jungmann notes that communion from the chalice was still given to the people in some parts of Europe during Durandus’s lifetime, Mass of the Roman Rite, ii, 385. Utraquism was not a pressing issue until the rise of the Hussites in the early fifteenth century.
of the mixing of wine with water on the basis of this: the union of the people with Christ, of the divine and human natures of Christ and the blood and water that came from the side of the crucified Christ (4.30.17, 19). Later, when considering the consecrations in the canon (4.41-42), he used Psalm 103:15 to say that the elements were chosen by Christ because they signified nourishment and bread and wine represented strength and joy (4.41.5, 31). This was followed by long sections on the scriptural symbolism of bread and wine (4.41.6-11; 4.42.21). The symbolism of the elements was, however, only one part of the many-layered symbolism of the rites and coexisted with practical questions such as what to do when the wine freezes or blood from the priest’s nose drips into the chalice (4.42.11, 19).

f. The fraction and the triform body

The most significant theological interpretation in Book 4 of the Rationale was that of the fraction of the host in chapter 51. Durandus first gave his own interpretation (51.4-10) and then recorded six schemes from his predecessors (51.20-22) (see Table 2.2). These various interpretations of the same liturgical object illustrate the method of liturgical interpretation. The given fact of the host as the body of Christ divided into three parts (of which one is put in the consecrated wine) was interpreted in different triform schemes on the basis of the ‘body of Christ’ meaning either the physical body of Jesus or the church which is the body of Christ. In accordance with his encyclopaedic method Durandus simply presented these six interpretations side by side, although by his time the practice of reserving the third part for viaticum, upon which some were based, had largely ended.51

Amalarius’s original interpretation of the three parts of the host as the ‘triform body’ of Christ resulted in a fierce dispute with Florus, and Henri de Lubac’s seminal work Corpus Mysticum established that this piece of liturgical interpretation played a central role in theological speculation on the church, eschatology and the sacraments for centuries. Amalarius’s interpretation was attributed to Pope Sergius because of an

51 Henri de Lubac, Corpus Mysticum: The Eucharist and the Church in the Middle Ages (London, 2006), 295-6; Jungmann notes a Rouen Missal of as late as 1516 which still prescribes the reservation of the third part, Mass of the Roman Rite, ii, 310.
error in a tenth-century liturgical commentary and because of this papal authority it entered two of the most important medieval texts, Gratian’s *Decretum* and Lombard’s *Sentences.* As such it was one of the most cited examples of liturgical interpretation in the late medieval and early modern period, as illustrated in the popular distich, quoted by Aquinas:

*Hostia dividitur in partes. Tincta beatos*  
*Plene, sicca notat vivos, servata sepultos.*

The popularity of this theme in liturgical interpretation was influenced by the developing doctrine of purgatory and only ceased to be of interest when the focus of theological reflection on the eucharist as the ‘body of Christ’ shifted from the church to the objectified real presence of Christ in the host. This new emphasis on the objective presence of Christ also caused a crisis for the symbolic method of liturgical interpretation. De Lubac claims that this change had happened by the thirteenth century but the commentary of Durandus suggests that at the end of that century a live interest in the doctrine of the ‘triform body’ not only remained but was of equal interest with speculation about the mode of Christ’s presence in the sacrament. The method of liturgical interpretation thus continued to serve a theological as well as an educational purpose.

---

52 The *Liber de divinis officiis* of Pseudo-Alcuin reproduced the text of Amalarius, *De divinis officiis*, 3.35, in its commentary on the fraction under a note that Pope Sergius had introduced the Agnus Dei at Mass. This proximity caused Amalarius’s teaching to be attributed to Sergius, and, bolstered by this papal authority, it entered Gratian’s *Decretum, De consecratione* 2.22 (Friedberg, i, 1321), and Lombard’s *Sentences*, 4.12.4(69), Giulio Silano, tr., *Peter Lombard, The Sentences: Book 4 On the Doctrine of Signs* (Toronto, 2010), 63. Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum*, 279-80.

53 ‘The host is divided in parts. The fully moistened part denotes the blessed, the dry part the living and the part kept back those who are in the tomb’, Thomas, *In scripto sententiarum*, IV.xii.1 ad 3, qu. 3. A different form is recorded by Gabriel Biel and attributed to Innocent III, *Canonis misse expositio*, lectio 80K (Oberman & Courtenay, iv, 13): ‘Frangitur in partes tres hostia, prima beatos. Plene secunda notat vivos, servata sepultos’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The undivided half placed on the paten or The dry part consumed</td>
<td>The predestined who are already in glory</td>
<td>All the faithful</td>
<td>The church triumphant</td>
<td>Christ walking on earth</td>
<td>Christ the head of the body</td>
<td>Those in paradise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The quarter put in the chalice</td>
<td>Those who live in the body because they still need the merits of the passion</td>
<td>The body of Christ which was taken from the Virgin</td>
<td>The church militant</td>
<td>The body of Christ already risen</td>
<td>The saints still in this world or in purgatory</td>
<td>Those in this world or in purgatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The quarter put on the paten or The dry part kept until the end of Mass</td>
<td>Those in purgatory as they are certainly to be joined to those in heaven</td>
<td>All the dead</td>
<td>Those in purgatory</td>
<td>The body of Christ in the tomb/ the faithful in the tombs</td>
<td>The faithful in tombs whose souls reign with Christ</td>
<td>no comment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) **Liturical interpretation and the grammar of signs**

As has been noted above, liturgical interpretation drew most of its methodology from contemporary spiritual exegesis of the Scriptures. Behind this were certain philosophical and theological principles and, on the basis of these, liturgical
interpretation is best seen as a way of ‘reading’ the symbolism of the liturgy which has its own ‘grammar’ and ‘vocabulary’.

a. The epistemology of the method

The method of liturgical interpretation, because it is concerned with the meaning of things, implies an epistemology - a theory of knowledge. Someone who looks on a chalice and just sees a cup, even a liturgical cup, has a different way of looking at the world and knowing things than one who looks at the chalice and thinks of the tomb of Christ, the joys of heaven and the passions of this world. One attains the truth and knowledge of a liturgical object or rite by going beyond its outer appearances to its inner meaning or ratio. Durandus’s prayer for access to the inner rationes of the liturgy, that ‘there shall be revealed to me the celestial model that was shown to Moses on the mountain’, is not pious decoration but rather epistemology.\(^{54}\)

This means firstly that the world of sense experience is a shadow of reality, albeit a shadow that hints at its prototype. Secondly it implies that the inner meanings of things exist in the realm of God, or in the mind of God, in such a way that God can reveal them as he revealed the prototypes of Old Testament worship. To access these ‘ideas’, divine illumination is required. This is an Augustinian Christian-Platonist epistemology, but it is also, as the reference to Exodus shows, a Biblical view of the world and of knowledge. It is the world-view of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Book of Revelation in the New Testament which present a heavenly liturgy in which the writers believed their earthly liturgy participated. It is also found in the liturgy itself, for example when the Roman canon presents the earthly altar as related to a heavenly altar: ‘Supplices te rogamus, omnipotens Deus: iube haec perferri per manus sancti Angeli tui in sublime altare tuum, in conspectu divinae maiestatis tuae’.\(^{55}\)

\(^{54}\) *Rationale*, Prologue 1.

\(^{55}\) ‘We humbly beseech you, Almighty God, command these [offerings] to be carried by the hands of your holy angel to your altar on high, in the presence of your divine Majesty’. This prayer, quoted by Ambrose (*De Sacramentis*, 4.27; SC 25bis, 116), contains an allusion to Revelation 8:3-4. Hebrews 9:23-24 also speaks of the heavenly sanctuary.
This epistemology involves more than a straightforward correspondence (the earthly altar signifies the heavenly altar), it also involves association, where a chalice can point beyond itself to other things. In this association, it is the distance between material object and heavenly prototype that leaves room for polysemy; the earthly thing can relate to more than one heavenly ‘inner meaning’. This epistemological method is thus symbolic because it is concerned with how things symbolise or signify other things, whether these be the things of heaven or the realities of Christian life on earth. It is rooted in Augustine’s teaching on signs and his epistemology in the De doctrina Christiana which has been discussed in the previous chapter.

b. Scriptural exegesis and the incarnational principle
The prologue to the Rationale stated that the method of interpretation, and thus the underlying epistemology, was the same as that used in spiritual exegesis of the Scriptures. Here again words and stories function as signs and point beyond themselves to a ‘spiritual sense’ (the ratio) which has within it three ‘senses’: allegorical, tropological and anagogical. In spiritual exegesis, things and words function in a symbolic manner as signs pointing to other things which have a more significant spiritual meaning, for example the sacrificial lamb of the Old Testament makes one think of Christ. While this can lead to extraordinary flights of allegory, it is important to realise that it is a method used in the New Testament itself: John the Baptist says of Jesus, ‘Behold the lamb of God’ (John 1:29), and Paul says of him, ‘Christ our passover [lamb] has been slain’ (1 Cor 5:7). The Amalarius-Durandus tradition of liturgical interpretation applies this exegetical method beyond the text to

Sign and symbol are here used in a similar way to mean things that signify other things. ‘Symbol’ can have a more precise meaning as something that stands for something else, like a flag for a country, as well as being something that simply points towards something else.

This connection between liturgy and epistemology is suggested by an example used by the Scottish philosopher James Liddell in his epistemological treatise on signs, Tractatus conceptuum et signorum (Paris, 1495). In discussing the nature of signs, Liddell notes that the words ‘Confiteor Deo caeli’ were held to represent the beating of the breast because that is what one did in the liturgy when one said them. Alexander Broadie, ‘James Liddell on Concepts and Signs’, in A.A. MacDonald, M. Lynch and I.B. Cowan, eds., The Renaissance in Scotland: Studies in Literature, Religion, History and Culture (Leiden, 1994), 92.

Rationale, Prologue 9-12.
things, places, and actions as well as words. It is thus distinctive in its combination of method and subject. For example, when speaking of the priest receiving the peace from Christ in the consecrated host and the deacon receiving it from the priest, Durandus states that ‘they perform in a sign the fact that the spiritual peace from Christ has been given to the human race’. There is an action and the action is a sign of a spiritual truth that is beyond the mere ‘literal’ meaning of the action. The practice of liturgical interpretation is simply a development of the Augustinian theology which sees sacraments as visible words and signs of something sacred, which is itself based on the incarnation in which the man Jesus reveals God to the world. The hermeneutic of liturgical interpretation extends this sacramental and incarnational principle from the sacrament in itself to the actions, things and words of which its rite is made.

c. The grammar and vocabulary of signs
If liturgical interpretation involves the analysis of the liturgy as a system of conventional signs, it is analogous to language which is the archetypal system of conventional signs. Liturgical interpretation may thus be expected to have its own ‘grammar’ or basic way of ordering this system of symbolism to reveal the inner meaning to which the signs point. The examples of the church-building, vestments and communion rites show that this ‘grammar’ has both natural and supernatural elements. Some signs take their meaning from the thing itself, as a circle symbolises completeness and a kiss unity, whereas others take their meaning from Scripture, as with the idea that the right side symbolises faith and the left infidelity (4.53.2) which is used in the parable of the sheep and the goats (Matthew 25:31-46). Such association or comparison of ideas is an essential part of this ‘grammar’. A complex system of symbols can be built up using it, for example when Durandus says without explanation that the right of the altar symbolises the Jews, the left the gentiles (4.55.3, 4.57.1) and the middle of the altar the union of both in faith in Christ (4.57.3), this is clearly based on this fundamental interpretation of right and left found in Matthew 25. It is the same with numbers: if the priest drinks the consecrated

---

59 *Hoc faciunt in signum quod pax spiritualis a Christo data est humano generi*, Rationale 4.53.1.
60 Fitzgerald, *Augustine through the Ages*, 741-47.
wine thrice it is in honour of the Trinity, if twice it recalls the double commandment of love (4.54.12). This is not arbitrary as there is a direct link via the number between the sign and the mystery it symbolises. Elsewhere it is the symbolic potential of the body that mediates the meaning: the priest’s hands on the altar at the Agnus dei are a sign that his mind is attentive to God (4.52.3); the uprightness of his body symbolises his mind raised to God (4.51.11); his joined hands express focussed attention and his bow humility (4.52.3). The method is also sometimes used to relate actions within the rite; for example the sign of the cross made by the priest with the elements before communion is related to the canon where he made the same sign over the same elements while consecrating them: by it he both sanctifies and asks to be sanctified (4.54.11). This association of things and ideas within the linguistic world of medieval religion is the centre of this ‘grammar’.

Whereas many today would presume that symbolism is used to supplement words which are the primary form of communication, Durandus says of the words spoken by the priest, Pax Domini etc., that ‘the joy of the resurrection is to be expressed not only through signs but even through words’. By this he seems to give primacy to symbolic over verbal communication. A key feature of this ‘grammar’ is its free nature. It is a method not simply a fixed tradition because it can be used in a variety of ways as long as one keeps within orthodox belief, ‘with the faith always being preserved’.

A clear ‘vocabulary’ of interpretations is built up and passed on. The tradition itself, however, like the liturgy, is constantly in process, hence the references above to development and Durandus’s awareness of change over time in the liturgy. If one set of interpretations were to become fixed and canonical to the exclusion of others it could be argued that the method had died and had become simply a fixed tradition, but this is not an adequate use of ‘tradition’. The method itself, if rightly understood, is a tradition because the creativity of interpretation found in Durandus and his

---

61 ‘Non solum per signa, verum etiam per verba, resurrectionis est gaudium experimentum’, Rationale 4.51.14.

62 Rationale, Prologue 12.
sources exists within clearly defined parameters and coexists with the handing on of a corpus or ‘vocabulary’ of interpretations. A key principle of the ‘grammar’ of liturgical interpretation is polysemy, but this needs to be preserved from incoherence by this distinct ‘vocabulary’ of signs. The vocabulary is formed by association and, as liturgical interpretation is an open method not a closed system of associations, it is capable of development. The method works in a way analogous to case-law, building up an inheritance of interpretations to influence future writers but not confining them to simply repeating this tradition. Durandus’s new interpretation connecting the vestments to the passion of Christ is an example of the method producing something new in line both with contemporary fashions in devotion and with the ‘vocabulary’ already produced by the method itself (the mass as passion drama). It is an example of creative thinking within the method and of what Denny-Brown calls ‘the usefulness of allegory as a hermeneutic that absorbs various kinds of change’.

d. The context of faith

Durandus’s words, ‘with the faith always being preserved’, indicate what holds the method together. It presumes a mind formed in the Scriptures and Catholic theology and open to the natural world so that it can recognise the connections which form the ‘vocabulary’ and relate them in a way consistent with its ‘grammar’. If one looks at the ways theology was structured in Durandus’s time, for example in the Sentences of Peter Lombard and the Summa theologiae of Thomas Aquinas, one can see the broad shape of these essential preconceptions. The first ‘given’ is Scripture as a whole, sacra pagina, which was seen as the basic matter of theology. Secondly there is a belief in the continuity between nature and the supernatural, faith and reason, theology and philosophy; a belief, in Thomist terms, that grace perfects nature rather

---

63 This is similar to T.S. Eliot’s view of the value of tradition in literature in ‘Tradition and the Individual Talent [I],’ The Egoist 6:4 (September 1919), 54-5, and ‘Tradition and the Individual Talent, II’, The Egoist 6:5 (November 1919), 72-3 (republished in his The Sacred Wood: Essays on Poetry and Criticism, New York, 1921). For Eliot, tradition is the place of innovation and is constantly being modified by the incorporation of the new. This is an organic process distinct from both a static view of tradition and a view of novelty as disruption, because the new comes out of the tradition and exists in relationship with what has come before, altering our perception of it.

64 Denny Brown, ‘Old Habits Die Hard’, 563. Durandus does not have an explicit theology of liturgical development but he is aware of it and his method enables him to live with it creatively.
than overthrows it. This enables the interpretation to go beyond the confines of Scripture and use non-religious signs, although these, as in the case of the kiss, are often also used in Scripture itself. Thirdly there is a sacramental view of reality which is based on the incarnation: material things reveal spiritual things. Finally the interpretations fit into a vision of theology essentially concerned with creation, redemption by Christ and human sanctification in the church through the sacraments. It is within this that the things, actions and words of the liturgy are related to aspects of the moral life or the mysteries of the faith. To practice this method well, one thus needed to be well-formed in the thought-world of Scripture, the liturgy and Christian theology.

e. A living tradition: the development of the method

This method of liturgical interpretation deployed by Durandus continued to be used and to develop. Gabriel Biel’s commentary on the communion rites, written two hundred years later, differed from that of Durandus in having long sections on transubstantiation. Biel also integrated the methods of scholasticism, having a clear structural distinction between literal and spiritual commentary and also judging between the various spiritual interpretations in the manner of a scholastic quaestio. He noted, for example, Albert the Great’s rejection of Innocent’s interpretation of the communion antiphon as ‘the joy of the apostles at the resurrection of Christ’ on the grounds that the texts never mention joy, but then criticised Albert by saying that because the liturgy follows Christ in teaching by actions as well as words, the chant is so joyful that the word ‘joy’ is not necessary. A different use of liturgical interpretation was found in William Bonde’s Meditations which said of the communion antiphon:

That tyme the masse betokenith the myrthe and Ioye of the holly Apostles after thai hard of the Resurrectyon of ther Lord and oures. And so lett us gyff

65 This is seen in the structure of the Sentences: 1. Trinity; 2. Creation and sin; 3. Incarnation and virtue; 4. Sacraments and the four last things; and the Summa theologiae: 1a. God and creation; 1a2ae. God as the end of man; 2a2ae. man’s return to God; 3a. Christ as the way to God.

66 Gabriel Biel, Canonis misse expositio, lectiones 84-88 (Oberman & Courtenay, iv, 77-171).

thanks with the blyssyd Apostles for that gracious gyffte of hys moost gloryous resurrectyon and for this blyssyd sacryfice.\textsuperscript{68}

Here the interpretation of Innocent, which Durandus repeats, Albert disputes and Biel discusses, is turned into an invitation to prayer. The method of liturgical interpretation used by Durandus thus continued to be a fruitful living tradition into the sixteenth century, responding to developments in theology and devotion.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Liturgical interpretation as practiced by writers from Amalarius of Metz to Durandus of Mende and beyond is thus a clearly defined method of understanding the liturgy which allows a great variety of possible interpretations. It presupposes an epistemology where the fullness of truth and meaning is found in the spiritual world but is accessed, with the help of God, via symbolism found in the physical world - in this case the complexus of verbal and physical signs which was the medieval Latin liturgy. This symbolic method of knowing or interpretation is based on a fundamental principle of Christian theology: the revelation of spiritual realities through matter, as the incarnation revealed God in Christ and the sacraments bestow divine grace by means of physical signs.

Liturgical interpretation shares its method with the spiritual exegesis of the Scriptures, from which it has taken it. It is, however, distinctive in its object which is the things, actions and words of the liturgy rather than simply the sacred text. It has its own ‘grammar’ which chiefly consists in the association of ideas and the discovery of relations between things in Scripture, liturgy, theology and the natural world. It is a tradition as well as a method and has built up a ‘vocabulary’ of interpretations and interpretational principles over time. Given that anything within the liturgy can be multivalent, can bear a number of different interpretations, it is a method which is open-ended and capable of development within its boundaries which are formed by Scripture and Catholic theology. Finally, liturgical interpretation is ordered to the spiritual benefit of those who practice it and those

\textsuperscript{68} Legg, \textit{Tracts on the Mass}, 28.
they teach. Its purpose is to enable those who celebrate or attend the liturgy to remember the mysteries of salvation and the principles of the moral life, and by holding these in their mind to be transformed by them so they may better live the Christian life, avoid hell and attain heaven; in the words of the ordination service, ‘agnoscite quod agitis; imitamini quod tractatis’.
Part B
Liturgical Interpretation in Scotland
1488-1560
Chapter 3. Used Books and Networks: The Aberdeen Liturgists and Catholic Reform in Scotland

This chapter begins with the study of books as material objects and the evidence of use and ownership by which they are marked. This leads to the uncovering of relationships and networks distinguished by interest in liturgical interpretation and commitment to Catholic Reform. Evidence from this use of the methods of ‘book history’ determined that this thesis be a study of Church Reform as well as of liturgical interpretation in Scotland. The main sources are the liturgical commentaries and reformed Catholic liturgical books that were in Scotland from the consecration of Bishop Elphinstone in 1488 to the events of 1559-60. These are studied in the context of a broader examination of 166 copies of the Rationale from all over Europe. As books can be carriers of relationships, this results in a prosopographically based study of Catholic reforming circles in the dioceses of Aberdeen, Moray and St Andrews.¹ Given the limited surviving evidence there may have been other similar groups. It is argued that the group of ‘Aberdeen Liturgists’ around Elphinstone who produced the Aberdeen breviary (1509-10) continued up to 1560 and beyond and laid the foundations for the enduring and distinctive religious culture of North-East Scotland. The relationships revealed by these books suggest that, although it ultimately failed, the Catholic Reform movement in Scotland was strong, had a distinctive intellectual base and was in contact with Catholic reforming circles on the continent. Many of the people, places and books discussed here will be revisited in chapter 4 on education, chapter 5 on material culture and chapter 6 on the Catholic and Protestant Reformations.

1) The books: liturgical commentaries in Scotland and Europe
The thirty-three liturgical commentaries which were, or may have been, in Scotland between 1488 and 1560 are listed in Bibliography 4. Some of the liturgical

¹ This chapter follows up Anthony Ross’s suggestion of a ‘Aberdeen-Kinloss link’ associated with an Edinburgh group, ESL, 20.
commentaries in this list are extant with a clear provenance, some have disappeared but featured in the medieval Scottish library catalogues edited by John Higgitt, and some were probably in Scotland before 1560 because they are found there soon after. They are part of a long but ignored tradition in Scottish intellectual life. The earliest Scottish library lists - that of Robert, bishop of St Andrews (1127-59) in 1153 and those in the 13th century Registrum Angliae - contain liturgical commentaries by Ivo of Chartres and Hugh of St Victor. The early Irish tract on the mass in the Stowe missal also suggests that liturgical interpretation was part of the intellectual tradition of the Gaelic West of Scotland.

a. The predominance of the Rationale and church reform

This list of Scottish liturgical commentaries is based on books and lists that have happened to survive and so it cannot be utilised for a scientific analysis of the use of liturgical commentaries in Scotland, but it does allow certain provisional conclusions to be drawn. The first conclusion is the predominance of the Rationale, 36% of the total. This is supported by an analysis by century of the thirteen available volumes of the Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues (CBMLC), see Table 3.1. The main author in the twelfth century was Amalarius; in the thirteenth century, Beleth; in the fourteenth, Beleth followed by Innocent III; in the fifteenth Durandus, closely followed by Beleth; and in the sixteenth, Durandus by a large margin. This dominance of the Rationale in the later period is perhaps even more striking than the results allow because older books remained in libraries, but it is not surprising

---

2 SL, 169 (Holyrood: Hugh, De sacramentis); 224 (Bishop Robert, Loch Leven: Ivo?, De ecclesiasticis sacramentis); 211-12 (Kelso: Ivo, De officiis et vestibus sacerdotum; Hugh, De sacramentis and Speculum ecclesie); 230 (Newbattle: Hugh, De sacramentis); 238 (St Andrews Cathedral Priory: Hugh, De sacramentis). G.W.S. Barrow, ‘The Lost Gaidhealtachd of Medieval Scotland’, in W. Gillies, ed., Gaelic and Scotland: Alba agus a Ghaidhilig (Edinburgh, 1989), 67-88.

because the *Rationale* was the most frequently copied and printed liturgical commentary and also the most comprehensive, interpreting the whole of the Latin liturgy. There may, however, have been another reason for the popularity of the *Rationale*.

Table 3.1: Liturgical Commentaries in English Medieval Library Catalogues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Durandus</th>
<th>Innocent III</th>
<th>Beleth</th>
<th>Amalarius</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th century</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th century</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th century</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th century</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th century</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
<td>15th century</td>
<td>5</td>
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<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
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Table 3.1: Liturgical Commentaries in English Medieval Library Catalogues
The Benedictine monastery of St Justina, Padua was the centre of the reforming monastic Congregation of St Justina (later known as the Cassinese). Giovanna Alzati’s edition of its late fifteenth century library catalogue records four copies of Durandus’s *Rationale* and one copy of Beleth’s *Summa*. In the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris is a fine copy of the 1459 first edition of the *Rationale* with an inscription saying it was purchased by this centralised Congregation for its Abbey of San Giorgio Maggiore at Venice. Alzati demonstrates that the Congregation had a careful policy of book purchase and distribution to support its programme of monastic studies. Examination of dates in the catalogue reveals that in 1453 the mother house had only one liturgical commentary, that of John Beleth, but in the next four decades it acquired four copies of the *Rationale* of which at least one was printed. One was a gift but the purchase of the others and the copy for San Giorgio suggest that the acquisition and use of this commentary in the late fifteenth century was a deliberate policy associated with the Congregation’s monastic reform objectives. Similarly, in the first quarter of the sixteenth century the library catalogue of the English Bridgettine Abbey of Syon, also associated with Catholic reform, records seven copies of the *Rationale* with five other liturgical commentaries. The predominance of the *Rationale* may have been a result of its popularity with Catholic reform movements.

b. Ownership of the commentaries, education and the importance of Aberdeen
The second conclusion from the list of Scottish liturgical commentaries is that they were predominantly owned by secular clergy, most of whom were connected with the diocese of Aberdeen. This Scottish pattern differs from that elsewhere in Europe.


5 Giovanna Cantoni Alzati, *La Biblioteca di S. Giustina di Padova. Libri e cultura presso i benedettini padovani in età umanistica* (Padua, 1982), numbers 363, 424, 850, 885 (Durandus) and 41 (Beleth).

6 BNF Véluins 125.

7 Alzati, *Biblioteca*, 6-8; all books acquired were to be designed, ‘*alimentare la formazione dottrinale del monaco e plasmare la sua spiritualità*’ (‘to feed the monk’s doctrinal formation and to form his spirituality’), 7.

Of the ninety-five pre-1581 European copies of the *Rationale* with clear provenance that have been examined (see Appendix 1), most (58%) belonged to the regular clergy, with the largest group being the Franciscans (18%) and significant numbers belonging to reformed orders such as the Franciscan Observants (7%) and the Carthusians (2%), while 31% belonged to the secular clergy and 7% were from universities. The twenty-four Scottish commentaries whose pre-1560 provenance is known provide a different profile. They were predominantly owned by the secular clergy (83%) and a large proportion came from collegiate churches (29%) most of which were university colleges (25%). This may be partly explained by the unique institutional continuity of Scottish university colleges over the Reformation period compared to the disruption suffered by religious, but the concentration of extant copies in the hands of secular clergy is surely significant.

Many of the Scottish commentaries of known pre-1560 provenance belonged to individuals and communities associated with Catholic reform, such as the Franciscan Observants, the Dominican provincial John Grierson, Bishop Robert Reid, and the bishops and clergy of the diocese of Aberdeen. Eleven of these liturgical commentaries (42%) belonged to individuals and institutions in or associated with the diocese of Aberdeen. This need not be surprising, it was the second richest diocese and had a post-Reformation tradition of religious conservatism which may explain a higher survival rate for these Catholic books. A survey of pre-1560 books owned by cathedral canons does, however, hint at a special interest in liturgical commentaries in Aberdeen (see Table 3.2, below). The results fit very closely with the wealth of the cathedrals but Aberdeen is in second place to St Andrews in wealth and books in general whereas with liturgical commentaries Aberdeen has a clear lead.

2) **Used books: marginalia in liturgical commentaries**

The Scottish liturgical commentaries frequently show signs of use, especially the presence of written marginalia: notes written in the margins and other blank spaces. The analysis of such marks is a good way of finding out how the commentaries were
used and a study of marginalia in the European *Rationales* will help understand how liturgical interpretation and liturgical commentaries were used in Scotland.

Table 3.2: Liturgical Commentaries and the Clergy of Scottish Cathedrals in the Mid-Sixteenth Century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIOCESE</th>
<th>A. Number of Canons 1560</th>
<th>B. Minimum Income 1561</th>
<th>C. Liturgical Commentaries</th>
<th>D. Canons’ Extant Books¹</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrews</td>
<td>32-39</td>
<td>£12500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15 6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>£5170</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15 4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>£5000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>£4400</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunkeld</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>£3400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galloway</td>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>£2540</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>£2100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brechin</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>£1250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caithness</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>£1166</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>£1100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 0</td>
<td>9=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunblane</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>£640</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Isles</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This is the number of canons who have extant books recorded in ESL followed by the number of canons with more than two books.

*a. Using marginalia to digest the text*

William Sherman’s 2008 book, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England*, demonstrates that the study of marginalia is an important part of the
‘interdiscipline’ of ‘the history of the book’ and also shows that renaissance readers were taught in school to make notes in their books to make them more useful, a practice that crossed ‘the medieval-renaissance divide’. Unlike the reader’s personal response to the text that Heather Jackson found dominant in modern marginalia, Sherman notes that ‘Renaissance readers tended to be more systematic and less psychologically revealing than post-Romantic readers’. Sherman’s study of incunabula in the Huntington Library suggests that between 60 and 70% have contemporary marginalia while by the 1590s the proportion was still over 50% for all books. This pattern is matched by the 166 pre-1581 copies of the Rationale examined: 70% of the 115 produced before 1501 are marked by marginalia and 49% of the 51 printed after 1501. One of Sherman’s key points is that, for renaissance readers, ‘most marginalia were concerned with clarifying and digesting the text, making it easier to read and apply to particular... needs.’ It is for this reason that books were marked by the greatest scholars of the age, such as Archbishops Cranmer and Parker of Canterbury, to create well-referenced research libraries.

b. Practical marks for liturgical practitioners
In addition to the manuscript underlinings, tables and marginal headings designed to make the Rationale more useful, the subjects marked also confirms this practical bias, as seen in Table 3.3 below. The large percentage of markings in the Preface and Book 1 perhaps reflect a trend to start reading a book, pen in hand, enthusiastically.

---


11 Sherman, Used Books, 9. The decline in the sixteenth century is partly explained by the increasing use of notebooks, Used Books, 7.

12 See Appendix 1.

13 Used Books, 77.

14 An early biographer noted of Cranmer that, ‘he seldom read without pen in hand’, Diarmaid McCulloch, Thomas Cranmer (New Haven, 1996), 26; Sherman’s own researches have included a study of the marks of Archbishop Parker in his extensive library now at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, Used Books, xii.
and then break off. The large proportion of marks in chapter 8, however, suggest that the book was used by clergy for liturgical calendar calculations, for example a Franciscan Rationale has extensive notes ‘de regularibus lunaris’ and the Rationale from the Charterhouse of Basle has various headings in Book 8 with fol. 196v on computus (calculation of the date of Easter) being blackened from frequent use and containing many notes.

### Table 3.3: Marginalia in the Sections of the Rationale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pages in CCCM critical edition</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
<th>Incidence in Rationales studied</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preface</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books 2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 4</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book 8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1300 pages</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other marks suggest the Rationale was used as a practical reference book for people who celebrated the liturgy. The same Carthusian volume has six notes on fol. 133r on the different tones used in singing the passion in Holy Week. One sixteenth-century Italian owner adorned his Rationale with pious texts including ‘cursed is the person who performs the liturgy negligently’, and he also made many notes in Book 4 on the

---

15 For example in BNF Vélins 126 there is much marginalia up to the end of the first chapter of Book 1 and little thereafter. BNF B-2511 is the same, but markings are resumed in Books 4 and 5.

16 BL IC.37101; BNF B-7.
times when one might celebrate mass more than once a day. There was also interest in such liturgical questions as the practicalities of Lent and fasting; the three masses of Christmas day; baptism and godparents; whether one can say mass with less than two present; and the things that should be done during the triduum. These reflected the practical liturgical tasks to which the owners were committed, for example the three sets of notes on baptism were all by pastoral priests and the eremitical Carthusians showed no interest in such rites. The rites for the dead seem to have been a particular concern of the owners of these books, for example the Benedictines of Venice were particularly concerned with the celebration of funerals. There are also notes concerning specifically monastic topics and other examples of a monastic interest in liturgy. The Rationale was thus clearly a practical book for liturgical practitioners.

c. Marking to teach or disagree
In the books examined there are few notes explicitly on allegorical interpretation, but four copies have marks by the discussion of the fourfold method of spiritual exegesis in the preface. This may have been for personal use but it may also have been for teaching. The marginal subheadings in two copies frequently start with ‘quare’

---

17 BNF B-10, verses on the rear endpaper starting, ‘maledictus homo qui facit opus dei negligenter’ (Jeremiah 48:10, but ‘opus Dei’ is a standard Latin term for the liturgy); 25v. In the section on Easter, 105v, he writes ‘nota quod stantes oramus’, ‘note that we pray standing’.

18 Lent: BL 7.a.8 (1518), 101r-117v; BNF B-2 (1470). Three masses of Christmas: BNF Vélins 125 (1459), 90r; BNF B-2 (1470, which also notes the ‘O Antiphons’); BNF B-602 (1486), 144v. Baptism and godparents: BNF Vélins 127 (1459) 119v; B-5 (1475) 236v; B-1455 (1481) 104v. Mass with less than two present: BNF B-595 (1479) 51v. Triduum: BNF B-1455 (1481) 183r-201v; 4Z.Don 205 (23) (1488) 184r-207v; B-42283 (1562) 432v.

19 BNF Vélins 127 (1459) 189v. Cf also BL IC.5413 (1470 – Carthusians); BNF B-1455 (1481) 255v-257r; and BNF B-592 (1477) 274v on holy water driving away demons from the dead.

20 BNF Vélins 127 (1459 - Benedictine), 79r ‘de officio monastico in noctibus’. Two copies mark the definition of monks among the ordines in the church in Rationale 2.1.12: BNF B-592 (1477), ‘monachorum quatuor genera’; CUL A*.5.31 (1500), 20r ‘monachi’.

21 BNF B-602 (1486 - Franciscan), 241r, notes of the gospel of Martha and Mary for the Assumption ‘allegoriam pertinens ad beatam virginem’ (‘pertaining to the Blessed Virgin as an allegory’). Quadripartite exegesis: BNF B-5 (1475), 1v-2r; CCCP EP.G.14 (1482 – Archbishop Parker’s copy although the note on the four senses is not in his hand), 2r-2v; BNF B-604 bis (1519), 1v; BNF B-28977 (1568), 1v-2r. BNF B-1466 (1479), 206v-207v has marks where the Preface to Book 6 discusses the relation between the two Testaments.
(‘why’) or ‘quod significet’ (‘what does it signify’), hinting that they were used for teaching subjects such as: ‘why is salt put in holy water’, ‘what does the priest’s bow towards the altar signify’ and ‘why does the church celebrate the Holy Innocents’.  

Teaching is a practical use of the book which will be examined in chapter 4, but there are also references to issues debated at the Reformation where the reader’s response is more personal and, in Sherman’s account, ‘modern’. Most of the examples are found in British copies but a French volume seems to show a Catholic (he has written the number and length of reign of each Pope mentioned) responding to the Reformation – he marked passages referring to iconoclasm and to heretics who say that Christ and the Apostles did not say mass.  

Protestant, or at least Humanist, response is indicated by those readers who write ‘fabula’ or ‘ridiculum’ by stories about miracles and Popes, and ‘blasphemia’ where Mary is called ‘porta misericordiae’ (‘gate of mercy’). There is also clearly an impatience with the sophisticated comparisons and numerology of the Durandus method, for example where the seven petitions of the Our Father are related to the seven words from the cross, an English reader writes ‘haec superstitiones redolent’ (‘these smell of superstition’), and when the three ways of starting the office are compared to three ways of sinning, Cranmer writes ‘ridiculum’  

The use of liturgical commentaries in Reformation controversies will be revisited in chapter 7.

3) Bishop Elphinstone and the Aberdeen Liturgists

a. Elphinstone’s reform and the diocese of Aberdeen

The Scottish liturgical commentaries suggest a special interest in liturgical interpretation in the diocese of Aberdeen and this fits well with what is known of the reform programme started by its bishop, William Elphinstone (1431-1514), who was

22 BNF B-591 (1477), ‘quae in aqua benedicta mittitur sal’, 61v, ‘quod significet inclination sacerdotes ante altare’, 65v; ‘quae ecclesia sollenizat innocentium’, 274r. The other copy is BNF Véjins-127 (1459), 27v-31v, all on the first chapters of Book 4.

23 BNF B-5 (1475), 8r, 53r.

24 ‘fabula’: BNF B-592 (1477), 15r; CUL A*5.31 (1500), 10r; BL C.77d.117 (1506 - Cranmer), 89v, 90r. ‘ridiculum’: BL C.77d.117, 89v, 91r. ‘blasphemia’: BL IB.41962 (1499), 88v.

25 BL IB.41962 (1499), 85v. BL C.77d.117, 89v.
consecrated and took possession of his see in 1488. A few months after his consecration, on Holy Cross day 1488, one of his allies on the Aberdeen chapter, canon Duncan Shearer, gave a copy of the *Rationale* to be chained in the choir of St Machar’s cathedral.

Leslie Macfarlane’s 1985 study of Elphinstone has been criticised for hagiographical tendencies but it is clearly based on evidence which shows that Elphinstone had a definite reform programme for his diocese with administrative, financial, liturgical, educational and spiritual elements. He obtained the right to chose his own diocesan officials and thus surrounded himself with a team of clergy who would further his projects, particularly the reformation of the chapter, the foundation of the university, church-building and the liturgical reform which produced the Aberdeen breviary. All of these projects were centred on the dignified celebration of the liturgy. The importance of Elphinstone’s reforms was such that in 1521 John Law, a canon of St Andrews cathedral priory, noted in his chronicle that at court Elphinstone had been compared to the great German reforming Cardinal, Nicholas of Cusa (1401-64).

Elphinstone’s building projects were significant. In addition to a bridge over the Dee, completed after his death by Bishop Dunbar and Alexander Galloway, he had a new choir built for the burgh church of St Nicholas, a chapel for his new university, a church for the new parish he established in Old Aberdeen (the Snow Kirk, *Sancta Maria ad Nivem*), and he built a belfry and spire, and possibly a new choir, for his cathedral – a series of projects distinguished by a concern for choirs, spaces in which


29 EUL. De.7.63, fol. 138r: ‘Hoc anno obit willelmus elphynston episcopus aberdonensis et fundator coegii et pater universitatis [margin: aberdonensis] eiusdem, qui electus erat in capitulo sancti andree archeepiscopus eiusdem, vir prudentia et consilio suis diebus nonnullis maximus. In curia regis iacobi quarti velat alter cusa ferebatur’ (‘In this year died William Elphinstone, Bishop of Aberdeen, founder of the College and father of the University of Aberdeen, who was chosen by the Chapter of St Andrews as Archbishop of that place, the greatest man of his time in prudence and counsel. At the court of King James IV he was referred to as another Cusa’).
bodies of clerics could offer dignified worship.\textsuperscript{30} Helen Brown’s study of collegiate churches in Lothian led her to note ‘the prominence of good corporate liturgy in the perception of a college’s functions’.\textsuperscript{31} For Elphinstone this emphasis on sacred space was the physical expression of his concern with the right ordering of these corporate bodies, whether at the cathedral, university or burgh church. This was expressed in his 1491 constitutions for St Nicholas, 1506 constitutions for St Machar’s cathedral, and the university college foundation charters of 1505 and 1514.\textsuperscript{32} In these documents the right functioning of the institutions is expressed in the right ordering of their corporate liturgical life. It is as if Elphinstone believed that dignified performance of worship would ensure the flourishing of other aspects of the foundations, pastoral, civic and educational, just as in contemporary theology the sacramental restoration of the right relationship to God in baptism was believed to help overcome the disorder in all aspects of human life caused by original sin.

One possible influence on Elphinstone’s liturgical activities was his visit to Rome in 1494-5. His main purpose in visiting Pope Alexander VI concerned legal privileges and the foundation of the university, but this was a period of liturgical codification in Rome under the Papal Masters of Ceremonies Agostino Patrizi Piccolomini and Giovanni Burckard who produced the 1485 \textit{Pontificale Romanum} for Pope Innocent VIII, an update of the pontifical of Durandus for use in the dioceses of the West.\textsuperscript{33} Such activity would have coincided with Elphinstone’s own interests and some evidence of its impact on Scotland after his death can be seen in the presence in Scotland of two copies of Piccolomini’s ceremonial guide, \textit{Rituum Ecclesiasticorum}


\textsuperscript{31} Brown, ‘Lay Piety in Later Medieval Lothian’, section 2.2.i ‘\textit{In augmentum Dei cultus}’.


Liber, owned by Archbishop James Beaton of Glasgow (Venice, 1516) and Bishop Robert Reid (Cologne 1557), prelates who also owned liturgical commentaries. The importance of liturgy and the regulation of ritual for Elphinstone is confirmed by his friend Hector Boece who wrote in 1521 of the bishop’s priorities on first arriving as bishop at Aberdeen thirty-three years before:

He formed the clergy with better ordinances and restored the worship which, owing to the evil times, had for some years been somewhat neglected. He ordered the chanting everywhere to be done in the ancient style of the fathers. For the due performance of the sacred rites in the church of Aberdeen he appointed John Malison master of ceremonies, a man deeply skilled in music and approved moral character, and gave him charge of the books on ritual which he had caused to be composed and arranged in methodical manner.

b. The ‘Aberdeen Liturgists’

Macfarlane thus rightly speaks of Elphinstone’s ‘programme of liturgical reform’. The existence of a group formed by the bishop in Old Aberdeen and dedicated to this is implied by the 1507 royal patent which led to the printing of the breviary when it speaks of Elphinstone ‘and utheris’ who have collected and expanded legends of Scottish saints. Macfarlane attempted to identify this group, partly using the presence in the breviary of the patron saints of their churches: Archibald Lindsay, precentor of Aberdeen, the official responsible for the choir and liturgy in the

34 Holmes, ‘Catalogue’, 177, 187.
35 ‘Clerum melioribus institutis format: divina nonnullos annos paulum neglecta, temporis iniquietae, restituit. Prisco atque patrum more cantu ubilibet celebrazque iubet. Ad sacra rite exequenda in basilica Aberdonensi, creat designatorum Johannem Malisonum, musica disciplina eruditum, moribus probatum, penes quem (quos scribi et concinnari fecerat) libri forent rituales’, Hector Boece, Hectoris Boetii Murthlacensium et Aberdonensium episcoporum vitae, ed. James Moir (Aberdeen, 1894), 79. There is a certain conventionality in this description in a book designed to glorify Elphinstone and his predecessors (Preface, v), his immediate predecessor Blackadder is said to have issued synodal decrees ‘pro divini cultus augmento’ (p.56), but it does emphasise his concern for the liturgy. In an earlier description of Elphinstone’s virtuous life as a parish priest in conventional terms, Boece singles out his recitation of the breviary, ‘diurnis aut nocturnis precibus horaris se dabat’, p.61.
36 Macfarlane, Elphinstone, 226, 243, 259.
37 Licence for the Aberdeen breviary: RPC, i, 223-4, no. 1546.; Isobel Preece et al., Our awin Scottis use: Music in the Scottish Church up to 1603 (Glasgow, 2000), 72.
cathedral; Duncan Shearer, rector of Clatt, who gave a *Rationale* to the cathedral in 1488 together with Juan de Torquemada’s glossed psalter; William Elphinstone, Shearer’s successor in the prebend of Clatt; three others of the bishop’s kin, Alexander, Robert and Adam Elphinstone, who all held office in the diocese; James Brown, dean of Aberdeen, who was in dispute with Elphinstone when he arrived in his diocese but who became a close collaborator; and Alexander Galloway, a remarkable figure whom Hector Boece called Elphinstone’s ‘chief and most faithful friend’. One might also add John Malison, a vicar choral and master of the song school but not a canon, who was singled out by Boece as one of Elphinstone’s chief collaborators in liturgical reform at the cathedral. Finally, another candidate is Hector Boece himself whom Macfarlane did not think was one of the group, although, given the fine Latinity of some of the hymns in the breviary, it is hard to imagine that Elphinstone would not have used his friend’s talents in this special project. These men were in Aberdeen and worked at its university and cathedral, they show evidence of interest in the liturgy and were almost certainly closely involved in Elphinstone’s liturgical reforms. Thus they may be called the ‘Aberdeen Liturgists’.

c. Two Aberdeen liturgists: Duncan Shearer and Alexander Galloway

A look at two Aberdeen Liturgists, Duncan Shearer and Alexander Galloway, will show that their interest in liturgy went beyond work on the breviary. Shearer was an Aberdonian, became dean of Arts at Aberdeen and was a generous benefactor to the cathedral and university in Old Aberdeen and to Greyfriars and St Nicholas in New

---

38 Torquemada, *Glossa psalterii*, (Strasbourg 1485), ENCL, Inc. 82.
40 Malison was chaplain of Folla, sat at the stall of the Precentor and was also *Magister Schole Musices de Cantore, Registrum Episcopatus Aberdonensis*, 2 vols, ed. Cosmo Innes (Edinburgh, 1845), ii, 96, 98; he gifted a gilded silver chalice and paten to the cathedral, ii, 180. Four of the twenty vicars choral listed in Elphinstone’s 1506 constitutions, not Malison, were Masters of Arts so it was a respectable position.
41 Macfarlane, *Elphinstone*, 242, gives these grounds for excluding him: he had little liturgical expertise and demanding duties in the Arts Faculty, he claimed that there was no ‘Scottish Use’ in liturgy and he does not mention the printing of the breviary. The last may be because the project had failed by the time he wrote his *Vitae*. One of the new hymns is hesitantly attributed to Elphinstone himself by Jane Stevenson and Peter Davidson, ‘Ficino In Aberdeen’, 75.
Aberdeen. His benefactions show liturgical interests. Giving practical books, like the *Rationale* and glossed psalter, to help those celebrating the liturgy in the cathedral understand what they do is not a conventional donation for one’s own glory or salvation. It shows a strong commitment to the liturgy, as does the regular donation of wine for mass to the Observant Franciscans and the psalter, breviary, martyrology and liturgical sermons given to the St Duthac altar in St Nicholas’s. The latter donation also included a silver chalice with images of SS Fotinus, Kentigern and Moluag, thus showing an interest in Scottish saints appropriate to an editor of the Aberdeen breviary. His donations frequently mention Moluag, who was patron of Clatt, and he endowed a mass on the feast of Fotinus, an obscure Aberdonian saint venerated in a chapel at Futtie by the mouth of Aberdeen harbour where Shearer owned land. These all suggest that he had a serious intellectual and spiritual interest in the liturgy he celebrated and the *Rationale* given to the cathedral was thus just one sign of this.

Alexander Galloway was a young man from St Andrews University who studied at Aberdeen and became a close friend of the elderly Elphinstone, whom Boece said did hardly anything without Galloway’s guidance. He eventually became a canon of Aberdeen and Rector of the university. The Leuven Catholic controversialist and enemy of Erasmus, Jacobus Latomus, referred to *Alexander Galoai Scotus Abordonensis canonicus* as one of the friends who persuaded him to publish his reply to Patrick Hamilton’s *Places*, which reveals that Galloway had contacts with

---

42 He was ‘one of the most generous benefactors’ to the university during its early years, Macfarlane, *Elphinstone*, 357.

43 Aberdeen Greyfriars Obit Book, AUL MS. 278; *The Miscellany of the Spalding Club, Volume 1*, ed. John Stuart (Aberdeen, 1841), 73; *Aberdeen Registrum*, ii, 233; *St Nicholas’ Cartulary*, i, 71.

44 In addition to the images on the chalice, he founded a mass at St Nicholas, Aberdeen in honour of SS Mary, Andrew, Moluag and Fotinus, *St Nicholas Cartulary*, i, 64-9; his anniversary masses at the university and cathedral were to be on St Moluag’s day, *Aberdeen Registrum*, ii, 234; he endowed a high mass and private Masses by the chaplains on the feast of St Fotinus at St Nicholas, *St Nicholas Cartulary*, i, 42.

continental scholars.\footnote{This is in his 1530 *De fide et operibus*, which is in Latomus's *Opera* (Louvain, 1550), a copy of which was owned by Bishop Gordon of Aberdeen (AUL pi f2384 Lut), John Durkan, ‘The Cultural Background in Sixteenth-Century Scotland’, in David McRoberts, ed., *Essays on the Scottish Reformation 1513-1625* (Glasgow, 1962), 331.} Galloway’s interest in things liturgical is suggested by ‘a neatly written little inventory’ of the liturgical furnishings of Aberdeen cathedral which he composed and adorned with his arms in 1549.\footnote{AUL MS 250. Described in *Aberdeen Registrum*, i, lxxii, and transcribed at ii, 127-153.} Like Shearer he also made many liturgical donations and foundations but his chief liturgical contribution was as a builder and furnisher of churches. He was behind the construction of new churches for the Franciscan Observants and the leper-house (the Spital Kirk) in Aberdeen; his initials or arms also show him to have been responsible for the font and a crucifix plaque at his prebendal church of Kinkell; and he had erected a remarkable series of stone sacrament houses at Kinkell, Dyce, King’s College chapel and probably other places in the North East.\footnote{See chapter 5, pages 168-73, 179-82, 185-88 and Appendix 3. McRoberts, ‘Scottish Sacrament Houses’, *TSES* 15.3 (1965), 33-56, at 45-47; McRoberts and Holmes, *Lost Interiors*, 89-90.} The sacrament houses and plaque will be shown in chapter 5 to be visible signs of aspects of the Catholic doctrine of the eucharist which were attacked by Protestants.

With their cathedral, university college, parish churches, religious houses and chapels, Old and New Aberdeen were well furnished with liturgical celebrations. The examples of Shearer and Galloway show that in the group around Elphinstone, Aberdeen had a circle of scholarly clerics who were not satisfied with celebrating the liturgy but desired to interpret and understand it, to defend it against attack and to educate their fellow clergy and the laity in liturgical spirituality.

\textbf{4) Aberdeen and the second Scottish liturgical movement}

Some of the Aberdeen clergy who owned liturgical commentaries died over sixty years after Elphinstone. Inscriptions in their books and the networks they reveal can help answer the question of whether the reform movement associated with Elphinstone and the Aberdeen liturgists continued after his death in 1514. This, and changes in liturgical interests associated with the Quiñones breviary, will provide a
link to the authors studied in Part C. At the centre of this ‘second Scottish liturgical movement’ was the controversial figure of William Gordon, bishop of Aberdeen.

**a. Books, networks and continuity**

Books can function as carriers of relationships. Sherman illustrates this by noting that, just as renaissance readers often put ‘et amicorum’ after their names in ownership inscriptions (as did John Greenlaw and John Watson mentioned below), so ‘complex relationships of friendship and patronage were captured by the inscriptions on books given as gifts’. Inscriptions in books can help one discern networks of the like-minded and find out if the group of ‘Aberdeen liturgists’ did continue. Such prosopographical studies have become more common in early modern Scottish church history. Little work has, however, been done on Scottish cathedral chapters comparable with the studies of the better documented English cathedrals by Dobson on York and Durham, and Orme and Lepine on Exeter.

---


Although the Aberdeen breviary seems not to have been widely adopted and did not have a second edition, the 1527 Aberdeen epistle-book and calendar reforms under Bishop Gavin Dunbar (1518-32) suggest that Elphinstone’s liturgical reform programme did continue after his death. To this can be added the rewriting of the Aberdeen cathedral ordinal for Bishop Stewart in 1540 and the Martyrologium secundum usum Ecclesiae Aberdonensis, written for Elgin cathedral between 1552 and 1560, which showed that the ‘use’ was used outside the diocese. There was also continuity in personnel. Alexander Galloway lived until 1552 and served under four bishops, the last of whom, William Gordon (1545-77), also had a copy of the Rationale. Another of Gordon’s canons, James Strachan (Strathauchin), possessed a Rationale and also had the commentary on the mass of Innocent III, suggesting a particular interest in liturgical interpretation. Strachan and Galloway were both Rectors of Aberdeen University and thus an interest in liturgy continued there. Another canon at the cathedral, William Hay of Turriff, had a copy of Biel’s liturgical commentary and the precentor of Aberdeen, Archibald Beaton, had a liturgical commentary by Rhabanus Maurus. Hay’s marginalia in his copy show a concern with the spiritual dignity of the priesthood, the celebration of mass and transubstantiation. He also notes a passage on what to do when communion wine freezes, of practical import in his diocese, and, like Bishop Gordon, marks a passage

54 AUL pi 264 Dur 1.
55 Durandus, GUL Special collections, Bk3-f.13; Innocent, EUL *D.33.72.
56 Biel, EUL RB.3.22; Rhabanus Maurus, EUL D*.32.1.
57 Biel, EUL RB.3.22, marginal marks on: the dignity of the priesthood, 6r-7v, 32r; the celebration of mass, 8r-v, 58r-v, 180v-183v; worthy communion, 191v-192r; and transubstantiation, 60r-93r. 91v-92r has marks by passages on indulgences and he writes ‘nota diligentiter’ by a section on the knowledge of the Saints, 48v-49r. A different hand writes ‘nota perfectio scripturae contra Traditiones’ (‘note the perfection of Scripture against Traditions’), 146r, and ‘nota oppositionem ecclesie Romanae institutioni Christi et praxi ecclesie primitive’ (‘note the opposition of the Roman Church to the institution of Christ and the practice of the primitive church’), by a section where Biel notes that communion was given under both kinds in the early church, 181r.
where clergy are said to be judges of the King. Strachan had studied at Paris and may have been a disciple of the greatest Scottish figure in the international Counter-reformation, Robert Wauchope.

b. Bishop William Gordon, Catholic Reformer or libertine?

These men lived on well into the 1570s or 80s. Bishop Gordon was thus at the centre of the web of influences revealed by copies of liturgical commentaries and book inscriptions; but Macfarlane speaks of Bishop Gordon’s ‘failure in leadership and his inability to effect any lasting reform in his diocese’. This comment follows the judgement on Gordon by Archbishop Spottiswood (1565-1639):

> Some hopes he gave at first of a virtuous man, but afterwards turned a very epicure, spending all his time in drinking and whoring. a man not worthy to be placed in this catalogue.

This reputation is based on Gordon’s feuing of Kirk-land and his relationship with a woman about which his chapter is said to have complained. Gordon’s actions here were not unusual among prelates and the Scottish historiographical tradition expects iniquity from pre-1560 bishops, but such deeds were not incompatible with a continuing commitment to Catholic reform. Gordon’s mistress, Janet Knowles,

---

58 Biel, EUL RB.3.22, 182r. He writes ‘privilegium romane ecclesie’ (‘the privilege of the Roman Church’) by a passage on the baptism of Constantine where Bishops and Priests are said to be judges of the King, 32r.


61 Aberdeen Registrum, i, lxvi.

62 The complaint about feuing of diocesan lands is given by Spottiswood. The source for the mistress is a minute of a chapter meeting on 5 January 1559 recording advice given by the chapter to the Bishop at his request, conforming to the decrees of the Provincial Councils and including the advice that he ‘be so gude as to schew gude and efective example: in speciale in removing and dischargeing himself of company of the gentill woman be quhom he is gretlie slanderit’, Aberdeen Registrum, i, lxi-lxv. This text is said to have been copied from the papers of John Erskine of Dun. A daughter of Gordon’s is recorded, Aberdeen Registrum, i, lxv.

63 Gordon Donaldson wrote that, ‘the medieval mind was not perturbed when practice was at variance with principle’, Scotland James V-James VII (Edinburgh, 1965), 133. If true, this changed during the sixteenth century. The beginnings of a more balanced assessment of Gordon are found in Wormald, Court, Kirk, and Community, 93; Allan White, ‘Religion, Politics and Society in Aberdeen, 1543-1593’, unpublished PhD thesis (University of Edinburgh, 1985), 119-133; and Ryrie, Origins, 23, 98.
may even have aided his reforming work as she was a committed Catholic who defended the mass before the Aberdeen Kirk Session in 1574.\textsuperscript{64} This picture of Elphinstone’s reforms running out of steam also fails to take account of Gordon’s fine library which he kept up-to-date and whose sixty surviving volumes reveal a Catholic reformer and Erasmian humanist with an interest in the early church – the product of his education at Aberdeen and Paris.\textsuperscript{65} It is possible to have books and not read them, and one of the few marginal notes in his *Rationale* is on the superior power of bishops over kings, but given that the Catholic doctors were not removed from King’s college until 1569 and that the North East remained a centre of Catholic recusancy under his Gordon kinsmen, the judgement of Spottiswood and Macfarlane seems too harsh.\textsuperscript{66}

Gordon’s books included John Fisher’s *Assertionis Lutheranae Confutatio* (Venice 1526) and also books by authors like Georg Witzel, Ruard Tapper and Stanislas Hosius published in the five years up to 1560 which suggest a Catholic continuing to respond to confessional debate. One such work is the catechism in five books of Frederick Nausea (Antwerp 1551) which may indicate that Gordon was involved in the work of preparing Archbishop Hamilton’s Catechism of 1552.\textsuperscript{67} At the end of the book he wrote ‘1554 Jhesus Maria’, a personal ejaculation which suggests a certain piety. Other inscriptions in his books reveal association with many Catholic reformers. He gave books to Robert Erskine, dean of Aberdeen 1540-63, Alexander Anderson, the Catholic principal of Kings who was removed in 1569, John Sinclair, dean of Restalrig and bishop of Brechin, John Leslie, bishop of Ross; and he was

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[64] White, ‘Religion, Politics and Society’, 116, 130-31, 178, with reference to the St Nicholas Kirk, Aberdeen Session Minutes (1529-1578), Aberdeen City and Aberdeenshire Archives, CH2/448/1, fol. 34.
\item[66] AUL pi 264 Dur 1, 46v. There are also marginalia on 155r-160r which show an interest in the liturgy of Advent, for example marking the liturgical texts used. In the copy of Florebellus’ *De Auctoritate Ecclesiae* bound with it there are later Protestant remarks such as ‘superstitiosus’, p.17.
\item[67] See chapter 4, page 134, and chapter 6, pages 202-05. AUL pi2382 Nau. Durkan attributed the catechism to the English Dominican Richard Marshall but Ryrie suggests more convincingly that he was its ‘research editor’ and the text, which is in idiomatic Scots and refers to its authors in the plural, was composed by a team, Durkan, ‘Cultural Background’, 302, 326-28; Ryrie, *Origins*, 100.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
given books by Alexander Galloway, Alexander Anderson, Robert Erskine, Bishop William Stewart, Alexander Arbuckle, the Franciscan provincial who went into exile after 1560, and Robert Reid, bishop of Orkney. These give the impression of a close-knit circle of intellectual clerics interested in Catholic reform. One of Gordon’s early acts was to install John Watson as a canon and diocesan preacher in 1547 in accord with the decrees of the Council of Trent, which were later incorporated in the statutes of the 1549 Scottish Provincial Council at which Gordon and many others named in this chapter played a part. Watson himself owned a 1554 copy of a Catholic work on the eucharist, which later belonged to William Hay of Turriff, and a series of books of liturgical sermons containing copious annotations which suggest that he took his preaching duties seriously. There is no extant liturgical commentary from his library but he did have a liturgical book that suggests a commitment to Catholic liturgical reform, the Quiñones breviary.

c. The Quiñones breviary and the second Scottish liturgical movement

A note in the 1962 volume Essays on the Scottish Reformation speaks of ‘a twofold liturgical revival’ in sixteenth century Scotland. The first was associated with the Aberdeen breviary, which was simply a rearrangement of the very complex office of the Sarum rite. The second ‘Scottish liturgical movement’ was associated with the liturgical reform of the Franciscan Cardinal Francisco Quiñones (d. 1540). Pope Clement VII (1523-34) had commissioned both Quiñones and Gian Pietro Carafa

---


72 McRoberts, Reformation, xvi.

73 The phrase ‘Scottish liturgical movement’, used in the description of a plate in McRoberts, Reformation, xvi, is an allusion to the twentieth-century ‘liturgical movement’ and may be attributed to the Scottish liturgical scholar David McRoberts who edited the volume.
(1476-1559), later Pope Paul IV, to reform the Roman breviary. The former advocated a radical revision, the latter a correction of the then current thirteenth-century breviary of the Roman curia, but after some hesitation Quiñones’ version was accepted and appeared in 1535, being authorised for private recitation. After severe censure from the Sorbonne, a revised version was published the following year and over a hundred editions appeared between then and 1568. This *Breviarium Sanctae Crucis* radically simplified the office, cutting the number of feasts, simplifying the distribution of the psalms, increasing the proportion of Scripture, excluding dubious legends and making it much easier to use. A link to Durandus is found in Quiñones’ 1536 preface where he uses the *Rationale* as an authority to show that the whole psalter was recited each day in the early church. The breviary influenced Cranmer’s work on the English prayer book, was attacked at Trent, banned by Pope Paul IV in 1558, re-authorised by Pius IV in 1559, and finally banned in 1568 by the bull *Quod a nobis* of Pius V which established the new *Breviarium Romanum* commissioned by the Council of Trent in 1563. This 1568 breviary represented a return to the principles of Carafa and the end of the Quiñones breviary, and it also marked the triumph of the extreme party in the Roman Church.


75 *Psalterium... ‘quod singulis diebus in primitiva ecclesia perlegi solutum est tradit Speculator’*, Lyons 1544 edition, NLS BCL.S31, fol. aii.v.  

In the decades before 1560 the Quiñones breviary seems to have become popular in Scotland.\textsuperscript{78} This was part of a developing Scottish interest in Roman liturgical books and may have been encouraged by Scottish members of Quiñones’ Franciscan order and by Scots visiting Paris, where the breviary was hotly discussed and where 29 editions of it were published between 1536 and 1560.\textsuperscript{79} In 1952 McRoberts knew of three extant copies from Scotland and in 1962 he spoke of ‘about 20’, but there are nine in the latest catalogue: three from Aberdeen, two from St Andrews, two from Glasgow and two from Orkney.\textsuperscript{80} There are also two Scottish copies of the reformed Roman missal printed at Lyon in 1550, which was influenced by the Quiñonian reform and had a short liturgical commentary as part of its introductory material.\textsuperscript{81} One of the breviaries belonged to Patrick Ogston, vicar of Peterugie (Peterhead) in Aberdeenshire who lived into the 1570s.\textsuperscript{82} He was a contemporary at Aberdeen University of another breviary owner, John Watson, and they both appear together as theological students in a 1542 list.\textsuperscript{83} It is reasonable to conclude that their attraction to the Quiñones breviary sprung from the interest in liturgy already noticed in Old Aberdeen. Ogston added the feast of St Drostan to the calendar of his breviary. Drostan was patron of Deer Abbey, who held his parish, and this is another example of that interest in local saints already noticed in the Elphinstone circle. The Quiñonian liturgical books may thus be put alongside liturgical commentaries as an indicator of interest in Catholic reform.

5) Other networks of liturgy and reform

There was thus a group of scholarly clerics in the diocese of Aberdeen, rooted in the Elphinstone circle, interested in liturgy and church reform and connected to others of like views. Liturgical commentaries and other evidence reveals similar groups.

\textsuperscript{78} McRoberts, ‘Medieval Scottish Liturgy’, 32-3, 38-9, discusses the presence and use of Roman liturgical books in fifteenth and sixteenth century Scotland and the advent of the Quiñones Breviaries.

\textsuperscript{79} Holmes, ‘Catalogue’, 177-87. Legg, The Second Recension, i, xiii-xix.

\textsuperscript{80} Holmes ‘Catalogue’, 180-87. See Bibliography 4.

\textsuperscript{81} Legg, The Second Recension, ii, 62-68, see chapter 6, page 203.

\textsuperscript{82} Charles H. Haws, Scottish Parish Clergy at the Reformation, 1540-1574 (Edinburgh, 1972), 199.

\textsuperscript{83} P.J. Anderson, ed., Officers and graduates of University and King’s College, Aberdeen, 1495–1860 (Aberdeen, 1893), 51. RMS, iv, 3014 (September 1577).
a. St Andrews and its archdiocese

The archdiocese of St Andrews came second after Aberdeen in the number of liturgical commentaries associated with it, but extant evidence does not suggest that this is the result of a network of the type seen in Aberdeen. A *Rationale* was chained in the choir of St Salvator’s College chapel and the commentaries of Durandus, Innocent, Hugh of St Cher and Gabriel Biel found in the library of St Leonard’s College in 1597 were probably in the college before 1560. The list of books belonging to John Grierson OP shows that a copy of Biel’s commentary was at the St Andrews Dominican priory and Thomas Methven of Craighton, who owned a copy of Rupert’s commentary, was a student at St Andrews in the early 1540s, and became a prebendary of St Mary on the Rock, St Andrews.84 This collection of commentaries does not reveal the personal interest in liturgical interpretation found among the canons of Aberdeen. Methven is interesting in that among his books are a copy of Calvin’s Institutes and anti-Protestant works by Adam Elder and Cardinal Hozyuz. In 1569 he said to St Andrews kirk session that ‘he was nether ane Papist nor ane Calwynist... bot Jesus Cristis man’, and in 1587 the kirk session made him profess the Reformed faith and promise not to describe himself in these terms.85 He was clearly a reform-minded cleric who continued to inhabit the confessional middle ground.

Almost all reforming clergy at St Andrews, however, divided in 1559-60 between Protestant and Catholic, unlike those at Aberdeen who generally remained Catholic. The St Andrews Protestants included a number of Augustinian canons from the cathedral-priory, three of whom had copies of the Quiñones breviary which suggests an interest in liturgical developments.86 A third of the extant copies are thus from one religious community. Lord James Stewart, the Commendatory Prior, had a copy, as

---


86 Holmes, ‘Catalogue’, 182-84.
did canons Ninian (Ringand) Rule and John Rule, and the ‘Breviariu
m Romanum’ in the St Mary’s College library lists may be another copy of the Quiñones breviary.\(^\text{87}\)

The university and cathedral of St Andrews thus does show an interest in liturgy and liturgical interpretation but not to the same extent as Aberdeen and there is no evidence of a group similar to the Aberdeen liturgists although chapter 6 will show that liturgical interpretation had a place in Archbishop Hamilton’s Catholic Reform movement which had great influence in his cathedral city.

**b. John Greenlaw and the Lothian group**

Elsewhere in the archdiocese, however, there is a cluster of extant books in Lothian which mostly belonged to a group of clerics interested in Catholic reform. A copy of Biel’s liturgical commentary was owned by Henry Sinclair (1507/8–1565), bishop of Ross and son of Sir Oliver Sinclair of Roslin; John Watson’s Quiñones breviary had been given to him by John Greenlaw of Haddington, a priest who had purchased it in Paris in 1553; a copy of the *Rationale* was given to Edinburgh University Library in 1581 by Clement Litill of Edinburgh; and another copy was given to the university library in 1609 by Adam Bellenden. This last had belonged to James Forester of Corstorphine in 1581 and was probably previously owned by Henry Sinclair’s brother John (c.1510–1566), dean of Restalrig.\(^\text{88}\) Book inscriptions and other evidence suggest that this is evidence of a Lothian network of Catholic reformers.

John Greenlaw matriculated at Glasgow University in 1505 and was a close associate of the Scottish theologian and international Catholic reformer Robert Wauchope, archbishop of Armagh, whom he succeeded as vicar of Keith Humbie in East Lothian.\(^\text{89}\) In 1558 he became one of the four prebendaries of the collegiate church at

---

\(^{87}\) SL, S22.67 = S23.2 = S24.32.

\(^{88}\) See Bibliography 4.

\(^{89}\) Durkan, ‘Robert Wauchope’. This association is seen in, *Calendar of the Laing Charters, A.D. 854-1837: Belonging to the University of Edinburgh*, ed. John Anderson (Edinburgh, 1899), 466, where he appears amongst various members of the Wauchope family of Niddry-Marshall. Greenlaw’s copy of Augustine’s *City of God* and *De trinitate* previously belonged to David Wauchope, canon of Dunkeld, GUL Bh8.e10, and his executor was Euphemia Wauchope, Lady Edmestone, Durkan, ‘Robert Wauchope’, 51, n.22.
Corstorphine and he died before 1567.\textsuperscript{90} Among Greenlaw’s seventeen extant books are two treatises on the mass by the contemporary Catholic polemicist Quintin Kennedy, one copied out in Greenlaw’s own hand.\textsuperscript{91} Ownership inscriptions in other books show links in the 1550s to other Catholic reformers and apologists, Ninian Winzet of Linlithgow, John Sinclair of Restalrig, and the Franciscan Observant John Scott.\textsuperscript{92} There is also a possible link between Greenlaw and the \textit{Rationale}. The copy presented to Edinburgh University in 1609, was printed in Lyon in 1551 and previously belonged to James Forrester and, perhaps, John Sinclair. It has marks showing that it had been used to interpret some of the main feasts of the year: Christmas and the three feasts that follow, Candlemas and its procession, Epiphany, Ash Wednesday, Palm Sunday, Pentecost, Holy Cross day and All Souls.\textsuperscript{93} This looks like the book was used for teaching or preaching the liturgical year in a church. One possible location is the collegiate church of Corstorphine. It had been founded in the parish church by the Forrester family, who retained rights of presentation, and it had a developed liturgical life.\textsuperscript{94} The Forresters had land in Aberdeenshire, were benefactors to St Machar’s cathedral and members of the family had been canons of Aberdeen in the fourteenth century.\textsuperscript{95} There are connections between the Forresters and Gilbert de Greenlaw, bishop of Aberdeen.\textsuperscript{96} John Greenlaw held his prebend at Corstorphine as a client of the Forresters and had his own connections to Aberdeen via John Watson.


\textsuperscript{92} ESL, 106-7.

\textsuperscript{93} EUL Spec Coll B*27.11, fols 166r-168v, 180r-183r, 194v-196r, 197v-199v, 243v-245v, 264v-266v, 274r-v, 275v-277v, 280v-281v.

\textsuperscript{94} \textit{Registrum Domus de Soltre, necnon Ecclesiae Collegiate S. Trinitatis prope Edinburgh...}, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh, 1861), 298-304.

\textsuperscript{95} Adam Forrester is commemorated in the Cathedral obit book, \textit{Aberdeen Registrum}, ii, 204. John Forrester gave the Cathedral a gold ‘Image of Pity’ which was put on a gilded monstrance, \textit{Aberdeen Registrum}, ii, 144. Walter Forrester, Bishop of Brechin (d.1425/6) was a canon of Aberdeen in 1384 and John Forrester was Official of Aberdeen in 1389, Elizabeth Ewan, ‘Forrester family (per. c.1360–c.1450)’, ODNB, accessed 8 Dec 2010.

\textsuperscript{96} \textit{Aberdeen Registrum}, ii, 151.
Behind this small set of liturgical books in Lothian there are thus a series of connections of kinship and patronage linking the people to each other and to Aberdeen. These links may also be extended to the two Sinclairs, who were related by marriage to the Forresters.\footnote{The second wife of John Forrester, who founded the College in 1429, was Jean Sinclair, daughter of Henry I, Earl of Orkney, and the Sinclair arms are found on the Forrester tombs in Corstorphine church, David MacGibbon & Thomas Ross, The Ecclesiastical Architecture of Scotland (Edinburgh, 1896-97), iii, 261-2. Elizabeth Ewan, ‘Forrester family’. I thank Dr Barbara Crawford for help with Sinclair genealogy.} John Sinclair had close links to Aberdeen: he lectured at Aberdeen University, holding the parsonage of the Snow Kirk and the prebend of the canonist until 1542 when he became dean of Restalrig. He also received the gift of a Bible and a book by the Catholic controversialist Ruard Tapper from Bishop Gordon of Aberdeen as well as a commentary on John’s Gospel from Greenlaw.\footnote{ESL, 61-3} It thus looks as if this Lothian group was closely connected to the diocese of Aberdeen and the Aberdeen Liturgists.

\textit{b. Robert Wauchope and the influence of continental Catholic Reform}

Through Greenlaw and Robert Wauchope the Lothian group also had connections to the continental Counter-Reformation. Wauchope, the son of Gilbert Wauchope of Niddrie-Marshall in Midlothian, studied at Paris and applied for a regency at the university in 1526 along with Hector Boece of Aberdeen and William Manderston (who had studied at Glasgow in 1505 with Greenlaw). He taught at Paris, was appointed archbishop of Armagh in 1539, then played a prominent part as a Catholic reformer in Germany and attended the Council of Trent. At this time he published a treatise on the mass, \textit{Conclusiones de sacrosancto Missae sacrificio & communione laica} (Mainz, 1544), which defended Catholic doctrine from Scripture alone with no appeal to patristic or scholastic \textit{auctoritates}.\footnote{NLS RB.s.978.} He was an associate of many of the greatest Catholic theologians of the day such as Campeggio, Eck, Gropper and Pighius; his friendship with Cardinal Pole may have obtained his promotion to Armagh; he was also a friend of Ignatius Loyola, Peter Faber and the first Jesuits...
who were studying in Paris 1528-35. The connection with the Jesuits made a great impression on him and he gave the Spiritual Exercises of St Ignatius as part of his reforming work in Germany.

Wauchope retained an interest in Scotland. He visited in 1534, was in dispute with James IV in 1540 over his appointment as abbot of Dryburgh, was involved in the papal missions to Scotland of Grimani in 1543 and Lipomano in 1548, and spent several months himself in Scotland in 1549-50 on his way to Ireland. John Durkan suggested that it was through him that the decrees of Trent influenced the Scottish Church, as in the appointment of Watson at Aberdeen. He was also instrumental in a mission by his friends the Jesuits to Ireland via Edinburgh in 1541-42. They were received graciously by James V and Queen Mary, who had already heard of the Society from some Scotsmen who had encountered the first Jesuits in Rome. The Jesuit Alfonso Salmerón wrote to Ignatius Loyola from Edinburgh:

Master John Greenlaw, who had been chaplain to ‘Doctor Scoto’ [Wauchope], has done us a thousand services in looking for lodgings for us, looking after us, and being our tongue, since the languages we know are of little use in this country. He sends his affectionate greetings to all the Company, especially Master Ignatius and Master Claudio. He is so steeped in the service of God that it seems he completed the Exercises only yesterday, and he talks of nothing else but the Exercises.

---


101 Durkan, ‘Robert Wauchope’, 55. Peter Faber wrote to Ignatius that he and ‘Dr Escoto’ (Wauchope) had been working for the personal reformation of the Catholics of Ratisbon and that Wauchope had been giving the Exercises to a group including the Bishop of Speyer, Fabri Monumenta (Rome, 1972), 62, 71.


104 Thomas M. McCoog and László Lukács, eds, Monumenta Angliae III: England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales, documents (1541-1562) (Rome, 2000), 50-59, at 57-58. ‘Maestro Juan Grillaut, capellán que fué del doctor Scoto, el qual nos ha hecho mil plazeres en buscarnos aposiento, y mirar por nosotros, y ser nuestra lengua, pues en esta tierra poco sirven las nuestras. Él se manda encomendar affectuosíssimamente e toda la Compañía máxime en miçer Ignatio, y en miçer Claudio. Está tan puesto en el servicio de Dios que parece que salió ayer de los exercicios, y nunca habla sino dellos’.
A footnote in the critical edition says, ‘We do not know when Greenlaw made the Exercises’, but if he had been chaplain to Wauchope on the continent he could have made them with him or with Ignatius and Claude Le Jay at Paris. This brief study of Wauchope thus links the network of owners of liturgical commentaries and reformed breviaries in Scotland to the mainstream of the European Counter-Reformation. William Gordon and James Strachan were studying in Paris when Wauchope was teaching and so, with Wauchope’s connections to Hector Boece and, via Greenlaw, to Watson, the later Catholic Reform movement in Aberdeen can be connected to Wauchope and Paris.

c. Orkney and the Ferrerio circle

Two of the reformed liturgical books are from the small northern diocese of Orkney, one belonging to Alexander Scot who became its Chancellor in 1544. One of the liturgical commentaries belonged to Robert Reid who became bishop of Orkney in 1541 and issued new reforming constitutions for his chapter in 1544. They emphasised the theological qualifications of the dignitaries, the provision of preaching and education, a Provost who could act as an Inquisitor against heresy, and showed a special concern for the celebration of the liturgy.105 Once again there is a concern with understanding the liturgy (the new liturgical books aim at this as much as do the commentaries) associated with Catholic reform. Reid was also abbot of Kinloss in Moray, which had close links with the University of Aberdeen and was a centre of humanist scholarship under the guidance of the Piedmontese scholar Giovanni Ferrerio.106 Kinloss possibly had a Rationale in its library, as will be suggested in chapter 6. Reid died in 1558 but other friends of Ferrerio owned copies

It is possible to argue that the words applied to Greenlaw could be about Wauchope, but the next phrase says that Wauchope can be told about this, ‘Al señor doctor Scoto se le puede dizi cómo hasta agora no habemos recibido letra suya’. I thank Dr Ewan Scott and Dr Fiona Mackintosh for help with the translation.

105 Alexander Peterkin, Rentals of the Ancient Earldom and Bishoprick of Orkney; with some other Explanatory and Relative Documents (Edinburgh, 1820), 18-30.

of liturgical commentaries such as James Beaton archbishop of Glasgow, Bishop William Gordon and Henry and John Sinclair.\textsuperscript{107} It is interesting how many of these links go back to Paris in the 1520s when Reid, Boece, Ferrerio and Wauchope were studying or teaching there. The 112 extant volumes from Henry Sinclair’s library reveal close connections with Ferrerio, and suggests a ‘group genuinely interested in promoting Greek studies in Scotland’ which was behind the appointment of Edward Henryson as Greek Lecturer at Edinburgh at the suggestion of Reid and Ferrerio.\textsuperscript{108}

The Ferrerio circle was composed of humanist scholars and higher clergy in the royal service and the ‘Aberdeen Liturgists’ were a group assembled around a university, but one could argue that interest in liturgical interpretation is simply what one would expect in places like cathedrals, monasteries and collegiate foundations where there is a highly developed liturgical life. Certainly a \textit{Rationale} was chained in the choir of Crail collegiate church and another commentary, by Rhabanus Maurus, was owned by the last precentors - those in charge of the liturgy – before the events of 1559-60 at Glasgow and Aberdeen cathedrals. Extant evidence of the presence of liturgical commentaries, however, almost always seems connected to Catholic reform, as is also seen in the religious orders.

d. The religious orders

While most of the extant Scottish liturgical commentaries were owned by the secular clergy, the association of liturgical interpretation and Catholic reform was also found among religious, especially those connected to the diocese of Aberdeen.\textsuperscript{109} The particular hostility shown by early Scottish Protestants towards the friars, especially the Dominicans and Franciscan Observants, was in large part a result of their success

\textsuperscript{107} Ferrerio gave Bellenden’s history of Scotland and Pico della Mirandola’s \textit{De animae immortalitate} to Henry Sinclair, ESL, 97. Ferrerio wrote a history of the Gordon family and dedicated his second edition of Boece’s \textit{Historia} to Archbishop James Beaton in a letter of 20 June 1574 and he says he was encouraged to revise the work by Henry and John Sinclair, \textit{Records of Kinloss}, ed. John Stuart (Edinburgh, 1872), xxii-xxiii.


\textsuperscript{109} This will be explored further in chapter 4.
as agents of Catholic reform.\textsuperscript{110} The Aberdeen chapter had good relations with the local Franciscan Observants. James IV supported the foundation of the same order in Stirling in 1494-8 and his Treasurer’s accounts record payments to William Foular in 1503 for books for the friars including Durandus’s ‘racionale divinorum officiorum’.\textsuperscript{111} The continental copies of the \textit{Rationale} examined suggest that there was a special connection between the book and the Franciscans and this may be because of their association with Catholic reform.\textsuperscript{112} The two reforming provincials of the Scottish Dominicans in the sixteenth century, John Adamson (1511-23) and John Grierson (1523-64), were both among the first students of theology at Aberdeen university and were praised by Hector Boece as part of the Elphinstone circle of reformers.\textsuperscript{113} Grierson was one of the theological experts at the 1549 Provincial Council, and was, with John and Henry Sinclair, a member of the commission to implement the statute against concubinage at the 1559 Council; an extant list of a hundred books belonging to Grierson includes Biel’s commentary on the mass.\textsuperscript{114} With Grierson, as with Galloway, the direct influence of Elphinstone lasted for almost fifty years after his death.

Another copy of Biel on the mass, with much marginalia, was in the hands of a Benedictine monk of Dunfermline and an Augustinian canon of Inchcolm.\textsuperscript{115} It will be studied in chapter 4 and in chapter 6 evidence will be examined for the use of the \textit{Rationale} in the chapter sermons of Adam Elder, a Cistercian monk of Kinloss, and the marginalia in a Bible belonging to Thomas Ross, a Benedictine of Pluscarden who continued to function as a Catholic priest after 1560. Pluscarden probably, like


\textsuperscript{112} See Appendix 1.


\textsuperscript{114} Patrick, \textit{Statutes}, 85-7, 163 (the other members were John Winram, Bishop Crichton of Dunkeld and Bishop Gordon of Galloway). SL, 240-56.

\textsuperscript{115} EUL Inc.68, this copy later belonged to Henry Sinclair.
Kinloss, had links with Aberdeen (in 1529 its prior was appointed coadjutor bishop of Aberdeen) and while the Dunfermline community gave many ministers to the Protestant Church, its last Commendator George Durie remained Catholic and in 1558 appointed the English Dominican exile Richard Marshall as preacher to the monastery, as recommended by Trent and the 1549 Scottish Provincial Council.\(^{116}\)

**Conclusion and the Aberdonian question**

This study of ‘used books’ and prosopographical analysis of the owners and their friends has revealed social networks interested in liturgy and reform. A central place in this association of liturgical interpretation and Catholic reform, however, was certainly held by the ‘Aberdeen liturgists’ and their influence extended up to and beyond 1560 during the episcopate of William Gordon. The activities of these groups and their continental connections show that sixteenth century Scotland was in the mainstream of European Catholic Reform, whether this was of an Erasmian humanist or a Tridentine Counter-reformation type. This will be examined further in chapter 6.

While this thesis is a study of the use of liturgical interpretation in Scotland, the evidence from liturgical commentaries has dictated that it also be a study of Catholic Reform. It has raised the question of the religious distinctiveness of Aberdeen and the North East, something discussed by Gordon Donaldson in 1965 and by Jane Stevenson and Peter Davidson in a 2009 article which argued for a distinctive Renaissance culture centred in the University of Aberdeen among those Hector Boece called *Scoti Boreali* (northern Scots).\(^{117}\) It is clear that the religious culture of the North East has been different from the rest of Scotland, for example in resistance to the covenant in the seventeenth century and the strength of recusancy and Episcopalianism. Given the long influence of the Elphinstone reform argued above, it could well be that the ‘Aberdeen liturgists’ made a major contribution to this distinctiveness and there may be a direct continuity between them and the ‘Aberdeen


\(^{117}\) Stevenson and Davidson, ‘Ficino in Aberdeen’, 64. Donaldson, ‘Scotland's Conservative North’.
doctors’ of the first half of the seventeenth century. The next two chapters, however, will investigate the influence of liturgical interpretation on education and visual and spatial culture.

Chapter 4. Learning Liturgical Interpretation

The first two books to be published by a Scottish publisher were school books, a dictionary (1505) and a liturgical commentary on the Sarum sequences (1506), both printed in Rouen by Pierre Violette for the Edinburgh bookseller Androw Myllar.¹ In the choir of Aberdeen cathedral two similar books, the *Catholicon* of John of Genoa and the *Rationale* of Durandus, were kept for educational purposes – either teaching or simply reference. Such an association between education and liturgical interpretation raises the question of how Scots learned this method of understanding the liturgy, which chapter 3 has shown was an important part of pre-1560 culture. This chapter will investigate for the first time the place of liturgical interpretation in the Scottish school and university curriculum and in the training and continuing education of clergy and religious. Recent scholarship provides the basis for this investigation but an essential part of the answer will come from the analysis of a number of educational books owned and used by Scots.

1) Liturgy and Scottish schools 1488-1560

Scanty evidence has survived of pre-university education in Scotland before 1560 but the studies of Grant and Durkan, together with comparison with England and the rest of Europe, enable its outline to be established.² This chapter will be mainly concerned with lowland schools, as the evidence for liturgical education in the Highlands is minimal in this period, and it is only concerned with liturgical education.³ There were a variety of different schools in Scotland, broadly divided by

---

¹ One copy of each is extant: John Garland, *Multorum vocabulorum... interpretatio*, BNF, RES P-X-16; *Expositio Sequentiuarum*, BL, C.35.c.6. Aldis Updated, 1505-1506, accessed 1/2/2011. I thank Professor Nicholas Orme for many useful comments on this chapter.


curriculum into ‘elementary schools’ and ‘grammar schools’ although some had elements of both.\textsuperscript{4} Durkan lists 107 schools in Scotland of which 36 were song schools (20 associated with collegiate churches), 43 grammar schools and 13 associated with monasteries.\textsuperscript{5} All school-masters were clerics in the sense of being literate and having benefit of clergy, although not all were in major orders, and most schools were attached to churches, with the parish clerk frequently teaching in the parish school as specified, for example, in the appointment of Jacob Afflek as parish clerk of Inverness in 1539.\textsuperscript{6} Not every school had a dedicated schoolhouse and pupils may have been taught in the choir of the church to which the school was attached or in the private houses of clerics.\textsuperscript{7}

\textit{a. Liturgy and schools}

All schools had a liturgical dimension, not just those training choristers or boys preparing for ordination. This is illustrated by a dispute at Linlithgow grammar school in 1539 when the schoolmaster James Brown complained that the curate compelled his pupils to attend mass and evensong on feasts when they would be better employed learning their lessons. This was not because of a desire to separate learning from liturgy but rather a question of liturgical obligations being imposed that exceeded those required by the 1489 foundation charter which specified a variety of daily and weekly prayers to be recited according to age, status and

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{4} Durkan, \textit{Schools and Schoolmasters}, 39; Durkan, ‘Education’, 145; Orme, \textit{Medieval Schools}, 68.
\item \textsuperscript{5} Durkan, ‘Education’, 168, with additions from his \textit{Schools and Schoolmasters}, 44.
\item \textsuperscript{7} Macfarlane, \textit{Elphinstone}, 229; Orme, \textit{Medieval Schools}, 63; Durkan, \textit{Schools and Schoolmasters}, 25, 35; \textit{Rentale Dunkeldense}, ed. Robert Kerr Hannay (Edinburgh, 1915), 329, ‘Sir Alexander Richardson… presides honourably over a household where he has brought up promising boys of his kin; some to enter religious houses, some to be priests, others for choral service’.
\end{itemize}
A similar range of proficiencies is reflected in the suffrages established by Alexander Galloway for the clergy, choristers, schoolboys and poor of Aberdeen.\(^9\) The scholars’ duties at Linlithgow were at the lighter end of the burden of Latin worship. At the other end children in song schools were obliged to attendance in choir at a number of daily services, for example Bishop Reid’s 1544 Orkney statutes prescribed that,

[Choristers] should be candle-bearers and shall sing responsories and versicles and other things according to the custom in choir and as the precentor and succentor command.\(^{10}\)

This implies the standard *cursus* of matins, high mass and evensong (and sometimes compline).\(^{11}\) Liturgy thus provided the context for pre-1560 education and it was also central to the entire school curriculum.

Van Orden’s study of sixteenth-century France notes how widespread was the knowledge of sung Latin liturgical texts among the laity.\(^{12}\) This was partly the result of church-attendance but also of the centrality of these texts in the school curriculum. In elementary schools pupils began at the age of about seven learning the alphabet in order to read liturgical Latin (proved by the Latin contractions and prayers printed with alphabets). They also learned how to read and sing plainsong and they memorised psalms with their psalm-tones and Latin prayers and liturgical texts.\(^{13}\) They were taught how to pronounce and sing these Latin liturgical texts, but full

---

8 Durkan, *Schools and Schoolmasters*, 31-32.


11 This is required, for example, at: Trinity, Edinburgh, *Midlothan Charters*, 68; Restalrig, *Midlothan Charters*, 285; and Crichton, *Midlothan Charters*, 309. Choristers also sang a regular Lady mass, as at King’s Aberdeen, Eelles, *King’s*, 218; Restalrig, *Midlothan Charters*, 288; and St Salvator’s, St Andrews, R.G. Cant, *The College of St. Salvator* (Edinburgh, 1950), 28 n.2.


comprehension was reserved for when they came to study grammar.\textsuperscript{14} The original medieval text books were Latin liturgical books but from the thirteenth century special Latin prayer books called primers, books of hours and grace books came to be used to help children read as ‘the immediate goal of teaching the alphabet was to enable pupils to read prayers’.\textsuperscript{15}

\textit{b. Song schools}

Song schools were of two main sorts, the ‘elementary’ type teaching reading and plainsong and the specialised polyphonic song school for choristers in major churches. The former were rarely called ‘song schools’ in England after 1300 and it seems probable that in Scotland too most of those called ‘song schools’ in the period studied here were of the latter type.\textsuperscript{16} The boys’ education was both ordered to the liturgy and fitted around it, as at Restalrig collegiate church where the choristers ‘should daily, when they are able to be free from choir, practice their work in the song school’.\textsuperscript{17} Jane Flynn’s study of English song schools demonstrates that ‘the aim of choristers’ education was not primarily musical; it was focused on the liturgy, the performance of which demonstrated practically the way to live a virtuous Christian life’.\textsuperscript{18} Legislation for the song schools at the Scottish collegiate churches of Restalrig, Crichton and Tain suggests that choristers would even have needed basic education in liturgy and chant in an elementary school before admission, thus confirming that these were of the specialised type mentioned above.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{14} Katherine Zieman, \textit{Singing the New Song: Literacy and Liturgy in Late Medieval England} (Philadelphia, 2008), 1. This is seen at Dumbarton song school, Durkan, ‘Education’, 164.

\textsuperscript{15} Orme, \textit{Medieval Schools}, 58-59. In 1520 Edinburgh burgh council decided that schools other than the high school were permitted to teach only ‘grace book, Prymar and plane donatt’: two prayer books used as reading books and the \textit{Ars Minor} of Donatus (or rather, something medieval based on it), \textit{Extracts from the Records of the Burgh of Edinburgh (1403-1718)}, 14 vols, eds J.D. Marwick \textit{et al.} (Edinburgh, 1869-1967), i, 194.


\textsuperscript{17} ‘\textit{Pueri... quotidiem cum a choro vacare poterunt cantacionis scholis operam exhibeant}’, Midlothian Charters, 286. Durkan, ‘Education’, 146.

\textsuperscript{18} Flynn, ‘Education of Choristers’, 180.

gave instruction in liturgy and ceremonies, as specified in the regulations for those at
King’s, Aberdeen and Seton.\(^{20}\) One extant liturgical commentary, Rabanus Maurus,
*De clericorum institutione et ceremoniis ecclesiae* (Cologne, 1532), was owned
successively by the precentors of Glasgow and Aberdeen Cathedrals and may have
been used in fulfilling their educational responsibilities.\(^{21}\)

This education *in ceremoniis* probably primarily concerned carrying out duties such
as candlebearer, but it is also likely to have included instruction in the meaning of the
rites, just as the choristers would have basic instruction in the meaning of the Latin
they sung. An objection to this might be that the meaning of the liturgy is
comparable to the meaning of Latin taught in the grammar curriculum, and so
liturgical interpretation, the meaning or ‘spirit’ of the liturgy, is proper to the
grammar school while in the song school the ‘letter’ of the liturgy, the simple
performance of the words and ceremonies, would be taught. Scottish song schools
were not, however, elementary schools and the song school/grammar school
distinction was not absolute: for example in Lochwinnoch song school the choristers
were to be taught the first two books of the grammar of Alexandre de Villedieu.\(^{22}\)
Where a place had two schools, students in the song schools did move on to the local
grammar school when their voice broke (*cum in voce puerili defecerunt*), as was
prescribed for the choristers of the collegiate church of Our Lady in Glasgow and St
Nicholas, Aberdeen. It is even possible that students in song schools may have had
part of their education in a local grammar school. The place of liturgical
interpretation in religious culture, however, implies that something of the meaning of
the rites they celebrated would have been taught in song schools of whatever sort.\(^{23}\)
c. Grammar schools and a Dundee antiphon

The grammar school curriculum was concerned with the study of Latin, ‘to which reading and song were only introductions’; its end was to speak Latin fluently, as well as to write and compose in it. A central element in the medieval grammar curriculum was the Latin liturgy. David Thomson’s study of middle English grammatical texts reveals that they contained a large number of liturgical pieces and that the main liturgical texts used were the hymnal (hymns from the office) and sequentiary (sequences from mass, of which there were many in the Sarum rite used in Scotland), which were studied alongside classical poetry. Examples of these school books will be studied in the next section.

A page of an antiphonal used in the binding of a sixteenth-century protocol book from Dundee, and thus probably coming from a liturgical book used in a church in East-Central Scotland before 1560, gives us a glimpse of the integration of liturgy, liturgical interpretation and education in pre-1560 Scotland. It is a very peculiar fragment and difficult to interpret. It has the unusual antiphon for the second vespers of the Epiphany, Omnes Patriarchae, and an added rubric at the foot of the page which describes a ritual otherwise unattested. The antiphon was sung four times by groups who came in turn before the altar representing the Biblical characters in the antiphon: first came the minor primicerius and the lectors representing the patriarchs who proclaimed Christ; then the maceconii representing the prophets who announced Christ; then the major primicerius, representing the Christmas angel, and clergy representing the shepherds; finally the archbishop, prelates and ordinaries came forward, with two subdeacons in their midst carrying lit lamps. This was clearly a

24 Orme, Medieval Schools, 86.
26 Dundee Central Library, Lamb Drawer 1(3). The antiphon is not in the Sarum or Aberdeen books but is found in a twelfth-century manuscript from Piacenza where it is sung before the gospel at the third mass of Christmas, Brian Miller Jensen, ‘Hodie puer natus est nobis: The Celebration of Christmas at Piacenza in 1142’, Plainsong and Medieval Music 8.1 (1999), 15-38, at 37.
27 See Appendix 2a for the text and an image of the fragment. The lectorate was one of the four minor orders given to boy-clerics who were training for the priesthood; the primicerius was a chapter
cathedral ceremony, perhaps from St Andrews or Glasgow because of the archbishop, and it may have been a liturgical fantasy rather than directions for an actual performance, but it hints at a lost world in which there was an intimate connection between education, liturgy and liturgical interpretation.

2) Books used in liturgical education

Those teaching or studying in schools were ‘the second largest segment of the book-buying public’ after the clergy, but few school books have survived from pre-1560 Scotland.\(^{28}\) There is only one extant Scottish copy of the essential grammar text, the *Ars Minor* of Donatus, and it is bound with a commentary on the hymns and sequences.\(^{29}\) The three extant commentaries on liturgical poetry will be studied, together with a book of liturgical readings at mass and some glossed psalters. Despite the limitations of the evidence, these, together with an examination of the use of the *Rationale* of Durandus, will show how liturgical interpretation was taught in Scottish schools.

a. Commentaries on liturgical poetry

Hymn and sequence-commentaries emerged in the twelfth century for educational use in schools and noviciates and there were two main types, illustrated by the following twelfth-century examples. The Cistercian *Explanatio super hymnos* gave a fuller theological exegesis of the texts in the style of liturgical interpretation for use in monastic noviciates.\(^{30}\) The *Expositio hymnorum* of Hilarius, however, treated each hymn according to a simpler pattern: a brief discussion of the author, subject matter and utility of the hymn, followed by literal paraphrases of the hymn text together with a construal (grammatical analysis).\(^{31}\)

\(^{28}\) Milway, ‘Forgotten Best-sellers’, 117.

\(^{29}\) (Antwerp, 1526) EUL RB.S.501/5. There were 284 editions of the *Ars Minor* before 1501.


\(^{31}\) The *Expositio* is among the fifty books most printed before 1501, Milway, ‘Forgotten Best-sellers’, 141. Erika Kihlman, ‘*Expositiones sequentiarae*: Medieval Sequence Commentaries and Prologues.
There are no extant examples of the theological type of commentary from Scotland but the three surviving examples of the construing type all include theological content which may be classed as liturgical interpretation. Myllar’s *Expositio Sequentiarum* only survives in a single copy from France, now in the British Library, but it was produced for an English and Scottish market. It began with a woodcut of a master teaching plainchant to a schoolboy, identifying it as a school book. The seventy-six sequences were each split up into sections and every section was followed by a commentary on the pattern set by Hilarius.

**Figure 1. Woodcut from Myllar’s *Expositio sequentiarum* (Rouen, 1506)**

---


The second commentary was a sixteenth-century *Expositio hymnorum* printed at Rouen and owned by the Scot John Abercromby. It was based on Hilarius and provided commentary on eighty-nine hymns, almost all of which were found in the Sarum breviaries used in Scotland. The third was the *Sequentie et hymni, cum diligenti difficiliorum vocabulorum interpretatione* of the Dutch grammarian Hermann van der Beke or Torrentinus (1450-1520), owned by Mathias Moncur of Dundee who probably purchased it while a student at Chateau College, Louvain in the late 1520s. It was bound, like many such commentaries, with various grammatical texts all published in Antwerp between 1523 and 1526.

Much of the commentaries concerned words and their meanings, as in this on the Pentecost sequence *Resonet sacra*:

> Construe: the divine voice, i.e. the voice of God; tells i.e. announces; suddenly i.e. quickly.

The commentaries also had a spiritual purpose, for example the preface to the *Expositio hymnorum* states that its intention is to lead the user to contemplation and knowledge of the Holy Trinity. It is thus not surprising to find that they contained theology and liturgical interpretation. The gloss on the Transfiguration sequence *Benedicta semper* in the *Expositio sequentiarum*, for example, said this on the section which taught that the Holy Spirit comes from the Father and the Son:

> The grammatical construction is clear. However where it says the Son himself is one true God and the Holy Spirit pours forth, that is proceeds, from

---

33 ENCL tVK 74 EXP. *Breviarium ad usum insignis ecclesiae Sarum*, 3 vols, eds F. Procter and C. Wordsworth (Cambridge, 1879-86), iii, appendix xci. A John Abercromby of St Andrews diocese was at St Salvator’s St Andrews in 1534, graduated in 1535 and matriculated at Louvain in 1536, Durkan, ‘Cultural Background’, 324; *Acta facultatis Artium*, 373, 376.

34 Durkan, ‘Cultural Background’, 323, taken from the Louvain Registers.


36 Myllar, *Expositio Sequentiarum*, fol. 19v, ‘Construe. *Divina vox, i.e. vox Dei nunciat, i.e. annunciavit repente, i.e. subito.*’

37 *Expositio hymnorum*, fol. 1v.
both, namely the Father and the Son, this confounds the sect of the Greeks who assert that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone. Therefore among the Romans they are called schismatics.\(^{38}\)

The *Expositio hymnorum* gave a similarly theological interpretation of the hymn *Corde natus*:

The matter of this hymn is the double nativity of the Son of God. One of them is eternal by which he was born before the beginning of the world, and this one was from the heart of his Mother and therefore the world existed first before his nativity, as this nativity was prefigured a long time before it happened. One is a temporal nativity by which the Son of God was born in time from the Virgin Mary as is revealed in the following verse.\(^{39}\)

A more scholastic style of theological interpretation was found in its commentary on the hymn *Pange lingua gloriosi* and the *Expositio sequentiarum*’s commentary on the Corpus Christi sequence *Lauda Syon*.\(^{40}\) Attributed to Aquinas, these were both written for the feast of Corpus Christi. They gave a concise presentation of the eucharistic theology found in his *Summa theologicae* and so to study them with the commentaries was to learn the standard late-medieval theology of the mass.

These books also give allegorical interpretations of the hymns and sequences, for example the commentary on the sequence for the dedication of a church, *Hierusalem et Syon*, in the *Expositio Sequintiarum* said:

Construe: the church is signified by the waves of the Jordan, namely where Christ was baptised by John (Matthew 3, Mark 1) and this church comes from the end, i.e. from the ends of the earth, to hear immediately, i.e. to know at once, this church described, i.e. made known, by Solomon, i.e. Christ,

\(^{38}\) *Constructio est plana, tamen pro sed ipse filius est unus verus Deus et Spiritus Sanctus emanate id est procedit ab utroque scilicet Patre et Filio. Hic confundit Grecorum secta qui Spiritum Sanctum a solo patre asserunt procedure. Ideo apud Romanos scismatici appellantur*, Myllar, *Expositio Sequintiarum*, fol. 55r.

\(^{39}\) *Materia huius hymni est duplex nativitas filii dei, una utriusque eterna qua erat genitus ante initium mundi et hoc ex corde sue matris, et itaque mundus fuerit prior ante nativitatem; iamdiu fuit ante prefigurata eius nativitas. Alia est nativitas temporalis qua filius dei erat natus in tempore ex virgine Maria ut patet in sequenti versu*, *Expositio hymnorum*, fol. 77v.

typologically (*typicis sensibus*), the church, I say, clothed with the wedding garments and the church joined, i.e. connected, to Christ, today present, i.e. in the midst of, the citizens of heaven.\textsuperscript{41}

These commentaries were designed to be of practical use by teachers and pupils. Matthias Moncur’s marginalia in his *Sequentie et hymni* are largely simple explanation, for example in the hymn *Ave maris stella* he writes ‘*salutare*’ and ‘*Salve*’ by the word *Ave*. He also, however, gave spiritual interpretation, for example in the commentary on the hymn, *Ad cenam agni providi*, the word ‘*diaboli*’ was written over *Pharaonis* and ‘*diabolum*’ over *Tiranum* where the hymn interpreted baptism allegorically as the drowning of Pharaoh and his armies (the devil and his angels) in the Red Sea (font).\textsuperscript{42} These notes give some idea of how a schoolmaster would have used these books in class and reveal that allegorical liturgical interpretation was part of the curriculum.

*b. Liturgical epistles and gospels*

Another of the texts bound in Moncur’s volume was a book of epistles and gospels for Sundays and major feasts throughout the whole year with marginal notes by Herman Torrentinus.\textsuperscript{43} *Epistolae et evangelia* were one of the most printed works from the first decades of printing and were used by clergy in the liturgy and for preaching, and by the laity for devotional use (many editions were in the vernacular).\textsuperscript{44} The use of the mass lectionary as an educational text is not mentioned by Orme but this was done in Italy and its presence here with notes by a Dutch

\textsuperscript{41}`Construe: Ecclesia est signata fluctibus Iordanis scilicet qua Christus fuit baptisatus a Ioanne (Mathei. iii. Marci primo) et haec ecclesia venit a finibus id est de finibus terrae audire cominus id est statim scientiam Salomonis id est Christi haec ecclesia descripta id est manifestata typicis sensibus ecclesia dico induta vestibus nuptiarum et ecclesia iuncta id est adiuncta Christo praestet id est interstet hodie civibus caeli’, Myllar, *Expositio Sequentiarum*, fol. 25r.

\textsuperscript{42} *Sequentie et hymni*, fols 7r, 13v.

\textsuperscript{43} Torrentinus, *Epistole Evangeliaque toto anno diebus dominicis ceteris divorum festis legenda una cum succinctis Torrentini marginalibus annotatiunculis* (Antwerp, 1526). The volume lacks page or folio numbering.

\textsuperscript{44} It is thirteenth in the list of best-selling titles 1455-1500 and 85% of the 112 editions were in the vernacular (though none in Scots or English), Milway, ‘Forgotten Best-sellers’, 126, 141.
grammarian suggest that the same was true of Northern Europe.\textsuperscript{45} There are ownership inscriptions by Moncur and ‘Ioannes Forsyte’ and two sets of early manuscript marginalia. In one of these the reading from Ecclesiasticus 15:1-6 on St John’s day has been changed to 1 John 1, and the reading of Isaiah 60:1-6 on the Epiphany has been changed to Ephesians 3. These were two of the days on which the \textit{Book of Common Prayer} differed from the Sarum lectionary and this is evidence both for the use of the Prayer Book in Scotland and for the continuing use of pre-1560 liturgical texts by Protestants. The other set of manuscript notes shows that this book of liturgical readings was designed to be used in school, as in the sequence and hymnal commentaries, they provide synonyms. In the lesson from 1 Peter 4:7-11 on the Sunday after Ascension ‘\textit{dilectissimi}’ was written by \textit{charissimi}; ‘\textit{future perspicientes}’ by \textit{estote prudentes}; and ‘\textit{amor}’ by \textit{charitas}. An interesting error is found in this passage where ‘\textit{fecit}’ was written by \textit{operit} (from the verb \textit{operio} ‘to cover’, not \textit{operor} ‘to labour’), thus glossing 1 Peter 4:8, ‘charity covers a multitude of sins’ (\textit{caritas operit multitudinem peccatorum}), as ‘sexual passion made sins’ (\textit{amor fecit peccata}). This may have been a Scottish renaissance schoolmaster’s joke, perhaps by Moncur, or an example of moral teaching, but it was in tune with the interest in sex that Orme noted in Tudor schools in England.\textsuperscript{46} The Latin readings at mass would be familiar to schoolboys from attending church and thus provided a good text to be used in learning grammar while improving their knowledge of the liturgy that many of them would eventually celebrate.

\textit{c. Glossed and paraphrased psalters}

Although zealous clergy who prayed the psalms daily would want to understand them better, the centrality of the psalter in the elementary school curriculum may assist in understanding the relatively large number of eight glossed and paraphrased psalters which survive from pre-1560 Scotland.\textsuperscript{47} The provenance and dates of these

\textsuperscript{45} Paul F. Grendler, \textit{Schooling in Renaissance Italy: Literacy and Learning 1300-1600} (Baltimore, 1989), 280-81.

\textsuperscript{46} Orme, \textit{Medieval Schools}, 116. In a personal communication Nicholas Orme suggests that this is probably not a joke as, in general, schools sought to teach sexual morality while simply allowing sexual (and scatological) humour among the pupils

\textsuperscript{47} Holmes, ‘Catalogue’, 191-92.
volumes mirrors that of the extant Rationales: one is from the 1480s, the others from the mid-sixteenth century; six of the eight are from the northern dioceses influenced by the Elphinstone reform. Torquemada’s Glossa psalterii was given to Aberdeen Cathedral by Duncan Scherar with his Rationale in 1488 to be chained in the choir where it could have been used for teaching. The format of these psalters was close to that of the hymnal-commentaries. They also gave theological commentary, as in this Christological and tropological commentary on Psalm 99:3-4 from Raynerius Snoy’s paraphrased psalter:

Know [and understand] that the Lord [Jesus Christ] himself is God [the Creator of all]; he made us [in his image and likeness], and [we did] not [make] ourselves, [because all our good is from him and not from us]... Enter [confidently therefore] the gates [of his mercy, but] with confession [of sins, then] enter into his [heavenly] halls, [then] in hymns [and praises] praise him [by giving thanks for all his benefits].

Snoy’s accessus (introduction) made it clear why he provided theological interpretation:

The psalter, much more than the other books of sacred Scripture, is sung in the divine office because it is the perfect summary of all theology.

The liturgical use of the psalter meant that the paraphrased psalters were a place where exegesis of both Scripture and liturgy were found together in a form suited for both schools and personal use. They are thus another example of the educational use of liturgical interpretation which may even have extended to the use of liturgical commentaries such as the Rationale.

---

48 ‘Scitote atque intellegite quoniam Dominus Iesus Christus ipse est Deus creator omnium: ipse fecit nos ad imaginem et similitudinem suam, et non ipsi fecimus nos, quia omne bonum nostrum ex eo est, et non ex nobis... introite ergo confidenter portas misericordiae eius, sed in confessione peccatorum, deinde introite in atria coelestia eius, deinde in hymnis et laudibus confitemini illi gratias agendo de omnibus beneficiis. Snoy, Psalterium, 386-7.

49 ‘Psalterium plus caeteris divinis scripturis, in ecclesiasticis decantatur officiis, quia est consummatio totius theologicae paginae.’ Snoy, Psalterium (Lyon, 1554), fol. A3r.
d. Liturgical commentaries and the Aberdeen Rationale

The *Rationale* given to Aberdeen cathedral by Duncan Shearer in 1488 was kept in the choir together with a grammar book, John of Genoa’s *Catholicicon*.\(^{50}\) Durandus’s book is also known to have been in the choirs of Crail collegiate church and the university chapels of St Andrews and Aberdeen.\(^{51}\) The *Catholicicon* was also found in the choir of Glasgow cathedral and King’s College Chapel, Aberdeen, and in St Salvator’s chapel, St Andrews there were ‘tua grammar bukis apon the lang lettrown’.\(^{52}\) Few books have survived and this pattern was probably repeated in many of the larger churches. While these may have simply been used for reference, given the place of liturgical interpretation in contemporary education they do suggest that choirs were indeed used for education outside services.\(^{53}\)

Possible confirmation of this is found in the All Souls, Oxford copy of the *Rationale* (Mainz, 1459), left to the College in 1499 by the humanist Bishop James Goldwell who had purchased it at Hamburg in 1465.\(^{54}\) The donation inscription specified that it was to be chained in the choir of the College Chapel for the use of students (*ad utilitatem studentium*).\(^{55}\) This is a significant witness to the use of the *Rationale* in university chapels, as at St Andrews and Aberdeen, but the other Scottish churches

---

\(^{50}\) SL, Ivi, 373. The *Catholicicon* or *Summa Grammaticalis* of the Dominican John Balbus of Genoa (d.1298), a contemporary of Durandus, contained treatises on orthography, etymology, grammar, rhetoric, together with an etymological dictionary.

\(^{51}\) See Bibliography 4.

\(^{52}\) SL, Ivi, 373.

\(^{53}\) SL, 26, 56, 135, 373. It does seem more usual, however, for the song school to have a separate room, Flynn, ‘Education of Choristers’, 181; J. Raine, ed., *A Description or Briefe Declaration of all the Ancient Monuments, Rites and Customes belonginge or beinge within the Monastical Church of Durham before the Suppression* (London, 1842), 54.


\(^{55}\) OAS LR.5.l.1., verso of first blank folio: ‘Liber collegii omnium animarum Oxon. quem Reverendus pater Jacobus Goldwelle episcopus Norwichen. emit in civitate Hamburgensi dum erat missus in ambaciatam a Cristianissimo princepe Edwardo Rege Anglie etc. ad illustriissimum principem Regem Dacie voluitque dictus Reverendus pater ut cathanetur in Choro dicti collegii ad utilitatem studentium. Et si quis eum alienaverit vel contra hanc dispositionem fecerit Anathema sit. Et hec disposicio erat per prefatum Reverendum patrem Anno Domini millesimo CCCCLXXXVIII’.
which had *Rationales* in the choir also had song schools and grammar schools. There, while the commentaries could have been for the personal use of the clergy, the All Souls’ example and the presence of grammar books suggests a more specific ‘school’ use, illustrated by the illuminated initial from a fifteenth-century German *Rationale* which shows Durandus (or a master) teaching the *Rationale* to a group of young students (figure 2).

![Image](image.jpg)

*Figure 20: Rationale, OBL Laud Misc. 311, initial to the Preface, fol. 1r*

The marginalia in the Aberdeen Cathedral *Rationale* support this hypothesis of educational use even below university level. As it was printed in 1486 and presented to the Cathedral in 1488, the marginalia related to the Latin liturgy would almost certainly have come from the period when it was chained in the Cathedral choir. The sections marked included various things which may have been explained to members of a song school as they were initiated into the liturgy they celebrated:

---

56 SHL Inc 109. See chapter 3, pages 90, 93-94.
six reasons why candles were carried in the Candlemas procession (fol. 235v; *Rationale* 7.7.14); an explanation of why it was good to say the Our Father and Hail Mary silently at the start and end of each office (fol. 111r; *Rationale* 5.2.6); the story of the origin of the *Te Deum* sung at the end of festal matins (fol. 121r; *Rationale* 5.3.31); and, marked with a manicule, a section on the place of hymns in the structure of the divine office which would have complemented the use of hymnal commentaries in school (fol. 112v; *Rationale* 5.2.25). There are also some pen exercises in the margin which imply school use: letters of the alphabet in secretary hand, musical notes, and the draft of part of a letter in Scots.57

Most of the marginal marks in the volume, however, relate to the mass and the doctrine of the eucharist. They are found between folios 85r and 89v where there are 33 marks and underlinings in *Rationale* 4.41 (the chapter on the sixth part of the canon, *Qui pridie*) compared with just over 20 significant manuscript marks in the whole of the rest of the book. In this section Durandus discussed the essential matter and form of the eucharist and the transubstantiation believed to have happened at this point. The marked passages, however, concerned liturgical interpretation and practical questions as well as sacramental theology: why the bread was round like a penny (4.41.8); the meaning of the two signs of the cross made at the consecration of the bread (4.41.14); whether one should break the bread before consecrating it as Christ did or break after the consecration as done by the church (4.41.15); the story of the Mass of St Gregory, where the consecrated bread turned into flesh when a woman doubted (4.41.28 – this will be revisited in chapter 5); how the words of consecration were to be said (4.41.45-7); and it ends by marking a section on the words used in the consecration of the chalice (4.42.3). This marked section was, therefore, a liturgical commentary on the central part of the canon of the mass.

Eucharistic theology and the doctrine of transubstantiation were taught to theology students at Aberdeen University when their course covered Peter Lombard’s *Sentences* 4.8-13 which included most of the questions marked here in the *Rationale*.

---

57 SHL Inc 109, fols 15v, 79v, 129v, ‘Trust fathyr and mothyr I commend me to yow wit all mi hurt and I pray yow send me 1t of mone and ane guid coti and ane guid sark and leven to visit tae yow’. 
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This part of the *Rationale* presented a theology of transubstantiation in a very similar way to the *Sentences* but it did so in the context of practical instruction on the meaning of the words and gestures of the canon of the mass. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that this section of the *Rationale* chained in the choir of Aberdeen Cathedral was marked because it was used to teach schoolboys contemporary doctrine on the eucharist. This was done by the liturgical interpretation of the text and rites of the canon of the mass, just as boys were also taught eucharistic doctrine from the commentaries on the hymns and sequences for Corpus Christi. Chapter 3 has shown that the *Rationale* was ‘a practical book for liturgical practitioners’; the Aberdeen *Rationale* suggests that it was also ‘a practical resource for liturgical educators’.  

3) The formation of the clergy

*a. A poorly educated and corrupt clergy?*

Little is known about the education of Scottish clergy who did not matriculate at university. In England the standard paths to ordination were education in a grammar school or working as a parish clerk and much relevant learning was picked up on the job. The limited evidence from Scotland suggests something similar but whatever route he took, the cleric would have ideally needed the sort of instruction in liturgical rites, their meaning and theology that is implied by the marginalia in the Aberdeen *Rationale*.

The study of the pre-1560 Scottish secular clergy has been dominated by a narrative of corruption rooted in a search by Catholics, Protestants and modern historians for the causes of the events of 1559-60. Protestant polemic has combined with literary anticlericalism, attacks on clerical standards and morality by Catholic Reformers and post-Reformation complaints by Catholic controversialists to form a black picture of the lower clergy (vicars, curates and chaplains) which has proved remarkably

---

58 As ‘question and answer’ was a basic technique of medieval education, this may also explain the questions written in the margins of Book 4 in two continental copies of the *Rationale*, BNF B-591 (1477) and BNF Vélines-127 (1459), chapter 3, pages 88-89.

enduring. The otherwise revisionist work of Gordon Donaldson maintained this view, although more recent studies by Jenny Wormald and Alec Ryrie have questioned the picture of the ‘pathetic figure of the parish priest, desperately poor, ill-educated, sexually immoral, covetous of his parishioners’ goods while indifferent to their well-being’.  

Most literary evidence of low standards among the pre-1560 Scottish clergy does not, however, stand up to examination. Recent studies have concluded that satirical attacks on the friars in the Reformation did not reflect their corruption but were rather the use of a standard medieval literary trope by Protestants against one of their most effective and observant enemies; this should warn against giving too much credence to literary satire on the lower clergy. The 1549 Provincial Council complained that the parochial clergy were ‘deficient in learning, morals and discretion’, but this was said to justify the new Catholic humanist reforming programme. A decade earlier Archibald Hay had written of the Scottish clergy:

I often wonder what the bishops were thinking about when they admitted such men to the handling of the Lord’s holy body when they hardly know the order of the alphabet... they address themselves to performing the sacrifice who have not tasted learning even with the tip of their lips.

---


62 Patrick, *Statutes*, 84 cf. 110, 146, 157, 176-7. A similar attack on the educational standards in monasteries was made by the Augustinian Catholic Reformer who became a Protestant, Robert Richardson, *Commentary on the Rule of St Augustine* (Edinburgh, 1935), 171.

63 ‘Non raro demirer [recte ‘demiror’?] quodnam episcopis venerit in mente, cum tales admitterent ad sacrosanctum Domini corpus tractandum, qui vix novunt literarum seriem... ad sacrificium peragendum se accingunt, qui ne supremis quidem labris disciplinas degustarunt’, Hay, *Panegyricus*, fol. 34r, cf 33r-34v.
Hay was, however, an Erasmian scholar who had been in Paris for over a decade and was supporting the foundation of a new humanist college to train priests at St Andrews by repeating what Euan Cameron calls ‘the by now formulaic humanist denunciation of lazy, greedy, ignorant priests and old-fashioned scholars’ – a literary trope that had a long history before renaissance humanism. Ninian Winzet and Nicholas de Gouda SJ writing in 1562 likewise had a polemical purpose in criticising the pre-1560 clergy, explaining the swift collapse of their church by the weakness of its leaders rather than any inadequacy in its doctrine. The charge of late medieval clerical illiteracy has been challenged for Europe in general by Leonard Boyle and for pre-1560 Scotland by Mark Dilworth who found no evidence of illiteracy amongst monks and canons and by John Durkan who concluded from his study of education that ‘there is little evidence of ignorant clerics’.

\[b.\] The education of non-graduate clergy

A survey of the Scottish clergy in 1560 using the evidence in Haws, *Scottish Parish Clergy* shows that 82% of Prebendaries and Rectors (100% in the diocese of Aberdeen) were graduates with a Master’s degree, as were 38% of vicars (43% in the diocese of Aberdeen). Sometimes the title ‘Master’ was given to those who had not graduated and those who were not called ‘Master’ may have attended university, as ‘Sir Patrick Ogston’, the vicar of Peterugy (Peterhead) in Aberdeenshire discussed in

---


67 Haws estimates there were about 3400 clergy in Scotland at this time of whom 700 were regular, 400 served cathedrals, 500 collegiate churches, 1100 parishes, and 700 were unbenediced, *Scottish Parish Clergy*, ix. Donaldson estimated that there were about 3000 clergy, *The Scottish Reformation*, 16.
the last chapter, had been a student of theology at Aberdeen in 1542. The picture that emerges, however, is of a generally university educated higher clergy, a sizeable minority of vicars who were graduates, and the vast majority of the lower clergy who were not graduates and were thus probably educated at a grammar school. English evidence suggests that some of these may even have had less than a full grammar education – which required some expenditure even in free schools - and have combined service as parish clerks with basic education picked up in various places. As prebendaries, rectors and many vicars were non-resident and employed curates, the majority of the clergy pastorally active in parishes and celebrating the liturgy for parishioners would therefore not have been graduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area, benefice type and number of parishes with extant information</th>
<th>‘Master’</th>
<th>‘Sir’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scotland</strong> (extant evidence from 650 parishes out of c.1000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prebendaries and Rectors</td>
<td>252 ‘Master’ (82%)</td>
<td>55 ‘Sir’ (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicars</td>
<td>199 ‘Master’ (38%)</td>
<td>320 ‘Sir’ (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aberdeen diocese</strong> (extant evidence from 75 parishes out of 100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prebendaries and Rectors</td>
<td>39 ‘Masters’ (100%)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicars</td>
<td>24 ‘Master’ (43%)</td>
<td>32 ‘Sir’ (57%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher proportion of graduates in the diocese of Aberdeen was a result of Elphinstone’s Aberdeen reform movement, but his reform also affected the training of non-graduate clergy and so it should not be presumed that non-graduates were necessarily poorly educated. In the archdiocese of St Andrews the Catholic

---

68 See p.102.
controversialist Ninian Winzet was a chaplain, notary and schoolmaster at Linlithgow but not a graduate and he was an example of the high intellectual and moral quality that could be found among the lower clergy.\textsuperscript{70}

Many non-graduate clergy thus probably received education in Latin and the understanding of liturgical texts at grammar school. In addition to this, John Durkan argued that

\begin{quote}
Training was largely by apprenticeship, living in an atmosphere of ‘good conversation’, acquiring some knowledge of the creed, sacraments and prayers, and, above all, learning to sing a music which was becoming increasingly sophisticated.\textsuperscript{71}
\end{quote}

He gave an early sixteenth-century example of this from a Dumbarton protocol book: Thomas Palmer’s relatives paid a priest, Andrew Watson, to take him in as a lodger while he studied at Dumbarton grammar school and until he was able to sing his first mass at the age of 24.\textsuperscript{72} Thomas Lawson, however, was appointed master of Cupar grammar school in 1552 while a layman and was to be paid out of an altar foundation until he was ordained and could obtain a chaplaincy.\textsuperscript{73} At Seton collegiate church it was stated that a chorister ‘of sufficient literature and command in music’ might be appointed to a prebend if one was vacant and he had passed examination.\textsuperscript{74} Although education in grammar and the liturgy was essential, there were thus different non-graduate routes to ordination, with some working as teachers or parish clerks between leaving grammar school about the age of 18 and attaining the age for ordination. Some may have attended lectures at the universities and others may have attended the theological lectures that were required to be given in cathedrals.\textsuperscript{75}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{70} Mark Dilworth, ‘Winzet, Ninian (1518/19–1592)’, ODNB, accessed 25 September 2011.
\bibitem{71} Durkan, ‘Chaplains in Late Medieval Scotland’, \textit{RSCHS}, 20.2 (1979), 92.
\bibitem{72} Durkan, ‘Chaplains’, 92, most of the grammar school scholars noted in the protocol book later turn up as town chaplains, and it is probable that before this they attended the town song school.
\bibitem{73} Durkan, \textit{Schools and Schoolmasters}, 30.
\bibitem{74} Durkan, ‘The Foundation of the Collegiate Church at Seton’, \textit{IR} 13.1 (1962), 71-76, at 76.
\bibitem{75} Orme, \textit{Medieval Schools}, 205-8; Patrick, \textit{Statutes}, 104-5, 136.
\end{thebibliography}
There is little evidence of their theological education beyond this; no synodical regulations for the training of priests have survived, but Durkan is too harsh in saying that ‘the great defect of a clerical education then was the lack of a specific theological training’. The marginalia in the Aberdeen Rationale suggest how this was done and Macfarlane was able to reconstruct what needed to be learned in clerical education: Latin grammar to understand the liturgy; the prayers which had to be taught to the laity; the various administrative documents; how to celebrate the sacraments; basic theology; the basic moral theology needed to hear confessions; and competence in liturgical chant.

c. Bishop Gordon’s Examen ordinandorum

It was common practice for there to be an examination before ordination, as Archibald Hay noted in 1540:

> It is the duty of an archdeacon to propound questions to each and every one that pants for the priesthood according to the grade that he seeks – thus easier questions to subdeacons, more difficult ones to deacons, and theological questions to presbyters - and, after the examination, to make a definite report to the bishop as to what is to be done’.

Among the many books of Bishop Gordon of Aberdeen which showed an interest in continental Catholic Reform was the 1551 edition of Frederick Nausea’s catechism, which Gordon signed in 1554 and later gave to Alexander Anderson, the Catholic Principal of King’s, Aberdeen. At the end is added the Examen ordinandorum of the Franciscan Johann Wild (1497-1554), one of many books to assist in the examination of ordinands published from the mid-sixteenth century among Catholics

---

77 Macfarlane, Elphinstone, 246-47.
78 ‘Est etenim Archidiaconi officium, singulis ad presbyteratum anhelantibus quaestiones pro gradus dignitate quem petunt proponere, ut Hypodiaconis leviore, Diaconis difficiliores, Presbyteris theologas, et facta examinatione ad Episcopum deferre certum aliquid, quod sit agendum’. Hay, Panegyricus, fol. 34v.
79 AUL pi.2382.Nau.
and Protestants as part of a desire to improve clerical standards.80 A second copy of the Examen which was probably in Scotland before 1560 was in Clement Litill’s collection which formed the nucleus of Edinburgh University Library.81 This was bound with Georg Witzel’s commentaries on the creed, Our Father, Hail Mary and decalogue, the catechism of Jacob Schöpper (1512/16-1554), Odo of Cambrai’s commentary on the canon of the mass and a schoolboy’s prayer and grace book.82 Wild, Witzel, Nausea and Schöpper were all irenicist Catholic Reformers and this mixture of catechetics, prayers and liturgical interpretation is a good picture of what the reforming Scottish bishops of the 1550s thought ordinands should know.83

The examination of ordinands in the Examen was in three parts for the three major orders, each began with doctrine and the sacraments and ended with a commentary on a part of the mass: the subdeacon from the introit to the epistle; the deacon from the gradual to the offertory; and the priest from the preface to the last blessing. This commentary was allegorical; for example, the preface was Christ’s return to Judah before the passion and also his meal at Bethany; the sanctus was the acclamation of the crowd on Palm Sunday; the elevation of the host and extension of the priest’s hands in the canon were the crucifixion; the silent canon was Christ’s silence on the cross; the fraction was his death; the particle put in the chalice was the burial of Christ; the pax was the fruit of the passion or the resurrection after which Christ said ‘peace be with you’; the Agnus Dei represented the centurion at the cross speaking of Christ and the people beating their breasts; communion was the thanksgiving of the church or the joy of the Apostles at the resurrection; the last collect (postcommunion) was Christ continually praying to the Father; the ite missa est was the sending home of the people or Christ’s return to the Father; and the last blessing was the ascension.

80 Other similar works include Frederick Nausea, Isagogicon de clericis ordinandis (Vienna, 1548); Philipp Melanchthon, Der ordinanden examen (Wittenberg, 1554); Bartolommeo d’Angelo OP, Examen confessariorum ac ordinandorum (Venice, 1583); and Johannes Holthusius, Modus examinandi sacrorum ordinum candidatos (Dillingen, 1564).

81 EUL Dd.6.4.

82 Macfarlane, Elphinstone, 247.

The priest’s vestments were related to Christ’s passion and the mass was seen primarily as a passion-drama:

‘What is the mass? It is the contemplation of the passion of Christ and like a representation. For from the introit to the canon the advent of Christ and his life up to the passion is represented; from the canon to the completion, the passion; from the completion to the blessing, the burial and resurrection. The blessing signifies the very blessing of the ascending Christ’.  

The commentary on the mass was thus presented as the high point of clerical training and Wild ended his commentary by directing ordinands to the *Rationale*. Bishop Gordon’s *Examen ordinandorum* thus suggests that it was highly likely that the Aberdeen Cathedral *Rationale*, with its marginalia relating to teaching about the mass, was used for educating ordinands and other grammar school pupils. The *Examen* also shows that while the education of ordinands included much doctrinal and moral teaching, the understanding of liturgy in the tradition found in the *Rationale* was of primary importance.

d. Pastoralia and the continuing education of the clergy

The Fourth Lateran Council decreed that priests should be competent ‘not only in the duty of preaching, but also in the hearing of confessions and the imposition of penances’, and from this developed a genre of pastoral manuals for the clergy which Leonard Boyle called *pastoralia*. They were very popular and gave the parochial clergy guidance from canon law and theology on their duties regarding marriage, preaching, confessions and liturgy. In Scotland the synodal constitutions of

---


85 *Examen ordinandorum*, fos 306r-v.


Archbishop Andrew Forman of St Andrews (1516-21) ordered that ‘every holder of a cure within his diocese’ should possess a copy of one of these manuals, the *Manipulus curatorum* of Guido de Monte Rochen, and produce it at each synod. Only one copy of this is extant, owned by the Aberdeen Carmelite, William Shewan, who was associated with the Aberdeen liturgists and another copy is recorded as having been pawned to the St Andrews Faculty of Arts in 1475. Three other such manuals are extant, the *Manuale Parochialium Sacerdotum* (Cologne 1492) owned by Bishop Elphinstone, Nicolaus de Plove’s *Tractatus sacerdotalis* (n.p., n.d.) owned by James Sutherland, canon of Glasgow, and Michael Lochmaier’s *Parochiale curatorium* (Rouen 1510) owned by Bishop Henry Sinclair. Three of the four extant manuals contain liturgical interpretation, as do many medieval manuals for the laity such as the *Lay Folks Mass Book* but no lay handbooks have survived from Scotland. It is reasonable to surmise that these four pastoral manuals were the only survivors of many hundreds that were in Scotland; only one copy of Donatus remains from this period, yet it was a key text in contemporary Scottish grammar education.

The pastoral manuals were practical texts for clergy with cure of souls. They dealt with practical matters such as penance and confession (although there were also dedicated confessional manuals), the law of marriage and burial, diocesan synods,

---

88 Patrick, *Statutes*, 266, where it is wrongly stated in a footnote that this is not the *Manipulus* of Guido de Monte Rochen. The *Manipulus* (2.3.4) actually does include the question of reserved sins discussed in the text translated by Patrick.


90 AUL Inc 34; NLS Gray.205; EUL Dd.6.8.

91 The two extant copies of the ‘Quiñonian’ *Missale Romanum* of 1550 from Scotland, discussed in chapters 3 and 6, contain liturgical commentaries which also reflect the importance of liturgical interpretation for clerical ‘continuing education’, Holmes ‘Catalogue’, 185.

92 Gordon Donaldson is too reticent in saying that we ‘do not know to what extent Scottish priests may have been furnished, as English priests were, with manuals of instruction to guide them in their work’, *Scottish Reformation*, 15.

93 The *Parochiale curatorium* is for the parish priest (*curatus*) and the *Tractatus sacerdotalis* describes itself as a ‘tractatum de administrandis rite ecclesiasticis sacramentis’ for ‘rectoribus ecclesiarium parochialium’, fol. 1v.
the duties of godparents and the basics of the faith that needed to be taught to parishioners such as the apostles’ creed, decalogue, Hail Mary and Our Father. Liturgical interpretation was used in the sections on the sacraments but even there it had a practical purpose and was combined with useful advice of the sort a priest would have been taught during his ‘apprenticeship’ or would have read in the rubrics of the Missal. The section on the sacraments in the Manuale Parochialium Sacerdotum was purely practical, covering subjects such as what the priest should do if he had a nosebleed at mass, how to hold and wash his fingers, and how he should teach his people to kneel when the Blessed Sacrament is carried past. The other three, however, use allegorical liturgical interpretation.

The priest’s vestments were interpreted using a number of different systems. In Manipulus 1.4.8 the seven vestments were said to signify: the seven gifts of the Spirit; antidotes to the seven deadly sins; the seven virtues; the seven works of mercy; the seven gifts in paradise; and the figurative seven days that Christ is with humanity in the sacrament before the end of the world. The individual vestments signified (significat) the virtues the priest should have, for example: the surplice, a pure life; the amice, a mind lifted up to God; the chasuble, charity. The section then ended, ‘many other opinions could be added, but let these suffice for now’.

The Tractatus had four ways of interpreting the six vestments: as weapons from John Beleth; relating to Christ in his passion from Durandus; as signifying the seven theological and cardinal virtues (with the stole as both prudence and temperance); and as the six duties of the priest: to baptise, preach, catechise, bind, absolve and

---

94 Four confessional manuals survive from Scotland: Antonius de Butrio, Speculum de confessione (Louvain 1483), owned by James Eliot OSA, SAUL TypGS.A88GR; Andreas de Escobar, Modus Confitendi (n.d., n.p.), owned by Bishop Elphinstone, AUL Inc 190; Thomas Aquinas, Confessionale (c.1500), owned by James Sutherland and bound with his Tractatus sacerdotalis and the Methodus confessionis (Paris 1540), owned by William Hay of Turriff, AUL pi.2656.Met.

95 Liturgical texts were written out for personal use: James Gray, priest of Dunkeld diocese and secretary to Archbishop Scheves, wrote out the canon of the Mass, together with the rite for blessing holy water and various mass prayers in his notebook, NLS, Adv. MS. 34.7.3; John Smith, monk of Kinloss, composed a short chronicle c.1550 adding texts from the sacrament of penance and the Cistercian Forma in missa privata servanda, BL, Harl. MS. 2363.

96 Manipulus 1.4.8, ‘Multae aliae opinions possent adduci, sed istae pro nunc sufficient’.
consecrate.\textsuperscript{97} The last was the only one not in the \textit{Rationale} and reveals the purpose of the interpretations: they were designed to remind the priest each day as he put on his sacred vestments that he should live a virtuous life, conform himself to Christ whose passion he celebrates in the mass and perform his pastoral duties. Liturgical interpretation here was uncompromisingly allegorical but also totally practical, recalling Archibald Hay’s use of an allegorical liturgical interpretation of the vesture of a Cardinal to speak of the sort of life a Cardinal should live.\textsuperscript{98} The \textit{Parochiale}, however, which uses the moral interpretation, is significant in that it said at the end of chapter 1 that the priest should know the meaning of the vestments for the benefit of his parishioners.\textsuperscript{99} The teaching of the manuals was thus for the benefit of the laity as well as of the priest and it can be inferred that, despite the lack of evidence from Scotland, liturgical interpretation was a part of lay spirituality.

The \textit{Manipulus} and \textit{Tractatus} both included allegorical commentaries on the \textit{ordo missae}. The former used numbers to aid memory: the three sacred languages used (Latin, Greek and Hebrew), three parts of the host, the four parts of the rite, the five times the priest turned to the people, the seven times he greeted them and the twenty-five signs of the cross. Each was interpreted allegorically and this could be for the benefit of the priest or to aid his teaching. The allegorical interpretations were often related to the passion but the rite as a whole was not given the form of a passion-drama. The \textit{Tractatus}, however, referred to the mass-commentary of Aquinas in order to teach that

The whole mystery of our salvation is included in the sacrament of the eucharist; [the various parts of the mass] signify the deeds, acts and works of Christ... especially concerning the mystery of his passion, resurrection and ascension.\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{97} \textit{Tractatus sacerdotalis}, fol. 54v.

\textsuperscript{98} Hay, \textit{Panegyricus}, fols 51r-54v.

\textsuperscript{99} ‘Sunt autem sex sacerdotalia indumenta quibus spiritualiter curatus debet vestire subditos suos... Felix sacerdos qui... potest vestire subditos vestimentis vestutum more Ioseph qui protulit sigulis fratribus binas stolas’, \textit{Parochiale}, fols 6v-7r.

\textsuperscript{100} \textit{Tractatus sacerdotalis} 53v, \textit{mysterium nostrae salutis totum comprehendid in sacro eucharistie’}, ‘designant enim gesta, facta et opera Christi... precipue circa mysterium sue passionis, resurrectionis et ascensionis’. This is in the section, \textit{De expositio misse}, 53v-71v, and recalls the prayer \textit{Unde et
The *Parochiale* did not have a commentary on the *ordo missae* but did teach that the mass signifies ‘the passion of Christ’ because his blood is separated from his body, a theological trope based on the allegorical interpretation of the separate consecration of the bread and wine in the canon of the mass.¹⁰¹ As well as the passion drama, the *Tractatus* also gave other interpretations of parts of the *ordo missae*, often following Beleth or Durandus, for example the priest’s return to the sacristy was said to signify the return of Israel from exile.¹⁰² Creative use of the tradition can be seen in its interpretation of the three saints in the emblem to symbolise: virginity, Peter; preaching, Paul; and desire for crucifixion, Andrew.¹⁰³ This is strange as Durandus had Peter, who had a mother-in-law, symbolise married life and Paul symbolise virginity, whereas Andrew symbolised the continence of a widower.¹⁰⁴ The *Tractatus*, however, was probably changing this for the benefit of the parish priest who should be celibate and preach and whose life should be centred on the celebration of the crucifixion in the mass. Pastoralia were thus a means of transmitting liturgical interpretation to the parochial clergy for their own use as well as for teaching their parishioners.

4) Universities, mendicants and monasteries

a. *Universities, liturgical interpretation and the curriculum*

The celebration of the liturgy in college chapels was central to university life for all members of college, most of whom were clerics. Each day had a ‘liturgical framework’, a group of priests and clerics would sing the mass and office in the chapel and the other members of the college community would attend parts of this.¹⁰⁵

---

¹⁰¹ *Parochiale*, fol. 150v, cf. chapter 7, page 268.


¹⁰³ *Tractatus*, fol. 67v.

¹⁰⁴ *Rationale* 4.49.5. No source is given in the critical edition, although Durandus attributes his interpretation of Andrew to John Chrysostom.

Elphinstone’s foundation charter for King’s is thus to be taken literally when it gave the purpose of the college as ‘that not only the fruits of knowledge but also the worship of God may be increased’. The university colleges of St Andrews and Aberdeen possessed liturgical commentaries (there are no comparable extant library lists or inventories from Glasgow), probably used for teaching, but this raises the question of the place of liturgical interpretation in the university curriculum.

The two main theological texts were the Bible and the Sentences of Peter Lombard. The latter covered the sacraments in Book 4, most of which concerned penance (distinctions 14-22) and marriage (distinctions 26-42) while the rest consisted of standard scholastic sacramental theology. Liturgical interpretation was, however, found in distinction 12 on the eucharist. This included Amalarius’s teaching on the three parts of the host and interpretations of the fraction as symbolising Christ’s passion and death and the mixture of water with the wine as symbolising the union of the people with Christ. The conclusion of the section on the eucharist at the end of distinction 13 was also the place where commentators added new questions on the mass which may contain interpretation of the liturgy.

There are four extant copies of the Sentences and sixteen different commentaries on Book 4 from pre-1560 Scotland and these contained a few examples of liturgical interpretation. Aquinas’s commentary, owned by the sixteenth-century Aberdeen Dominican Andrew MacNeil, had liturgical commentary in at least three places.  

106 ‘Ut non solum scientie fructus sed eciam cultus Dei divinis augeatur’, Eeles, King’s, 174, cf 154. Similar phrases are found for other colleges, Cant, St Salvator, 55, College of St Leonard, 129.


108 On Amalarius’s teaching on the three parts of the host see page 69, footnote 52.

109 The commentaries are by Pope Adrian VI; Albert the Great; Bonaventure; Durandus de St Pourcain; Francis Lichetus; Gabriel Biel; John Capreolus; John Duns Scotus; John Major; Marsilius of Inghen; Peter D’Ailly; Peter of Aquila; Peter de Palu; Thomas Aquinas; William of Auxerre; and William of Ockham.

110 Thomas Aquinas, In Sententias (c.1500), GUL Bm1.d3: dist. 8, expositio textus; dist. 13, expositio textus; dist. 15, q.4, a.3, q10 1.
The commentaries of Albert the Great, owned by Bishop Gordon, and William of Auxerre, owned by Abbot Alexander Mylne, had long discussions of the significance of the three parts of the host after the fraction and used the verb *significare* as a technical term for liturgical interpretation. The commentary of the Dominican Peter de La Palu (c. 1277-1342), owned by James Crichton OP, gave an allegorical interpretation of the altar cloths (4.13.2), which was also found in Aquinas’s commentary. The cloths were said to represent Jesus’ shroud and thus should be of simple undyed linen both because grave-clothes were of this material and also because of the symbolism (*in significando*) of linen which was made white by much beating just as the body of Christ passed through the passion to immortality.

The 1512 commentary on Book 4 by the Scottish theologian John Major (1467–1550) included liturgical interpretation in a supplementary question entitled *'quis sit modus celebrandi'* (‘how does one celebrate [the sacrament]’), which he expanded in the 1519 edition. The 1512 edition taught that the corporal symbolised (*significat*) Christ’s shroud, to which the 1519 edition added that the chalice and paten symbolised Christ’s tomb and the stone covering it. The 1512 edition simply stated that one may not celebrate mass without vestments but the 1519 edition added an allegorical commentary on the priest’s six vestments which represented (*representat*) the passion of Christ in the way taught by Durandus, and he justified this interpretation by grounding it on 1 Corinthians 11:26, ‘as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup you proclaim the death of the Lord’. At the end of this lecture, Major concluded ‘I think that seeking the mystical sense of these things is worthless,

---

111 Albert, *In 3 & 4 Sent* (Basle 1506), EUL Dd.4.27, 4.13.14, fols 18v-19r. William of Auxerre, *In Sententias* (Paris c. 1518), EUL Dd.5.17, 4.5.4., fols 18v-19r.

112 Peter de Palu, *In quartum Sententiarum* (Paris 1518), EUL Dd.5.21, fol. 56r; Aquinas, *In Sententias*, lib. 4 d. 13 q. 1 a. 2 qc. 5 ad 3.; cf. *Rationale* 4.29.3.


114 ‘*Hoc enim significat sindonem mundam qua Christus involutus fuit in sepulcro....* [1519: *Et licet calix sepulchrum Christi, et patena lapidem supra positum significet*]’, Major 1512, fol. 62v; Major 1519, fol. 76v.

115 Major 1512, fol. 62v; Major 1519, fol. 76v.
it is the sort of thing which anyone can make up according to his own wishes.\footnote{116} This sounds like cynicism about allegorical liturgical interpretation, the sort of thing that Erasmus or Luther might have said, although it may just be a pedagogue’s joke. By not only including liturgical interpretation in his lectures but adding to it in a later edition it is clear that he thought it should have a place in the theological curriculum, but this place is not central and the dismissive comment hinted at a suspicion of the method, perhaps he saw it as something characteristic of the lower curriculum of the grammar school.

\textit{b. Liturgical education and the friars}

In chapter 3 it was noted that two liturgical commentaries are known to have been in the hands of Scottish friars and that the Dominicans and Observant Franciscans were associated with Catholic Reform in Aberdeen. Among the 166 copies of the \textit{Rationale} examined, a significant number were also found to have been of Observant Franciscan provenance; there was also a copy in the 1490-1523 library catalogue of the Observants of Youghal, Ireland.\footnote{117} The presence of liturgical commentaries in mendicant houses associated with Catholic Reform suggests that it was a part of their intellectual milieu. Franciscans and Dominicans played an important role in university education and liturgical interpretation had a distinctive place in the Dominican intellectual tradition.

Young Dominican friars were first formed in the rule and liturgy of the order and then in the practical theology they would need for preaching and hearing confessions. The psalter with canticles, litanies and hymns which the Dominican nun, Sr. Marion Crawford of Skene Priory, Edinburgh adapted for liturgical use shows that formation in liturgy was not confined to the friars.\footnote{118} The legislation of the order prescribed that there was to be at least one lector in each friary who gave daily

\footnote{116} ‘\textit{Sensum aut mysticum istorum prosequi inane} [correction from ‘\textit{mane}’] censeo, q\text{ue}m quilibet pro suo arbitrio talem fabricat’, Major 1519, fol. 76v.

\footnote{117} Colmán O Clabaigh, \textit{The Franciscans in Ireland 1400-1534} (Dublin, 2002), 163-4. It is in the part of the catalogue written in 1491.

\footnote{118} \textit{Psalterium Davidicum, cum aliquot canticis ecclesiasticis. Litanie. Hymni ecclesiasticci} (Lyons, F. Regnault, 1552), NLS, H.8.f.17. There is no other evidence of liturgical education in Scottish nunneries.
lectures on the Bible and Sentences and, after two years of hearing lectures on the Sentences, a friar could proceed to a Studium Generale for advanced study, although it seems probable that few friars in England did this.\textsuperscript{119} In Scotland little is known of Dominican education apart from their involvement in the three universities.\textsuperscript{120} It is not certain that the Priories of Glasgow and St Andrews were erected into Studia Generalia but Dominicans were involved with the University of Aberdeen from its foundation, taught in the University of Glasgow (which had been founded in their convent) and also at St Andrews.\textsuperscript{121} The Summa theologiae of Aquinas had a special place in Dominican theological education and there is evidence that members of the Scottish Dominican Province had an interest in the renaissance Thomism of Thomas Cardinal Cajetan (1469-1534), Master General 1508-18.\textsuperscript{122}

Aquinas included liturgical interpretation in his commentary on the Sentences and the Tertia pars of his theological Summa included what Frank Quoëx has called Thomas’s ‘expositio missae’ (ST 3a, q.83, a.4-5), a largely allegorical discussion of the words and rites of the mass.\textsuperscript{123} A copy of the Tertia pars, edited by Cajetan, was given by John Major to the Franciscan Observant Catholic Reformer Alexander Arbuckle and other copies were owned by the Elgin Observant Franciscans and the Dominicans Alexander Barclay and John Grierson.\textsuperscript{124} Quoëx argues that while many modern scholars including Enrico Mazza have seen Thomas’s liturgical commentary in the Summa as a mere appendix to satisfy the medieval love of allegory, it was actually an integral part of the treatise on the eucharist (3\textsuperscript{a} q.73-83) providing

\textsuperscript{119} Orme, Medieval Schools, 261-3.

\textsuperscript{120} A lector principalis is mentioned at Edinburgh Priory in 1479 and a lector in theology at Elgin in 1538, Foggie, Renaissance Religion, 101-115.

\textsuperscript{121} William Moir Bryce, ‘Black Friars and Scottish Universities’, SHR 9 (1911), 1-9, at 8; Foggie, Renaissance Religion, 111-3; Boece, Vitae, 92-3; Macfarlane, Elphinstone, 253-4; R.G. Cant, The University of St Andrews: a Short History (Edinburgh, 1970), 30; John Durkan and James Kirk, University of Glasgow 1451-1577 (Glasgow, 1977), 12-14, 110-15, 170-73.


\textsuperscript{123} Quoëx, ‘Thomas d’Aquin, mystagogue’. See chapter 1, page 40.

\textsuperscript{124} ESL, 13-14, 71, 74, 109, 188.
liturgical interpretation in the light of its eucharistic theology. Given the importance of liturgical interpretation in late medieval education this seems reasonable, but it is still true that the main emphasis in this treatise is on the act of transubstantiation (3a q. 74-78), followed by the effects, recipient, minister and institution of this sacrament (3a q. 79-82) and the position of liturgical interpretation is still marginal. Liturgical interpretation was thus an integral part of Dominican education, as one would expect in an Order which celebrated the liturgy in community, but it was not of central importance.

c. Liturgical education in monasteries

Monasteries, whether of canons regular, monks or nuns, had as their main work the celebration of the liturgy. Most monks and canons came from the middle orders of society rather than from the poor and seem to have entered in their mid teens by which time they had presumably had some education in reading, plainsong, and grammar in the world which may well have needed improving in the cloister. Monastic education in the noviciate consisted mainly of learning and memorising the liturgy, the rule, monastic virtues and the customs of the house and it is probable that, even after one was ordained, one only ceased to be a novice when this process was completed. This would have included instruction in the meaning of the liturgy, as seen in the Cistercian Explanatio super hymnos mentioned above. There was a development in Benedictine education in the later middle ages which emphasised grammar and the moral and pastoral arts which a priest might need in his ministry but liturgy retained its centrality.

---

128 Clark, Monastic Renaissance at St Albans, 51.
There is some evidence of this liturgy-centred education in Scotland: for example, the regulations laid down by the visitor appointed by the Cistercian general chapter in 1537 for Deer Abbey envisaged a school for the novices and no monk was to be ordained priest unless he had memorised the hymns, canticles and antiphons and was competently instructed in grammar. The same curriculum was followed by Thomas Crystall at Kinloss after he entered in 1488. This was a variant of the standard school curriculum but under the influence of Abbot Robert Reid and Giovanni Ferrerio the monks of Kinloss later had a full programme of humanist formation. Ferrerio’s account does not mention liturgical education, but this would have remained part of monastic education at Kinloss. A continuing interest in liturgy, both practical and theoretical, in the community is suggested by: the survival of a 1531 Cistercian ordinal given by Ferrerio to James Pont, monk of Kinloss; the liturgical texts written in the 1550s chronicle of John Smith, monk of Kinloss; and the liturgical commentary of Amalarius and the 1557 Roman ceremonial by the humanist liturgists Piccolomini and Burckhard owned by Abbot Reid. Apart from the Kinloss volume of Amalarius and the Rationale written in 1470 by Robert Kinghorn, priest of St Andrews diocese, for an unknown religious house, the only extant liturgical commentary known to have come from a Scottish monastery is from


Inchcolm and Dunfermline, although chapter 7 suggests that others may have been in the libraries of Kinloss and Pluscarden Priory.\textsuperscript{132}

The Dunfermline copy of Biel’s *Sacri canonis missae expositio* owned by John Wilson OSA, canon of Inchcolm and vicar of Leslie, and James Redpath OSB, a monk of Dunfermline who signs monastery charters between 1548 and 1560, gives some evidence of how a liturgical commentary was used by monks and canons.\textsuperscript{133}

The marginalia by one of the religious showed an interest in the doctrine of transubstantiation and the liturgy for the dead, including the practical question of whether one can say out loud the names in the memento of the dead at mass.\textsuperscript{134} Both of these were controverted doctrines and Wilson or Redpath also marked out the section on faith with the words ‘*de fide*’ and the section on why one can pray through Saints by ‘*cur sanctos [sic] oramus*’.\textsuperscript{135} The sections on the priesthood and the meanings of the six priestly vestments were marked and so were two sections of monastic interest.\textsuperscript{136} There were many marks in *lectiones* 74 and 75 on fraternal correction, which mention the monastic chapter of faults; a section is marked which justifies sung liturgy; and ‘*conclusio magistralis de pollutione nocturna*’ (‘the magistral conclusion concerning nocturnal pollution’) is written by the end of a long study of whether a priest may say mass on the morning after having a wet dream.\textsuperscript{137}

This liturgical commentary was thus used as a practical manual for a monk or canon,

\textsuperscript{132} OBL Laud Misc. 100, inscribed on f.1, ‘*liber conventus de*……[ ]’; EUL Inc.68. Chapter 7, pages 238-42.

\textsuperscript{133} John Wilson is not found in the few surviving sixteenth-century lists of signatures of Inchcolm canons, Mark Dilworth, ‘Canons Regular and the Reformation’, in *Renaissance in Scotland*, 164-82, at 175. He is unlikely to be the canon of Holyrood of this name who signed abbey charters between 1531 and 1570 and was excommunicated for saying mass in 1564, *Register of the Minister, Elders and Deacons of the Christian Congregation of St. Andrews*, ed. David Hay Fleming (Edinburgh, 1889-90), i, 81, 193; Hawes, *Scottish Parish Clergy*, 137, 140. Redpath signs Dunfermline documents in 1548, NRS RH 6/1432B, and 1560, RH 6/1769. The volume later belonged to Henry Sinclair (1508-65), Bishop of Ross.

\textsuperscript{134} EUL Inc.68, b4r, D1r-D4r on liturgy for the dead; q8v on transubstantiation.

\textsuperscript{135} EUL Inc.68, c3r, 13v.

\textsuperscript{136} EUL Inc.68, c3v, 74r.

\textsuperscript{137} EUL Inc.68, M7v-O4v, f3v, [c3r-] c4v.
but also as a source of Catholic responses to doctrines controverted at the Reformation.

**Conclusion**

Liturgical interpretation was an integral part of elementary and grammar school education. This is not surprising given that the liturgy provided the context of education in most if not all schools and the celebration of the liturgy was also in varying degrees the purpose of education. Grammar schools provided the highest education for most of the clergy and the Scottish lower clergy were not as ignorant as commonly thought, although Catholic reformers were trying to improve their condition. Wild’s *Examen ordinandorum*, though a product of continental irenicist Catholic reform, confirms what was discovered from the grammar school curriculum - that formation in liturgical interpretation was an essential part of the training of ordinands. This was also true of the formation of friars and monks. The recommendation of Durandus’s *Rationale* at the end of Wild’s *Examen* provides more evidence to support the idea that the *Rationale*, which was written as part of Durandus’s programme for clergy formation, was used in teaching at this level. Liturgical interpretation was present in the university curriculum but in a minor place and John Major’s comment at the end of a lecture may have reflected a common view of it as belonging more properly to grammar schools. On the other hand the presence of liturgical interpretation in university texts warns us against too simplistic an identification of liturgical interpretation with the lower end of renaissance education. Evidence in the chapter, such as the *Examen ordinandorum*, also supports the association of liturgical interpretation with Catholic Reform.
Chapter 5. Seeing Liturgical Interpretation: Reading Churches and their Furnishings

Liturgical interpretation was not just a literary activity associated with books and spoken about in schools, it was taught primarily as a way of recalling unseen truths through things seen, done and heard: rites, buildings and objects. This complexus of verbal and physical signs which was the Catholic liturgy both concealed and revealed these unseen spiritual truths but a formation in liturgical interpretation enabled one to read the signs and access their meaning. This chapter will show how liturgical interpretation both influenced the design of religious material culture and enabled it to be used as a means to remember divine truths.

Sacred rites are of their nature transitory and need to be reconstructed from surviving books and artefacts, but the architecture in which they were performed and the objects used can survive. Even in Scotland where many medieval churches are in ruins and devotional artefacts ‘were destroyed with remarkable thoroughness’, there are survivals which can be seen and interrogated. Modern scholars, especially art and architectural historians, have only recently begun to take liturgical interpretation seriously. This revival of interest will be studied first and the application of liturgical interpretation to buildings will be compared with the medieval *ars memorativa*. Starting with Alexander Galloway’s church at Kinkell, Scottish evidence will then be examined to investigate whether liturgical interpretation was influential in three aspects of Scottish church buildings: the church plan, the design of sacrament houses and passion imagery.

---

1 The late medieval Sarum liturgy used in Britain has been reconstructed by the 2009-1012 AHRC/ESRC funded major research project at Bangor University, ‘The Experience of Worship in the Late Medieval Cathedral and Parish Church’, http://www.bangor.ac.uk/music/AHRC/

1) Liturgical interpretation and the study of medieval churches

The church building defined, and was defined by, the space in which liturgy was performed. For this reason, as has been seen in chapter 2, it was interpreted as part of the Catholic liturgy using the methods of liturgical interpretation. There are at least fifteen Latin liturgical commentaries which do this and Book 1 of the *Rationale*, on the church building, is the most marked section of the copies examined, with British books being almost twice as likely to have marginalia here than those from the continent.\(^3\) This shows that the interpretation of the church building was an integral part of contemporary intellectual life. Chapter 3 has even suggested that Bishop Elphinstone believed that the right use of liturgical space creates a right ordering of societies.\(^4\) Like liturgical interpretation as a whole, however, this tradition was neglected from the seventeenth century but it has been rediscovered in modern scholarship.

a. Rediscovering the symbolic interpretation of churches

The nineteenth century saw a revival of interest in medieval architecture which included a new appreciation of this tradition, shown by the translation of the first book of the *Rationale* into English and French in the 1840s and the use of medieval symbolism in Gothic revival churches and church furnishings.\(^5\) Two broad trends may be identified in subsequent studies of medieval churches by architectural and art historians. One is technical and formalist, concerned with ribs, tracery and styles; the other is interested in aesthetic theory and cultural context. In simplistic terms, the former relates to the work of the medieval architects and masons, the latter, which is of interest here, to the clerical patrons. Eric Fernie said of this:

---

3 See Table 3.3, chapter 3, page 87. Book 1, which is shorter than Books 4, 5, 6, and 7, is marked in 36 of the 105 copies with marginalia (34%). Fifteen of the twenty-four British copies with marginalia have marks in Book 1 (63%).

4 Chapter 3, pages 90-91.

5 Kees van der Ploeg notes that the Gothic revivalists seized the medieval system of symbolic interpretation but applied it in a rigid manner in the name of ‘iconographical integrity’, Kees van der Ploeg, *Art, Architecture and Liturgy: Siena Cathedral in the Middle Ages* (Groningen, 1993), 30.
One of the greatest divides in the study of architectural planning lies between those who think that the proportions and dimensions of religious buildings had a symbolic dimension and those who propose that systems are practical in character.\(^6\)

Although there was no mention of such symbolism in works by contemporary architects, and chapter 2 has shown how allegorical meaning can be read into buildings whether it was intended by the designers or not, Fernie gives clear evidence that symbolism could be a factor in medieval church design: for example Amiens and Beauvais Cathedrals are 144 feet high, which recalls the 144 cubit height of the walls of the heavenly Jerusalem (Revelation 21:2).\(^7\) Erwin Panofsky’s 1946 edition of Abbot Suger’s writings highlighted the importance of architectural symbolism and the role of the clerical patron in determining design.\(^8\) Panofsky gave an influential but only partially convincing iconographical interpretation of the abbey church of St Denis, attributing its design to Suger’s reading of Pseudo-Dionysius but emphasising Dionysian light-metaphysics rather than the liturgical interpretation of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy.\(^9\) He was, however, right in emphasising the influence of religious culture and theology on church design. Suger himself wrote that the twelve columns of the choir at St Denis represented the twelve Apostles, on the basis of Ephesians 2:20 (the church is ‘built upon the foundation of the Apostles’), and that the twelve columns in the ambulatory signified (‘significantes’) the twelve minor prophets.\(^10\) From the 1990s an attention to the liturgy for which these churches were

---


\(^8\) Erwin Panofsky, Abbot Suger on the Abbey Church of St Denis and its Art Treasures (Princeton, 1946).


built has led to a wider appreciation of the importance of understanding the design of churches and their furnishings in their cultural context, as in Kees van der Ploeg’s 1993 study of Siena Cathedral. Although there were earlier exponents of this integrated approach such as Yves Delaporte, it has become more common in recent publications, especially those influenced by ‘the spatial turn’ in the humanities. Such studies have often drawn on liturgical commentaries and Dominique Iogna-Prat’s *La Maison Dieu* (2006) includes a major study of the interpretation of the church-building in Western Europe from Amalarius to Durandus.

*b. Allegory, English gothic, and episcopal reformers*

Clerical patrons who were church reformers are prominent in two studies of English thirteenth-century gothic art which integrate liturgical interpretation into their analysis of buildings: Paul Binski’s magisterial *Becket’s Crown* and Matthew M. Reeve’s analysis of the cycle of wall painting at Salisbury Cathedral. Binski aims to recover ‘the imaginative universe of early gothic art and architecture in England’


and shows the importance of circles of reformist eruditi with French connections among the secular clergy in the building campaigns at cathedrals such as Canterbury, Salisbury, Wells, Lincoln and Trondheim.\(^\text{15}\) He uses liturgical commentaries and contemporary writing on the buildings, such as Gervase of Canterbury’s *De combustione*, to show that allegory was important for their design and contemporary interpretation, although he notes that ‘neither the allegorical nor the ethical aspects of these buildings can be deduced from their architecture alone: they are matters for historical and contextual discretion’.\(^\text{16}\) Reeve’s book has a similar purpose and aims to ‘re-engage with the allegorical language of the liturgical arts’ found in liturgical commentaries.\(^\text{17}\) He argues that ‘the [Salisbury] cycle and its meanings were dependent on recent commentaries on the liturgy’ and that

> Recent scholarship has shown that liturgical commentaries played a significant role in the development of the form, iconography and meanings of religious art of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.\(^\text{18}\)

The reformist agenda of the thirteenth-century English ‘Langtonians’ responsible for many of the works discussed in these books included liturgical reform, relations between the church and secular power, the promotion of certain saints and the reform of clerical conduct. It was remarkably similar to the later Scottish reformist agenda of Elphinston and his circle. Liturgical interpretation was a significant element in Scottish clerical culture in this later period and particularly associated with Catholic reformers, as has been discovered above, but there is the problem of the loss of most material and written evidence. Paul Crossley’s study of the choir of St Laurence in Nuremberg warns us that the interior of a late medieval church, with its altars, statues, relics, stained glass and altarpieces which were opened on certain feasts, was a complex mass of symbolism (rather like the structure of the *Rationale* itself), but,

\(^{15}\) Binski, *Becket’s Crown*, xii, 62.


\(^{17}\) Reeve, *Thirteenth-Century Wall Painting*, 7-8.

using the rich literary and artistic remains from this church, he demonstrates that
behind this was a ‘logic and order’ based on ‘devotional association and allegorical
connection’. This would also have been true in Scotland of both rich city churches
like St Giles, Edinburgh with over forty-three altars and the more prosperous small
country parishes such as Kinkell. Whatever is done in this chapter is thus partial but
it will offer a significant glimpse of the intellectual context of these lost Scottish
interiors.

2) ‘Reading’ a church and the ars memorativa
The question of how a cleric formed in liturgical interpretation might ‘read’ a church,
discussed in chapter 2, can be linked to another aspect of medieval intellectual life
that uses a similar method. There is a clear connection between that aspect of the
medieval ‘art of memory’ in which imaginary buildings (‘memory palaces’) and their
contents are used to remember things, and the liturgical interpretation of real church
buildings in which parts of the building and its contents bring to mind Christian
truths.

a. The church as memory palace and meditation machine
The use of ‘memory palaces’ goes back via Cicero to the ancient Greeks but it
became particularly popular in the high middle ages, being recommended by Albert
the Great and Thomas Aquinas and used in musical education. It was known in
Scotland because two works which used mnemonic picturae to teach about the
church were found there in the middle ages: Adam of Dryburgh wrote his De
tripartito tabernaculo in the Scottish border abbey of Dryburgh c.1180 and Hugh of
St Victor’s De arca Noe mystica is in the extant library lists of Dunfermline Abbey.

---

19 Paul Crossley, ‘The Man from Inner Space: Architecture and Meditation in the Choir of St
Laurence in Nuremberg’, in G.R. Owen-Crocker and Timothy Graham, Medieval Art: Recent
Perspectives: a Memorial Tribute to C.R. Dodwell (Manchester, 1998), 165-182, at 166.
20 George Hay, ‘The Late Medieval Development of the High Kirk of St Giles, Edinburgh’, PSAS 107
(1975-76), 242-60.
21 Mary J. Carruthers, The Book of Memory: a Study of Memory in Medieval Culture (2nd edn
Cambridge, 2008), 155, 193. Anna Maria Busse Berger, Medieval Music and the Art of Memory
(Berkeley, 2005), 92, 214-20. Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge
Holyrood Abbey, Kelso Abbey, St Andrews Cathedral Priory, and St Leonard’s College, St Andrews. The method retained its popularity in sixteenth century Europe, for example in Johannes Romberch’s *Congestorium Artificioso Memorie* (1533) which used an imaginary abbey and liturgical artefacts to aid the memory.

Since the pioneering work of Mary Carruthers, these two aspects of medieval intellectual life have been linked: imaginary mnemonic architecture and the liturgical interpretation of real church buildings. The 1523 *Ars Memorativa* of Laurent Fries which used Strasbourg Cathedral as a ‘mnemonic theatre’ gave contemporary evidence of this connection. For Carruthers, ‘the cathedral was a non-verbal textual form’, though not, as Emile Mâle had thought, simply a Bible for the illiterate laity because elaborate imagery is also found in buildings and parts of buildings destined solely for use by learned clerics (who would have been literate in symbolism as well as letters). Reeve suggests that the paintings of the eastern arm of Salisbury Cathedral enabled it to be, in Carruther’s words, a ‘meditation machine’:

Like the mental perambulations of worshippers through mnemonic works of architecture, Salisbury’s physical spaces prompted meditation on the very structure of salvation history and contemporary man’s crucial role within it.

---


b. Churches designed to foster sacred memory

Clergy formed in the tradition of liturgical interpretation and in the *ars memorativa* would thus view the church in which they spent much of the day as a sign of spiritual truths and a prompt to the memory of sacred things. A Strasbourg preacher wrote in 1494 that

> The shape of the church itself, which reaches up to heaven with its towers, reminds us of the Temple of glory, in which God is eternally contemplated and praised by all the angels and saints.  

To one who held such interpretations in mind, any church is a ‘memory palace’ of Christian life and faith. It cannot be known what late medieval and early modern Scottish clerics thought, only what they read and the cultural world they inhabited, but it is clear that both were favourable to this way of looking at the church-building. Meditation on the meaning of the church-building, however, would have been easier if the architecture reflected and provoked the interpretations. This certainly did occur deliberately in some churches: for example Binski has shown how the rebuilding of Canterbury in the late twelfth-century deliberately alludes to the cult of Becket and chapter 2 has given some concrete examples of how the ways of ‘reading’ a church may be built into its fabric. Three aspects of extant Scottish churches may provide confirmatory evidence: the influence of the Temple-plan, sacrament houses, and passion imagery.

3) The church building and the Temple

St Michael’s church, Kinkell, in the diocese of Aberdeen, was from 1515 to 1552 the prebendal kirk of Alexander Galloway, the Aberdeen liturgist with an interest in church architecture studied in chapter 3. Now ruined, it has the standard rectangular form of most rural Scottish parish churches and was probably rebuilt in the early sixteenth century by Galloway as its stone fixtures have his initials and the dates

---


1524 and 1525. Its interior measurements are 5.5 x 22 metres giving the proportions 1:4 - the same as the interior proportions of the visionary Temple in Ezekiel 40-41. This may be coincidence but is more likely to be the result of a tradition that assimilates the form of churches to that of the Old Testament Temple.

![Figure 3: Plan of St Michael’s, Kinkell](image)

\[a. \text{Churches designed in heaven and temple-proportions}\]

Durandus taught that the shape and spaces of the Christian church building were derived from the form of the Old Testament place of worship given by God to Moses on Sinai:

> From both Tabernacle and Temple our church takes its form, in whose outer part the people listen and pray; in the sanctuary the clergy pray, preach, offer praises and minister.\(^{32}\)

Chapter 2 showed how this reflected the strong teaching on the unity of the two Testaments in liturgical interpretation but it also influenced the design and interpretation of church buildings. It was part of a long tradition of Christian exegesis

---


\(^{31}\) MacGibbon and Ross, iii, 383.

of the Tabernacle and Temple by such as Bede and the twelfth-century Scottish theologians Richard of St Victor and Adam of Dryburgh. An allusion to churches being built according to a heavenly plan can be seen in George Buchanan’s anti-clerical poem of c. 1538, *Franciscanus*:

> The time will come when the people... will expel the priests from the temples and altars and tear down the replicas of Olympian palaces.

Recent research by Aonghus MacKechnie and Ian Campbell has demonstrated that in its design and proportions James VI’s 1594 Chapel Royal at Stirling Castle was intended to be, in the words of a 1594 letter, a ‘copy’ of ‘the Great Temple of Solomon’. Although the exact length of foot used in constructing the chapel is not known, its size in imperial feet, 104 long, 30 wide and 44.5 high, is remarkably close to the size of the Temple given in 1 Kings 6 according to the *Postillae* of Nicholas of Lyra (c.1270-1349): 105 feet long, 30 wide and 45 high.

Durandus’s words referred to the division of the church into nave and chancel but the ‘form’ of the building could also include its proportions. 1 Kings 6:2-3, 17, 20 describes Solomon’s Temple as sixty cubits long, twenty cubits wide and thirty cubits high (the proportions 3:1:1.5) with a porch of the same width and ten cubits deep (floor plan proportions of 1:3.5), a holy place forty cubits long (floor plan 1:2) and a holy of holies which was a cube of twenty cubits (floor plan 1:1). Around three sides of the Temple were three floors of chambers up to seven cubits broad and fifteen cubits high in total (1 Kings 6:5-6, 10), giving a proportion of 1:2 for the

---

33 Bede, *De templo, De tabernaculo* (CCSL 119A, 5-234); Richard of St Victor, *De tabernaculo, In visionem Ezekielis* (PL 196:191-256, 527-600); Adam of Dryburgh, *De tripartito tabernaculo*.


whole ground plan. The plan of the holy place and holy of holies, together with their orientation, with the door at the east, were the same as the Tabernacle (Exodus 25:1, 8-9). When the original Temple was in ruins, Ezekiel had a vision of a new Temple in Jerusalem which John Wilkinson argues, on the basis of a study of their proportions, was the chief model for synagogues and early church-buildings. The inner spaces and outer walls of Ezekiel’s Temple had the same proportions as those of the Tabernacle and first Temple, but the inclusion of interior walls gives slightly different proportions: an interior space of 20 x 62 cubits (1:3.1) and, including the porch, of 20 x 80 cubits (1:4).

These proportions and the ground-plan of the Temple were made known through a much-copied tradition of illustrations in manuscripts of Richard of St Victor’s commentary on Ezekiel and manuscripts and printed editions of Nicholas of Lyra’s

---

Campbell and MacKechnie connect the Solomonic architectural allusions at Stirling to the late sixteenth-century origins of Scottish freemasonry but the teaching of Durandus raises the question of whether Temple allusions, including these sets of proportions, can be found in earlier buildings.

Figure 621: Plans of Ezekiel’s Temple from Nicholas of Lyra, Postillae super Biblia (Nuremberg: Anton Koberger, 1481) and Richard of St Victor, In visionem Ezekielis; (OBL Bodley 494, fol. 156r.)

b. Rome, Bishop Elphinstone, and Aberdeen

Bishop Elphinstone of Aberdeen visited the papal court in Rome between autumn 1494 and autumn 1495 and would have seen the new Sistine chapel, constructed for Pope Sixtus IV between 1475 and 1481. It was built to the 3:1:1.5 proportions of

---


the Temple (40.9m long x 13.4m wide x 20.7m high) and the typological decoration of the walls, with scenes in which the New Testament fulfils the Old, is reflected in the building itself where the old Temple has become the new church. John Monfasani criticised this interpretation because of a lack of contemporary evidence but the proportions are only one part of the chapel’s complex symbolism, which includes Franciscan, papal and liturgical themes, and the Temple-reference of the new building is reflected in its decoration and confirmed by the epigraph on a fresco by Perugino, ‘You, Sixtus IV, unequal in riches but superior in religion to Solomon, have consecrated this vast Temple’. Other churches in Rome were connected to the Temple, the twelve twisted ‘Solomonic’ pillars in old St Peter’s and various objects in the Lateran were supposedly taken from the Temple. Marie Tanner has shown how important Temple imagery and artefacts were for the developing ideology of Roman primacy in fifteenth and sixteenth century Rome.

Part of Elphinstone’s business in Rome was to obtain the foundation bull for his new university in Aberdeen and this Roman evidence together with the interest in liturgical interpretation among his circle means that it is not surprising that the chapel of his new foundation, of which Galloway was a member, has been associated with the Temple. On its west front is a contemporary inscription recording that, under James IV, the masons began work on April 2, 1500. This day was a simple Thursday in Lent but Elphinstone owned a copy of Nicholas of Lyra’s Postillae which follows


Jerome in saying that this was the date work began on Solomon’s Temple (2 Chronicles 3:2). Aonghus MacKechnie and Jane Geddes have argued that the proportions of Elphinstone’s Chapel are those of the Temple. Its external dimensions are 11.5 x 39.3 metres (1:3.4) and internally the original length of the choir was 13.2 metres and the length of the sanctuary was 6.25 metres (2.1:1) which is exactly the proportion of the lengths of the holy place and holy of holies in Ezekiel’s Temple.

Figure 7: Plan of King’s College Chapel, Aberdeen

Ian Campbell has also argued that Elphinstone’s grand renaissance tomb, known from early descriptions and similar to Pollaiolo’s 1493 tomb of Sixtus IV, included allusions to the Temple such as its two angels recalling the cherubim in the holy of holies.  

---


46 Ian Campbell, ‘Bishop Elphinstone’s Tomb’, in Geddes, King’s College Chapel, 115-129.
c. Temples of learning: college chapels and parish churches

The architecture of King’s College Chapel was inspired by that of the Low Countries and France (and possibly St Peter’s basilica in Rome), but also probably by Bishop James Kennedy’s College of St Salvator, St Andrews (1450), whose college constitutions were used by Elphinstone as a model for his own college.47 St Salvator’s was the first Scottish church to be designed with a rectangular aisle-less main body terminating in a polygonal eastern apse. Its internal measurements are 32.5 x 8.5 metres (1:3.8) but excluding the apse they are 29.5 x 8.5, giving the Temple proportions 1:3.5.48

![Figure 8: Plan of St Salvator's Chapel, St Andrews](image)

On the north side of the high altar in the wall of the apse is a sacrament house to reserve the transubstantiated bread from mass (believed to be Christ himself) with a carving of two angels holding a monstrance. The sacrament house recalls the ark of the covenant in the holy of holies of the Temple, where the manna-bread was preserved under two cherubim (the Corpus Christi liturgy presents the manna as a type of the eucharist). The sanctuary of St Salvator’s also had four angels bearing the

---
47 Cant, St Salvator, 81. Richard Fawcett, ‘The Architecture of King’s College Chapel and Greyfriar’s Church, Aberdeen’, AUR 53.2 (1989), 102-126. Macfarlane, Elphinstone, 391. Many Scots visited Rome and Ian Campbell suggests that the idea of the polygonal apse was taken from that built at the old St Peter’s by Pope Nicholas V (1447-55), Campbell, review of Fawcett (1996), 108.

48 MacGibbon and Ross, iii, 199.
symbols of the passion on pillars around the high altar which recalled the Letter to the Hebrews where it is said that Christ entered the heavenly prototype of the holy of holies bearing the blood of his passion.\textsuperscript{49} A painting of Pompey in the Temple in a manuscript of Josephus illuminated by Jean Fouquet, written 1470-75, shows a raised ark, which looks like a medieval relic-chest, between two cherubim, behind an altar with seven candlesticks that is surrounded by four pillars surmounted by angels holding candles. This is in a polygonal apse, recalling the two college chapels, and is part of a medieval tradition connecting the sanctuaries of church and Temple.\textsuperscript{50}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure9.png}
\caption{Pompey in the Temple. Flavius Josephus, \textit{The Antiquities of the Jews}, illuminated by Jean Fouquet, c. 1470-1475, BNF, MS Français 247, fol. 293v.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{49} Cant, \textit{St Salvator}, 163. Hebrews 9.

\textsuperscript{50} Jeffrey F. Hamburger, ‘The Medieval Work of Art: Wherein the “Work”? Wherein the “Art”?’\textsuperscript{50}, in Jeffrey F. Hamburger and Anne-Marie Bouché, \textit{The Mind’s Eye: Art and Theological Argument in the Middle Ages} (Princeton, 2005), 374-412, at 390-91, where he notes that the two sanctuaries are also assimilated to the heavenly Jerusalem.
These two examples of pre-1560 Scottish churches containing allusions to the Temple are both college chapels.\textsuperscript{51} A survey of all surviving remains of pre-1560 churches in the diocese of Dunblane, however, shows that there is no direct relationship between their proportions and those of the Temple, although one chancel, at Dunning, is roughly square like the holy of holies (see Appendix 2b). Michael O’Neill’s study of the ground-plan proportions of the medieval Irish parish churches of Counties Meath, Dublin, Offaly and Louth also concluded that their proportions were geometrical not symbolic, being the product of simple squares and two proportional systems, one based on the root-2 extension of a square and the other on the ‘golden section’. Both could easily be laid out on the ground using pegs and cord.\textsuperscript{52} For such smaller churches practical geometry used by their builders gives a sufficient explanation of their proportions although the division of space between nave and chancel could still have been related to the Temple-plan as Durandus suggests. Where symbolic geometry was present it is likely to have been the result of the wishes of clerical patrons like bishops Kennedy and Elphinstone or the graduate clerics of St Andrews and Aberdeen. Monastic churches which may have been influenced by the Temple-plan include the choir of Crossraguel Abbey, rebuilt to the same plan as St Salvator’s by Bishop Kennedy’s kinsman, Abbot Colin Kennedy (1460-90).\textsuperscript{53} It has the proportions of the holy place and holy of holies in Solomon’s Temple, 1:3 (23 x 7.6 metres) and the sanctuary, marked out by three steps, is square like the holy of holies. The same is true of the church (18 x 6 metres) and sanctuary (6 x 6 metres) of the thirteenth-century nunnery on Iona.

Possible Temple proportions are found some of the thirteen surviving pre-1560 college chapels at Oxford and Cambridge. All Souls, Oxford (1442), built just before St Salvator’s, had the same proportions (1:3.5), as did Corpus Christi, Oxford if one


\textsuperscript{53} Fawcett, \textit{The Architecture of the Scottish Medieval Church} (New Haven, 2011), 318.
includes the original short ante-chapel. The original choir of Corpus Christi chapel, Oxford (1517), Christ’s, Cambridge (1511) and St John’s, Oxford (1530) all have the proportions of the two main spaces of the Temple (1:3). New College choir, Oxford (1380s) has the proportions of Ezekiel’s holy place and holy of holies (1:3.1) and the later choir of Trinity, Cambridge (1555-64) has the proportions of the interior of Ezekiel’s Temple, 1:4. At Magdalen Chapel, Cambridge (1470s) the proportions between the ante chapel, choir and sanctuary are those of the Temple’s porch, holy place and holy of holies 1:4:2.\(^{54}\) None of this is conclusive evidence that any of these college chapels was built to Temple proportions, but the cumulative evidence does fit with that of the Scottish chapels, the Sistine chapel and literary evidence to suggest that this was possible. If this is true then the proportions of both Solomon and Ezekiel’s Temples were used.

d. Rosslyn and the Temple: liturgical interpretation or the symbology of Dan Brown

The plan of Rosslyn Chapel, founded as a collegiate church at the same time as St Salvator’s, is the same as that of the mid-thirteenth century choir of Glasgow Cathedral and both, with a central rectangle surrounded on three sides with a lower-roofed space, are the same as the ground-plans of the Temple in Ezekiel’s vision given in manuscripts of Richard of St Victor’s commentary on Ezekiel or Nicholas of Lyra’s Postillae. If the plans of Solomon and Ezekiel’s temples are superimposed on Rosslyn to the same proportions, the seven bays of the central part of the church correspond to the holy of holies, the holy place and the porch, although the orientation is reversed. If the high altar was to the west of the central pillar at the east end of the central space, then it is at the key position at the entrance to the holy of holies where heaven and earth meet according to Bede and Durandus.\(^{55}\) At Glasgow the low roofed ‘holy of holies’ behind the high altar probably contained the feretory of St Mungo, which, with his tomb in the crypt, was one of the two main pilgrimage

\(^{54}\) See Appendix 2c. Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the City of Cambridge; An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the City of Oxford (London, 1939).

\(^{55}\) ‘This division of the Lord’s house is a clear figure of a mystery... the first house [holy place or the nave]... is the present church...but the inner house which was built at the rear of the Temple [holy of holies or sanctuary] is the promised life in heaven’, Bede, On the Temple, 9.2-3. Bede: On the Temple, tr. Seán Connolly, Jennifer O'Reilly, p.37. Rationale 4.1.13-14.
Durandus associates the reliquary used in the dedication of a church with the ark of the covenant and there is a tradition in medieval art of assimilating the design of reliquary-chests and depictions of the ark. It is not known if a feretory was at this same point in the Rosslyn ‘holy of holies’, but the unusual dedication to St Matthew may indicate that the Sinclairs had obtained some of his relics from Italy.

To discuss the relationship between church buildings and Solomon’s Temple is to court the danger of being associated with the pseudo-history of Dan Brown’s *The Da Vinci Code*, where he claims the plan of Rosslyn Chapel is ‘an exact architectural blueprint of Solomon’s Temple in Jerusalem’. Although there is no unambiguous

---

56 Fawcett, *Architecture of the Scottish Medieval Church*, 114. Papal permission to translate the relics to a shrine of gold or silver was obtained in 1420, *Calendar of Scottish Supplications to Rome, 1418-22*, ed. E.R. Lindsay and A.I. Cameron (Edinburgh, 1934), 182-3.


58 The *Database of Dedications to Saints in Medieval Scotland* only records Rosslyn and an altar at Kirk o’Field, Edinburgh as dedications to St Matthew in Scotland. Relics of St Matthew were found at Salerno Cathedral, and Santa Maria Maggiore and SS Cosma e Damiano in Rome.

59 Dan Brown, *The Da Vinci Code* (New York, 2003), 434; Christopher Knight and Robert Lomas, *The Hiram Key* (London, 1997), 403. Opponents of Brown’s pseudo-history make the assertion (contradicted by the evidence in this chapter) that Rosslyn chapel is not based on the Temple-plan,
contemporary evidence as there is with the 1594 Chapel Royal at Stirling, the plan of Rosslyn chapel, like the chapels at St Andrews and Aberdeen and other pre-1560 Scottish churches, does seem to have been based on Solomon’s Temple. This is not grounded in esoteric masonic ‘symbology’ but in the tradition handed on by Durandus and other Christian writers that from the Tabernacle and the Temple ‘our material church takes its form’, using the proportions found in Scripture and contemporary exegesis. Each year the liturgy kept this association before the minds of clergy when every Scottish church commemorated its dedication with eight days of liturgical celebration using proper texts in both breviary and missal that alluded to the Temple. The sixth lesson at mattins gave an allegorical interpretation of the dimensions of the Temple in which its length symbolised faith, its breadth, love and its height, hope. Most of the churches which seem to have had Temple proportions were collegiate and monastic churches, not rural parish churches, and this suggests that, as with the Sistine chapel, the role of the learned clerical patron was decisive.

4) Sacrament houses: the lost ark?

The association of church and Temple involved an association of the sanctuary of the church with the holy of holies containing the ark of the covenant. It has been argued that the sacrament house in the sanctuary of St Salvator’s chapel symbolised the ark. This was the first of a distinctive series of sacrament houses in fifteenth and sixteenth century Scotland, many of which are associated with Alexander Galloway and the Aberdeen liturgists. An illustrated descriptive list is found in Appendix 3. The method of liturgical interpretation allows them to be better understood.

a. The Alexander Galloway group of sacrament houses

Galloway was a learned clerical patron and Kinkell kirk gives three examples of sculpture which, when compared with other similar survivals, shows how the decoration of a church under the guidance of a patron formed in liturgical


60 See, for example, the *Aberdeen Breviary* (London, 1854), i, cxxiii recto-cxxxi verso; ii, cxxiii recto-cxxxiv verso; and the *Arbuthnott Missal* (Burntisland, 1864), 263-67.

61 *Aberdeen Breviary*, ii, cxxxi.
interpretation used its methods to teach the faith. They are a sacrament house dated 1524, a crucifix plaque dated 1525 and a font, which all bear his initials. The sacrament house is in the north wall of the sanctuary and consists of four panels in a Greek cross. Above the aumbry which contained the eucharist is a much-decayed relief of two angels holding a monstrance, panels either side have scrolls with the text ‘Hic est servatum corpus de virgine natum’ (‘here is kept the body born of the Virgin’), and a panel at the top which possibly contained a painting is now blank. On the sill of the aumbry is ‘Ano Dni 1524’, ‘A.G.’ and Galloway’s motto ‘Memorare’ (‘Remember’).

Whereas in England reservation of the sacrament was usually in the form of a hanging pyx, in Scotland the use of an aumbry or sacrament house was common. It

Figure 11: Kinkell Sacrament House

---

was usually sited in the sanctuary, and there are thirty-nine surviving decorated sacrament houses from pre-1560 Scotland (including fragments and uncertain examples). Many more will certainly have been destroyed. There is also evidence that at least one of Galloway’s Aberdonian associates, John Grierson OP, was thinking about reservation of the sacrament in a tabernacle on the altar in the manner used by Catholic Reformers in Italy from the late fifteenth century, required by Cardinal Pole in 1550s England and associated with the Tridentine reforms.

Galloway was particularly concerned with the provision of dignified sacrament houses. The 1542 inventory of King’s college chapel, Aberdeen named him as the donor of the ‘altar of the venerable sacrament’ above which was a pyramidal place for eucharistic reservation, and a sill of what appears to be a sacrament house from the church of St Fergus, Dyce (in the patronage of the parson of Kinkell) has the initials ‘A.G.’, the date 1544 and Galloway’s arms. Other sacrament houses from the diocese in his time have been associated with him. At St Mary’s, Auchindoir, a prebend of King’s College, the whole sacrament house is in the form of a monstrance with ‘Hic est Corpus Dominicum’ (here is the Lord’s body) on its pyramidal cover. On the sill are the initials ‘M.A.S.’ which probably refers to Master Alexander Spittal, a colleague of Galloway’s in the university and cathedral chapter of Aberdeen, who was prebendary of Auchindoir 1529-38. At St Mary’s church,


65 ‘Altare venerabilis sacramenti constructum per prefatum rectorem de Kinkell; super hoc altare est locus pro sacramento, figure pyramidalis, per eundem rectorem donatus’, Eeles, King’s College Chapel, 14.

66 McRoberts, ‘Scottish Sacrament Houses’, 49, where it is said to have been designed by Galloway. Eeles, King’s College Chapel, 6, notes that Spittal was Galloway’s co-visitor of the College in 1542.
Kintore, near Kinkell and also in the gift of its rector, the upper panel of the sacrament house has angels in albs, amices and crossed stoles bearing a large and elaborate monstrance surmounted by a large crucifix. The lintel of the aumbry is inscribed ‘Jesus Maria’ and it is surrounded by a renaissance baluster frame.67 Other fragmentary sacrament houses, perhaps part of this ‘Galloway group’, are at St Meddan’s, Fintray, with a crucifix plaque and what is possibly a monstrance, and St Congan’s, Turriff, where the sill has a scroll and the letters ‘AL’, probably referring to Galloway’s fellow canon, Alexander Lyon, prebendary of Turriff (d. 1541).

Figure 12: Angels with Monstrances on the Deskford and Cullen Sacrament Houses

Two slightly later elaborate sacrament houses at Cullen and Deskford, erected by Alexander Ogilvie of Findlater (d. 1554) and his wife Elizabeth Gordon, were probably influenced by Galloway because of their design. That at St John’s, Deskford, has two angels in embroidered albs, amices and crossed stoles holding a monstrance, a vine-moulding and wheat ears which allude to the eucharist and also an inscription from John 6:51-52a, ‘Ego sum panis vivus qui de celo descendi: qui

67 McRoberts notes that it has ‘the sole renaissance feature that appears in any surviving sacrament houses in Scotland’ ‘Scottish Sacrament Houses’, 47; Fawcett, Scottish Medieval Churches, 261, suggests that Alexander Galloway may have been responsible for this sacrament house.
manducaverit ex hoc pane vivet in aeternum: Johans, sesto et cetera’ (‘I am the living bread who has come down from heaven; whoever eats this bread will live forever: John 6 etc.’). This was the Benedictus antiphon for Corpus Christi but the et cetera referred to the subsequent verses where the Jews doubt the teaching of Jesus about the bread, which was the gospel at masses for the dead on Fridays (John 6:51-54).68 Above the aumbry is the text ‘os meum es et caro mea’ (‘you are my bone and my flesh’). This was from the story of Laban and Jacob in Genesis 29:14 (cf. 2 Samuel 19:12) and was an unusual text to choose. It was not found in contemporary liturgy. It is best understood in the light of the Vulgate text of Ephesians 5:30 about Christians and Christ, ‘membra sumus corporis eius, de carne eius, et de ossibus eius’ (‘we are members of his body, from his flesh and bones’), and the teaching of Aquinas that Christ’s whole body, bones and all, was consumed in the sacrament.69 This implies such a level of theological literacy that a graduate clerical mind such as that of Galloway must have aided the lay-patrons, and it was indeed from the last year of his life. It has the arms, initials and mottoes of Ogilvie and his wife and an inscription which shows that ‘sacrament house’ was a contemporary Scots term:

This present loveable work of Sacrament House maid to the honour and loving of God be ane noble man Alexander Ogilvie of that ilk, Elizabeth Gordon his spous. The year of God, 1551.

The sacrament house in Cullen collegiate church is very similar, almost certainly by the same sculptor and commissioned by the same patrons as it is next to their tomb. It also has two angels in albs, amices and crossed stoles with a monstrance, over a decorated aumbry. The inscription is ‘Caro mea vere est cibus et sanguis mea vere est potus qui manducat meam carnem et bibit meum sanguinem vivet in aeternum’ (‘My flesh is true food and my blood is true drink, whoever eats my flesh and drinks

68 Arbuthnott Missal, 465.

69 Aquinas, ST 3a 76 a1 ad2, ‘By the power of the sacrament there is contained under it, as to the species of the bread, not only the flesh, but the entire body of Christ, that is, the bones the nerves, and the like.’
my blood will live forever’), which is a conflation of John 6:56-7 and 6:59, giving the beginning and end of the gospel for Corpus Christi.70

b. Two Scottish angels and a monstrance

The most distinctive iconographical feature of these and other Scottish sacrament houses is the two vested angels holding a monstrance. Two vested angels were not uncommon in late medieval art - for example, they are seen raising a soul in an illumination in the Arbuthnott Prayer Book - but the concern here is with the angels and the monstrance as one composition.71 There were two earlier examples of this in Scotland, the one already mentioned at St Salvator’s chapel, St Andrews, c.1450, and another at Pluscarden Priory on a sacrament house that is difficult to date.

The sacrament house at Fowlis Easter, c.1450, and another, possibly by the same sculptor, at nearby Tealing also both have two angels. At Fowlis Easter they hold the cross and pillar of the scourging either side of Christ as St Salvator and at Tealing they hold scrolls with texts from the Gloria from the ordinary of the mass with Christ in the middle holding a scroll with ‘Hic est corpus m[eum]’ (here is my body). Timmermann’s major study of European sacrament houses, which strangely omits Scotland, notes ‘the ubiquitous presence’ of angels on sacrament houses.72 Among a riot of imagery of saints, prophets and typological scenes from the Bible there are sacrament houses with groups of angels holding passion imagery, as at Fowlis Easter, and extracts from the Corpus Christi sequence Lauda Sion, like the Tealing angels with the Gloria.73 Some sacrament houses have two angels, like the Scottish

70 [In illo tempore dixit Iesus discipulis suis et turbis Iudaeorum:] Caro mea vere est cibus, et sanguis meus vere est potus. Qui manducat meam carnem et bibit meum sanguinem, [in me manet et ego in illo. Sicut misit me vivens pater, et ego vivo propter patrem; et qui manducat me, et ipse vivet propter me. Hic est panis qui de caelo descendit. Non sicut manducaverunt patres vestri manna, et mortui sunt: qui manducat hunc panem,] vivet in aeternum. Arbuthnott Missal, 214.


72 Achim Timmermann, Real Presence: Sacrament Houses and the Body of Christ, c. 1270-1600 (Turnhout, 2009), 279.

examples, but these are performing various activities. Only a few in the Empire, however, have two angels holding a monstrance and sometimes this is not on the sacrament house itself; in two examples the sacrament house is made to look like a giant monstrance, as at Auchindoir, and is supported by two painted angels (there may originally have been a painted surround at Auchindoir, see figure 13). The carving of two angels holding a monstrance was thus a particularly Scottish emphasis, probably first commissioned by Bishop Kennedy in the fifteenth century but made a dominant theme by Galloway in the context of the Aberdeen liturgical movement. This distinctiveness raises the question of why this image was chosen.

Figure 13: Reconstruction by David McRoberts of the Auchindoir Sacrament House

74 Timmermann, *Real Presences*, 30, 241 (holding candles: Alskog in Sweden c.1300 [painted] and Soulzbach-les-Bains c.1514); 31, 280, 281 (holding thuribles: Alsemberg in Brabant [painted], Eltville in Hesse 1360s, and Soulzbach-les Bains c.1514), 220 (praying: Eriskirch in Baden-Württemberg 1430s).

75 Timmermann, *Real Presences*, 89 (on a donation plaque near the sacrament house at Dinkelsbühl in Bavaria, 1480), 153 (on the curtain in front of the sacrament house at Freising Cathedral, 1490), 234 (on the painted wooden door of the aumbry at Hämmerö in Sweden c.1500), 215, 280 (painted angels holding a monstrance-like sacrament house: Allmeindingen in Baden-Württemberg c.1505 and Gernsback in the Black Forest c.1470).
The reasons for choosing this image would have been closely related to the tradition of liturgical interpretation. Timmermann says that ‘angels effectively identify the sacrament house as an earthly access portal to the heavenly Jerusalem, as a liminal divide between this world and the next.’\textsuperscript{76} He notes that, as in Scotland, these angels were usually vested as priests and ministers. This related the sacrament houses to the heavenly liturgy which, according to liturgical interpretation, was the reality behind the signs of the earthly liturgy.\textsuperscript{77} The carved monstrance was an image of what was inside the aumbry and was part of an elaborate system of concealing and revealing which the sacrament houses, with the help of doors, curtains, candles and grilles, constructed around the eucharist. This may be compared to the epistemology of liturgical interpretation with its own interplay of revealing and concealing discussed in chapter 2. The two angels, as has been suggested in the case of St Salvator’s, may also be related to the Temple theme where there was also a liminal divide between this world and the next symbolised by the division between the holy place (nave) and the holy of holies (sanctuary).\textsuperscript{78}

c. The sacrament house as ark of the covenant

The two angels with the monstrance are either side of the eucharistic presence of the body of Christ. They may thus be related to the cherubs either side of God’s presence on the mercy seat on the ark in the holy of holies. An objection to this is that there was a developed medieval iconography of cherubim and seraphim rooted in Isaiah 6, attached to a literary genre of spiritual teaching in treatises such as \textit{De sex aliis}, which portrays them with four or six wings whereas the angels on sacrament houses have two wings.\textsuperscript{79} The cherubim over the ark, however, each had only two wings (1 Kings 6:23-26) with which they ‘made a covering over the ark’ (1 Kings 8:6-7) and

\textsuperscript{76}Timmermann, \textit{Real Presences}, 281.

\textsuperscript{77}Cf. Hamburger, ‘The Medieval Work of Art’, 380, ‘In medieval art as in medieval theology, angels were seen as figures of mediation between heaven and earth, the visible and the invisible’.

\textsuperscript{78}See pages 163-64.

this is represented by another tradition in medieval iconography. The cherubim on the ark in a woodcut in the Nuremberg Chronicles (1493) are vested like the angels on the Scottish Sacrament Houses.

![Figure 14: The Ark with Cherubim in the Nuremberg Chronicles (1493)](image)

This is an ancient tradition, as seen in the Carolingian apse mosaic of the ark in Theodulf of Orléans' oratory at Germigny-Des-Prés which also had two-winged cherubim. The ark contained manna, the heavenly bread, and in this mosaic from the time of iconoclasm it takes the place of Mary who was usually portrayed between two angels and is herself an antitype of the ark and the Tabernacle because God

---

80 As in the Copenhagen Pentateuch, Peter Comestor’s Historia Scholastica, and the Bible Historiale of Guyart Desmoulins, Rosenau, Vision of the Temple, 51, 54, 55.

81 Ann Freeman and Paul Meyvaert, ‘The Meaning of Theodulf’s Apse Mosaic at Germigny-des-Prés’, Gesta 40.2 (2001), 125-139, argue that Theodulf’s depiction of the ark was inspired by its presence in the mosaics of Santa Maria Maggiore, Rome and his depiction of the cherubim by the mosaics of SS. Cosma e Damiano, Rome and Bede’s De Templo.
dwelt in her, as Walter Kennedy wrote of Mary, ‘The Haly Gaist schane in hir tabernakill’.\textsuperscript{82} Freeman and Meyvaert argue from the writings of Theodulf and Bede that the ark prefigures the eucharist and in the mosaic an empty ark represents the Old Testament prototype fulfilled in the sacrament on the altar below in the apse.\textsuperscript{83} The presence of Christ in the sacrament meant that the assimilation of ark with altar could easily become an assimilation of the ark with the sacrament house, as Karl Morrison writes of Theodulf’s mosaic, ‘In Christ’s flesh was contained the complete mystery foreshadowed by the ark of the covenant that Moses made at God’s command’.\textsuperscript{84} Durandus explicitly associates the golden mercy-seat (\textit{propitiatorium}) on the ark, where God dwells, with the place of eucharistic reservation:

\begin{quote}
...whence the Tabernacle, or the place located above the back part of the altar, in which is reserved Christ our \textit{propitiatio}, that is the consecrated host, today is called the \textit{propitiatorium}".\textsuperscript{85}
\end{quote}

He then speaks of the two cherubim and their wings, saying that they signify the two Testaments whereas the \textit{propitiatorium} signifies the incarnate Lord whose mystery is narrated by both Testaments. In the sacrament house in the sanctuary with its two angels, the ark-prototype with its angels in the holy of holies becomes one with its fulfilment in the Christian eucharist.

Although there was no tradition of monumental sacrament houses at the time Durandus was writing, his teaching and the tradition of exegesis of the ark does give a partial explanation for the ‘angels and monstrance’ motif on Scottish sacrament

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{83} ‘Once the New Testament had replaced the Old, and the manna had become the eucharist, the ark could be shown emptied of its contents’, Freeman and Meyvaert, ‘The Meaning of Theodulf’s Apse Mosaic’, 135.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{84} Karl F. Morrison, ‘Religious Images in the \textit{Opus Caroli Regis}’, in Hamburger and Bouché, \textit{The Mind’s Eye}, 32-45, at 37.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{85} \textit{Rationale} 4.1.15. ‘\textit{Inde tabernaculum, sive locus super posterior parte altaris collocates, in quo Christus propitiatio nostra, id est hostia consecrate, servatur, hodie propitiatorium nuncupatur’. Cf. 1.2.4 (and 1.3.26), ‘\textit{In cuius rei imitationem [sc. arca in tabernaculo] in quibusdam ecclesiis super altare collocatur archa seu tabernaculum in quo corpus Domini et reliquie reponuntur’.}
}
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houses. This fits with the interest in the *Rationale* and liturgical interpretation in the dioceses of Aberdeen and St Andrews where these images were designed. Liturgical interpretation was thus flexible enough to adapt to and influence a liturgical development, the adoption of decorated sacrament houses.

d. The sacrament house as bastion against heresy and monument of reform

The image of the angels with the monstrance was also probably related to contemporary challenges to Catholic eucharistic doctrine. Sacrament houses were ‘key sites at which membership in the church’s mystical body could be visibly affirmed, advertised and glorified, but also contested and flatly denied’. Timmermann argues that, as the first monumental sacrament houses were built in areas affected by Hussitism, challenges to orthodox eucharistic practice caused what were originally simply cupboards for the sacrament to become ‘triumphalist monuments of fifteenth-century church reform’. As the Hussite banner included the chalice as a sign of their utraquism, so the use of the monstrance in sacrament house design was originally an anti-Hussite device and became a sign of orthodox Catholic eucharistic theology and devotion. It is thus probably no coincidence that the first extant sacrament house with a monstrance in Scotland was set up in St Andrews c. 1450. It was in the chapel of a college founded to oppose heresy in a town where in 1433 the Hussite emissary Pavel Kravař (Paul Craw) was burnt at the stake by Kennedy’s predecessor for errors on the eucharist, among others. Walter Bower’s account of Kravař’s perceived heresies, written after his burning but before the erection of the sacrament house, emphasises the eucharistic errors of the Hussites and thus may be more important for revealing contemporary reasons for the carving of the monstrance than Kravař’s actual opinions in 1433.

---

86 Timmermann, *Real Presences*, 308
During the time of the Galloway group of six surviving sacrament houses with figurative carving in the diocese of Aberdeen, which date from the second quarter of the sixteenth century, the church in Scotland faced new heresies.\textsuperscript{91} Many Aberdonians studied at Louvain where Galloway was friends with Jacobus Latomus. Galloway thus probably visited the Low Countries with their many sacrament houses and he certainly encouraged Latomus in his opposition to the teaching of Patrick Hamilton who held a Lutheran doctrine of the eucharist.\textsuperscript{92} There is circumstantial evidence to link the sacrament houses to heresy. The earliest, at Galloway’s own church at Kinkell, is dated 1524, the year before the act of Parliament against the importation of Lutheran works and four years before the burning of Patrick Hamilton. The 17 July 1525 Act, however, was swiftly put into effect by the bishop of Aberdeen because such books were being read and their teachings disseminated in his diocese.\textsuperscript{93} That the first evidence of Lutheranism in Scotland comes from Aberdeenshire may give a context for these carvings, especially as the teachings would have arrived before 1525 and thus probably before the Kinkell sacrament house.

Already in 1520 Luther had attacked contemporary teaching on the eucharist, advocating communion under both kinds, denying that the same texts from John 6 carved on the sacrament houses referred to the eucharist, denying transubstantiation by saying the bread and wine remained in the sacrament, and denying that the mass is a sacrifice and a work. In 1523 he had called for the abolition of sacrament houses

\begin{footnotes}
\item[91] Kinkell, 1524; Kintore, ?; Auchindoir, 1529-38; Fintray, ?; Cullen, c.1550; Deskford, 1551. There are also the fragments at Dyce, 1544; and Turriff, 1520s or 30s. Galloway was parson of Kinkell, c.1516-1552.
\item[92] Durkan, ‘The Cultural Background’, 331; J.E. McGoldrick, \textit{Luther’s Scottish Connection} (Vestavia Hills, 2008), 42-51.
\item[93] ‘Forsamekill as it is humelie meynit and schewin to ws be ane reuerend fader in God, and our traist consalour, Gawyne bischop of Aberdene, that quhare syndry strangearis and otheris within his diocesy of Aberdene, has bukis of that heretik Luthyr, and favoris his arrorys and fals opinionys incontar oure act of Parliament laitlie maid in our last Parliament’, \textit{Extracts from the Council Register of Aberdeen 1398-1625}, 2 vols, ed. John Stuart (Aberdeen, 1844-1848), i, 110-11, dated 14 August 1525. Alec Ryrie thinks the 1525 Act was ‘more like prevention than cure’, but he admits that the regime saw a real threat in the diocese of Aberdeen, \textit{Origins}, 29-30.
\end{footnotes}
in *On the Adoration of the Sacrament of Christ’s Holy Body*.94 At the same time the Catholic Johann Eck said, ‘A church without a sacrament house is not a church at all’.95 Timmermann shows how the sacrament house became a physical locus of Reformation conflict. They were destroyed or had their grilles removed by Protestants and there was a new phase of their construction by Catholics between the 1530s and 1560s as visible signs of Catholic eucharistic devotion.96 He notes that while some sacrament houses were gothic and some were renaissance in style, the latter was not a sign of ‘modernity’, although he does state that in the Empire the new but traditional-looking ‘Nachgotik’ ecclesiastical style was ‘institutionally reformist’.97 The predominantly gothic Aberdeen sacrament houses were thus in accord with contemporary European culture and the renaissance details at Kintore were not a lone mark of modernity amidst backward-looking religion and decoration.

The use of the monstrance and the inscriptions thus suggest a polemical edge to the Galloway group, especially as they are associated with the Aberdeen Catholic reformers whose surviving books indicate that they were well informed about Catholic reform on the continent. Jeffrey Hamburger states that ‘inscriptions are one way of manipulating response’ to an image and one can ask why these particular texts were chosen for the sacrament houses.98 The Kintore inscription identifies the ‘bread’ within as Christ’s body born of the Virgin, a connection to Mary also suggested by the Annunciation on the Fowlis Easter sacrament house and the names of Jesus and Mary at Fowlis Wester and Kintore. The ‘hic’ at the start of the inscriptions at Kinkell and Auchindoir, and the earlier Tealing, is perhaps best translated as ‘here, in this place’. At Tealing it is used in place of the usual ‘*Hoc est corpus meum*’, the ‘words of consecration’ at mass, which confirms that it means

---

94 Luther, *Von Anbeten des Sakraments* (WA, xi, 445); Timmermann, *Real Presence*, 321. It is not known whether Luther’s attacks on Catholic eucharistic doctrine were contained in the books diffused in Scotland but this is likely.


97 Timmermann, *Real Presences*, 324.

'here’ not ‘this’. This ‘hic’ emphasises that the body, blood, soul and divinity (and bones and sinews) of the risen Christ are in the aumbry (and in heaven), not everywhere as in Luther’s doctrine of ubiquity or in heaven alone as with Zwingli and the Reformed. With this polemical edge is a call to devotion: if Christ is here then he should be worshipped. The liturgical texts from John 6 at Cullen and Deskford have the same mixture of polemic and invitation to devotion. Luther denied that Christ’s discourse in John 6 referred to the eucharist, but for Catholics it gave scriptural warrant to eucharistic realism, a connection between rejection of this realism and unbelief (where the Protestants could be seen in the same place as the unbelieving Jews), and a clear connection between eating the bread/flesh and being saved.

These texts may seem ironic, the monstrance was actually an instrument of ‘communion by seeing’ whereas the accompanying text demanded ‘communion by eating’, but this raises the question of to whom these messages were addressed. They are obviously for those literate in Latin, and Cullen and Deskford, where parts of liturgical gospels are given, suggest that they are also for those who know the liturgy, a large group including some laity given the place of Latin and the liturgy in contemporary education. Their location, however, suggests that they were designed for the clergy and ministers, as in each case where the location is known it is within the sanctuary at the east end of the north wall. These figurative inscribed sacrament houses can thus be seen as a development of the use of liturgical interpretation in clerical education noted in the last chapter. Screens, however, did have openings, as does the extant screen at Fowlis Easter, and so the carved and painted images of the monstrance and angels could also be seen by the laity. They served as markers of what was conserved in the aumbries and, via the vested angels, linked the earthly liturgy to that of heaven.

5) The mass and images of the passion
The two other significant works of iconography given to his prebendal church by Alexander Galloway were the crucifix plaque dated 1525 and a font. They reveal his priorities and both include passion symbolism. The font, now in St John’s Episcopal
church, Aberdeen, has on its eight sides: a heart pierced with a sword (the ‘arms of Mary’); Galloway’s initials; the IHS monogram; two roses; the cross with crown of thorns; the five wounds or arma Christi; and a crowned M for Mary. The plaque in the wall of the church, with Galloway’s initials and two roses at the top, is a bronze replica of the original which is now lost. It shows an altar with Alexander Galloway’s initials on its frontal, a chalice and bookrest on the mensa and a large altar crucifix which dominates the panel. To the right of the cross is a haloed figure which may be Mary and to the left a vested angel holding a chalice into which something flows. Below Mary is a vested priest and below the angel is what looks like four heads around a flat panel.

Figure 15: The Kinkell Font

a. Passion devotion in renaissance Scotland

There was much passion-symbolism and devotion in Scotland during this period, as throughout Western Europe, seen for example on the Fetternear Banner from St Giles, Edinburgh and in various devotional poems and religious foundations, but the concern here is with the relationship between the images and liturgical interpretation. Alasdair MacDonald argued in 1998 that ‘passion devotion in late-medieval Scotland has hitherto scarcely been identified as a topic worthy of investigation in its own right’, although it was a central theme in middle-Scots literature as demonstrated by MS Arundel 285. He also links passion devotion to the spread of the devotio moderna which he associates with church reformers such as Elphinstone, John Adamson, and Robert Reid discussed in chapter 3. Charles Carter’s study of the Arma Christi in Scotland shows that this image first appeared in the closing years of the fifteenth century at St Salvator’s, St Andrews and that much of the evidence for the spread of the mass of the five wounds in Scotland was associated with Elphinstone’s liturgical reforms.

Many instances of the Arma Christi were in collegiate churches founded during this period on the East coast of Scotland, which had trading links with the Low Countries and Germany where passion symbolism was very popular. The greatest popularity of this imagery coincided with the literary renaissance associated with Dunbar, Kennedy and Lindsay. Ecclesiastical patrons such as Bishops Kennedy, Beaton, Stewart (Moray), Blackadder, Elphinstone and Robert Reid (at Beauly and Kirkwall) directly inspired the use of the imagery and Carter notes that a special place in this was held by Alexander Galloway,

---


103 Carter, ‘Arma Christi”, 127, 118.
Who has been regarded as the man behind the late flowering of medieval (sic) art which took place in the NE of Scotland during the first third of the 16th century'.

Carter also notes the association of Marian emblems with the passion imagery of Christ found on Galloway’s font and plaque. Finally he emphasises that this was not just a pre-1560 phenomenon; passion iconography remained popular into the seventeenth century in the North East, as the work of Bryce and Roberts has confirmed, and this may have been part of the legacy of the Aberdeen liturgists. The distribution of these passion motifs thus had close parallels with the sacrament houses and the use of liturgical commentaries.

b) Fonts: participation in the passion of Christ

Fonts were decorated in various ways, with coats of arms, as at Inverkeithing, Seton and Newbattle; the seven sacraments, as often in England; scenes from the Lord’s life, especially the crucifixion, as at Fowlis Easter (which includes Christ’s baptism, arrest, flagellation, crucifixion, harrowing of hell, and resurrection); or saints, as in the Loch Eynort font with Our Lady, St Michael and St Maelrubha. The font was usually sited at the west end of the nave near the main entrance in the west or south side and may have been in a space marked out, like the location of the sacrament house, by screens, hangings and candles and visited in the course of the liturgy. On the few surviving examples of what must have been over a thousand Scottish fonts the passion is prominent, as with the crucifixion at St Maelrubha’s, Eynort (now in the National Museum of Scotland) and Fowlis Easter, and the emblems of the passion at Kinkell and Meigle, which has the crucifixion and resurrection together with six panels with the Arma Christi.

Images of the passion on a font taught the meaning of the sacrament, as Paul interpreted the rite, ‘Do you not know that all of us who are baptized in Christ Jesus are baptized in his death’ (Romans 6:3). This was also mentioned in the *Rationale* which dealt with baptism in the section on the Easter vigil (6.83). The sacrament was said to have been instituted by the water and blood from the side of Christ on the cross; it was noted that Jesus was baptised by his passion (Luke 12:50); and in the rite the immersion was related to the cross with the three dippings said to represent the death, burial and resurrection of Christ (6.83.1, 12). Passion imagery on a font, as at Kinkell and Eynort, was thus a visible means of liturgical interpretation.

c. The Kinkell crucifix plaque and the liturgy

The crucifix plaque at Kinkell appears, like the sacrament house, to be in its original position. It shows the altar and is near the altar where the mass was celebrated, which raises the question of its function. Rachel Moss notes of surviving stone sculpture that ‘more often than not it was only one component of a more complex visual programme in various media’, but here this has been lost. ¹⁰⁸ There is nothing like the

---

plaque in Scotland, though there are a number of stone fragments of retables with passion imagery.\(^{109}\)

In Ireland at Ennis friary, Co Clare, however, there is a stone panel with Jesus as Man of Sorrows and the instruments of the passion on the west wall at the entrance.

\(^{109}\) James S. Richardson, ‘Fragments of Altar Retables of Late Medieval Date in Scotland’, PSAS 62 (1928), 197-224.
to the transept. On the other side of the chancel arch is a stone panel with St Francis above the remains of an altar and so the Ennis passion panel was probably also part of a reredos with an altar in front of it.110 The panel at Kinkell is on the side wall, so it could not have been a reredos, but if the proportions of Kinkell church are indeed based on the proportions of Ezekiel’s Temple, it is sited just outside the square holy of holies - the sanctuary (see figures 3 and 5), as at Crossraguel Abbey and Iona Nunnery. It being a simple parish church, one could imagine a screen there with an altar on the west side (as Galloway’s sacrament altar was just outside the sanctuary at King’s), in which case the plaque would have been visible to the congregation by the side of the priest as he celebrated mass.

Given the prominent altar and priest on the plaque it is clear that it was erected to teach something about the mass. The large crucifix suggests that its purpose was to show, in the same way as much liturgical interpretation and medieval eucharistic theology, that the mass was a re-presentation of the passion. The composition should perhaps be read in an anti-clockwise way around the central pole of mass and cross which, in the manner of liturgical interpretation, are the outer and inner aspects of the same thing. First one has the priest who offers mass for the viewer and for his relations in purgatory; then the Virgin, standing by the cross in a way reminiscent of the sequence Stabat Mater, who prays for them; then the blood of Christ falls down into the angel’s chalice which is the same as the one on the altar according to the prayer in the canon of the mass, ‘jube haec perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum Domine’ (‘command O Lord that these gifts be borne by the hands of your holy angel to your altar on high’), and also on the souls in purgatory who are said to have borne an inscription ‘purgatorium’ or ‘preces sanctorum’; these links are confirmed by lead sockets which were discovered in the original image and seem to have held wires linking Christ’s wounds to the chalice, altar and holy souls.111 Galloway’s donations and sacrament houses showed that he was devoted to the eucharist and his encouragement of Latomus to oppose the teaching of Patrick

110 Colmán Ó Clabaigh, ‘The Other Christ: The Cult of St Francis of Assisi in Late Medieval Ireland’, in Moss, Ó Clabaigh and Ryan, Art and Devotion in Late Medieval Ireland, 142-162, at 161.

111 McRoberts, Reformation, xxii-xxiii (a note on an illustration, probably written by McRoberts)
Hamilton in the schools reveals his horror of heresy. Through images (although the panel may also have had painted words) this plaque gave a Catholic interpretation of the mass for the people in the church and the prominence of Galloway's initials suggests that he wanted to be remembered for this teaching.

d. The mass of St Gregory interpreting the liturgy in Scotland

This altar and large crucifix, with blood coming from Christ to a chalice on the altar, recalls an image which was popular in Scotland and Europe between 1400 and 1500, the ‘Mass of St Gregory’. It was found in the Arbuthnott Book of Hours, the Edinburgh University Book of Hours, on the frontispiece of the 1540 Acts of the Scottish Parliament and stamped on the binding of a book owned by Hector Boece. In the Aberdeen Cathedral Rationale the section on the Gregorymass, taken from the Golden Legend, is marked with three lines (Rationale 4.41.28, 86v). This story concerns a woman’s disbelief that the bread she has baked has become the body of Christ; Gregory prays, it turns into a finger of flesh and she believes. It is thus about transubstantiation, but the Gregorymass image has no woman or finger but rather concerns the passion and the mass. Caroline Walker Bynum argues that for this reason the popular fourteenth/fifteenth century image had nothing to do with the story. It is right to note the dissimilarities but this is not true. Around 1380 a Byzantine mosaic icon of the Man of Sorrows was given to the Roman basilica of Santa Croce in Gerusalemme and soon became identified as a contemporary depiction of what Gregory had seen at mass. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries

112 Durkan, ‘Cultural Background’, 331.
this *Imago pietatis* became an object of pilgrimage and it caused the popularity of a new image based on the Golden Legend story of the Gregory mass but leaving out the woman and with the finger being replaced by the crucified Christ. The literary form of the story, however, as in the *Rationale* and the Golden Legend, remained the same. The image thus represented a major change in the story around the year 1400 but it is a mutation in the story in response to the *Imago pietatis*, not a new story.

*Figure 18: The Mass of St Gregory in the Arbuthnott Hours*

---

Bynum also argues that the Gregorymass was not a response to doubt but rather an exploration of exactly how Christ was to be encountered on the altar, a response to ‘the physicalisation of religious experience in miraculous objects (wonderhosts and blood relics)’ by emphasising not seeing but ‘seeing beyond’, or rather ‘an exploration of seeing and seeing through’.¹¹⁷ Often, as in the Arbuthnott example, the priest and attendants do not look at the manifestation of Christ’s passion, which is an unseen presence; another example of revealing and concealing the mystery. The emphasis here is less on the moment of consecration than on the sacrifice of the cross and, in an aside, she relates this to contemporary mass-commentaries which emphasise the *ordo missae* as a whole as ‘the narrative of Christ’s crucifixion and entombment’.¹¹⁸

The mass-commentaries, however, and thus liturgical interpretation, were probably the primary source of this iconographic motif as they teach that what one sees in the performance of liturgy leads one via an enacted allegory beyond seeing to the inner reality of the rite which, as Jesus and Paul taught, is the passion and death of Christ. As Hamilton’s 1552 Catechism said, ‘this blissit sacrifice of the altar is ane quick memorial, ordanit to reduce to our mynd the passioun of our saviour Christ’.¹¹⁹ In the Arbuthnott image while the clerics are not looking at the passion imagery, the blood which streams from the side of Christ into the chalice on the altar linked the unseen passion, known through the teaching of the mass-commentaries, with the visible rite. The image thus performed the same purpose as the Kinkell panel.¹²⁰

While the Gregorymass could simply have been a decorative devotional image, as on Boece’s book binding and the frontispiece to the Laws, it and the Kinkell panel give visible form to the way of interpreting the mass which Galloway wished to be taught to his parishioners. A similar function was played by the rood or crucifix between nave and chancel which those attending mass would see when they looked towards

¹¹⁸ Bynum, ‘Seeing and Seeing Beyond’, 228.
¹¹⁹ Hamilton, *Catechism*, 204-5.
the altar. At Fowlis Easter the lively painted passion seems to have filled the whole space between the top of the screen and the roof. Prominent on it is the soldier piercing Christ’s side with a lance releasing blood and water which was symbolised by the mixing of water and wine in the mass.

![Figure 19: The Fowlis Easter Rood Painting](image)

The painting would have taught the laity, in a similar way to Galloway’s plaque, that what went on behind the screen was identical to what was portrayed above it. As with the sacrament houses and the Gregorymass there was again an interplay between concealing and revealing, the screen concealed the dramatic representation of the passion in the liturgy at the altar but this was partially revealed to the congregation through the gaps in the screen and also in pictorial form in the painted rood. It was another visible means of liturgical interpretation.

**Conclusion**

In liturgical interpretation truth is accessed allegorically via something pointing beyond itself and it implies an epistemology in which that which is beyond is revealed through the signs which also veil it. The Fowlis Easter rood screen and the sacrament houses carved with monstrances both conceal that which is within and
reveal it by an image. The Kinkell crucifixion panel, images of the Mass of St Gregory and passion-carvings on fonts reveal what is happening in the sacraments in a more didactic way but also use imagery in the same way as liturgical interpretation. These all use images, but a pillar in the nave of a church is just a stone column holding up the roof until one is told that it, and the eleven others, represent the Apostles, as Abbot Suger of St Denis stated in his *Libellus de consecratione*. This is not an arbitrary interpretation as it is rooted in Scripture and tradition.\(^{121}\) If, as at the Sainte Chapelle in Paris, there are Apostles carved on the pillars then the interpretation has explicitly affected the construction of the building. In all these examples, as with the Temple proportions, it was teaching and patrons that were decisive. Teaching liturgical interpretation, with its connection to the techniques of the *ars memorativa*, enabled one to use churches as ‘memory palaces’ of the faith and it would seem that patrons who knew the method demanded that builders and artists made the interpretations explicit.

\(^{121}\) Galatians 2:9, Ephesians 2:19-22; Binski, *Becket’s Crown*, 9-10
Part C

Two Reformations Interpreting the Liturgy

1549-1590
Chapter 6: Liturgical Interpretation in a Protestant Poem and the Official Texts of Two Reformations

The two final chapters conclude the study of liturgical interpretation in sixteenth century Scotland by looking at the ‘Scottish Reformation’ in both its Catholic and Protestant aspects during the period from Archbishop Hamilton’s Scottish Provincial Councils to the publication of the sermons on the Lord’s Supper by Robert Bruce (1554-1631). This period deliberately crosses the historiographical barrier of 1560. In examining the sources a distinction needs to be maintained between sacramental theology - such disputed questions as the nature of Christ’s presence in the sacrament - and liturgical interpretation - the literal and historical description of the rites and the discussion of their symbolism. The concern here is with the latter and the main questions are: what was the place of liturgical interpretation in the two rival versions of reformatio ecclesiae, Catholic and Protestant; was there a Reformed version of liturgical interpretation and how was it related to and distinguished from the traditional version? The structure will be thematic, studying Catholic and Protestant official texts (legislative, liturgical and catechetical) in chapter 6 and controversial texts in chapter 7. Chapter 6, however, begins with a polemical poem which introduces the main themes of Part C and chapter 7 ends with Bruce’s sermons.

1) Two reformations meet in Aberdeen: liturgical interpretation in Patrick Adamson’s De Papistarum superstitiosis ineptiis (1564)

The liturgically-minded Catholic reform movement in the North East of Scotland described in chapter 3 continued after the Protestant revolution of 1559-60 when many Catholic reformers in southern Scotland such as John Winram and John Douglas became Protestant. The Catholic doctors were not purged from Aberdeen University until 1569 and in 1575 the Protestant General Assembly heard George Hay, Commissioner of Aberdeen, say that ‘there is no discipline kept within the diocese’ and local ministers and readers foster superstitious liturgical practices.1

---

Probably as a result of Elphinstone’s reforms, the North-East remained a centre of recusant Roman Catholicism and became the heartland of Scottish Episcopalianism. Adamson’s 1564 poem documented the results of a clash between the Catholic Reformers of Aberdeen and an emissary from the new Protestant Reformed Church in Southern Scotland. It reveals liturgical interpretation to be at the centre of the conflict between these two Reformation.

Patrick Adamson alias Constantine (1537-92), who became archbishop of St Andrews in 1576, was born in Perth and educated at St Mary’s College, St Andrews (1554-58) – an important centre of the Scottish Catholic Reform movement in the 1550s. On 20 December 1560, however, he was recognised as apt for ministry in the newly-reformed Church of Scotland. Two years later the General Assembly approved him for ministry in Aberdeen or Perth but he became minister of Ceres in Fife. Then, on 31 December 1563, the Assembly renewed his commission ‘to plant kirks from Dee to Ythan’ (the area around Aberdeen) and on 29 June 1564 it refused him license to pass to France and other countries, for the augmenting of his knowledge’ although he did leave at some time within the next two years. In 1564 Robert Lekprevik printed at Edinburgh a Latin poem by Adamson, ‘On the superstitious absurdities of the Papists’, written at the urging of George Buchanan with a preface dated 29 August 1564 at St Andrews and beginning:

In these last days, when I was travelling in the North, by the grace of the advance of the gospel, lest I might be doing nothing in the utmost laziness, I described in a poem the more gross of the papist abuses. But lest they remain hidden secretly among the Aberdonian papists, I have taken care that they be brought forth into the light, nor should I begrudge so small a fruit which might be produced from these verses for other men of the same sect.

---

2 Donaldson, ‘Scotland's Conservative North’; Stevenson and Davidson, ‘Ficino in Aberdeen’.
4 AGA, i, 36, 59, 70. I thank Steven Reid for allowing me to see his forthcoming book chapter, ‘Parallel Lives: The Early Careers of Patrick Adamson and Andrew Melville, c. 1558-1574’.
5 ‘Superioribus his diebus, quum in septentrione peregrinarer, promovendi Evangelii gratia, ne in summo oio nihil agere nemo, papismi cruorres aliquot abusus carmine descripsi. Ea vero ne clam apud Papistas aberdonenses latenter, in lucem aedenda curavi, neve tantillum fructus qui ex versibus prodire poterit, aliis eiusdem sectae hominibus, invidere’, Patrick Adamson, De Papistarum
This confirms that Adamson did take up his commission to plant kirks and suggests that the poem, addressed ‘Ad Papistas Aberdonenses’, was a response to bruising encounters with Catholics in the diocese of Aberdeen which made him want to flee to France. The poem included standard anti-Catholic invective with allusions to the Book of Revelation but it was distinctive in being primarily about the liturgy. It began by accusing the ‘papists’ of following human not divine traditions, ‘scorning the Word of the Lord... you fix human laws in your high heart’. The pope was said to be the satanic monster of Revelation 9:11 who gave birth to an idol called ‘mass’ and the rest of the first part of the poem was a parody of a liturgical commentary on the ceremonies of mass. Adamson even added a marginal reference to the mass-commentary in Book 4 of the Rationale of Durandus to ensure that the reader understood what he was doing. As part of this ‘anti-commentary’ Adamson mocked the interpretation of the division of the host into three parts as signifying the church in purgatory, heaven and earth:

Then [the priest] signs the chalice with crosses, then he divides the easily split Deity,
One part lying submerged in the Falernian wine
consoles the souls immersed in sulphurous flame.
Those which remain, which signify those worshipping souls
In the vault of heaven and earthly places,
Everyone with tenacious teeth devours,
And the priest of the mysteries pours into his greedy stomach.
Then he licks his fingers, then he offers his ears to his fingers
lest they cause to clatter the crushed bones of Christ which he grinds.

---


6 ‘Ut spreto Domini verbo... humanas alto figatis pectore leges’, Adamson, *De Papistarum*, A2r.


8 As found in *Rationale* 4.51.4-22, see chapter 2, pages 68-70.

9 ‘Tum crucibus calicem signat, tum fissile numen partitur, pars una iacens submersa falerno, sulphureo manes mersos solatur in igne. Quae restant, convexa poli et terrena colesentes significant
Adamson used the verb *significare* which is a sign of the presence of liturgical interpretation. The reference to the communicant eating the bones of Christ recalls both the teaching of Aquinas that the Christian consumes the bones of Christ in holy communion and the inscription on the 1551 Deskford sacrament house, linked to the Aberdeen liturgists, ‘you are my bone and my flesh’.  

After this ‘anti-commentary’ on the Catholic liturgy, Adamson turned to the Reformed doctrine of the Lord’s Supper. Under the marginal heading ‘*Corpus Christi in cena*’ (‘The body of Christ in the Supper’) he appealed to an Augustinian doctrine of signification:

> Why therefore is it accustomed to be called ‘the body’?  
> Because mystic signs often take their names from the things signified.  
> We do not, however, thus confess to you bare signs;  
> But being united to the Word of God they do whatever they signify  
> And we feed on the holy body of Christ and by faith grow together into one body.  

This reflected the standard Scottish Reformed doctrine of the eucharist, as found in the Scots Confession of 1560. It was also, however, a form of liturgical interpretation applied to the elements and using the verb *figurare*, which Durandus used together with *significare* in defining his method in the *Rationale*.  

---

*animas, quas omnes dente tenaci devorat, atque avida mystes ingurgitat alvo. Tum lambit digitos, digitis tunc obserat aures ne collisa crepunt Christi quae conterit ossa*, Adamson, *De Papistarum*, A3v.

10 See chapter 5, page 172.


12 ‘*Eos damnamus qui affirmant sacramentum nihil aliud esse praeterquam nuda signa*,’ the 1572 Latin translation of the *Confession* is by Adamson, Henderson, 10; Hazlett, 282, 286; Reid, ‘Parallel lives’.

13 See chapter 2, page 46.
The investigation of liturgical interpretation in Scotland in Part B enables this little-studied poem to be better understood. Adamson was educated at St Mary’s and, like some of his masters such as John Douglas and William Skene, is found on the Protestant side in 1559-60, while some of their colleagues such as the Dominicans Richard Marshall and John Black remained Catholic. Adamson would thus have been familiar with the liturgical interpretation which was part of Catholic Reform, and the prominence of liturgical interpretation in his very personal poem suggests that liturgy was a central part of his disputations with Catholics in Aberdeen. The ‘Aberdeen liturgists’ identified in chapter 3, with their keen interest in Durandus and liturgical interpretation, were almost certainly his opponents. Adamson’s opposition to the mass being a sacrifice offered for the dead – he wrote, ‘The fart of the sacrificing priest gives refreshment to the souls in purgatory’ - was a literary refutation of the doctrine portrayed in material culture by Galloway’s crucifix plaque at Kinkell. The structure of the poem reveals not Bible-religion versus sacramental-religion but rather two ways of interpreting the liturgy distinguished by their view of what is authentic liturgy. These are the subject of the remainder of the thesis. Using these two ways of interpreting the liturgy, the poem documented a clash between two parts of the Scottish Catholic Reform movement of the 1550s, the St Andrews reformers who became Protestant in 1559-60 and the Aberdeen reformers who remained Catholic. Liturgical interpretation is again found closely linked to church reform.

2) Scottish Catholic Reform 1549-1559 and Cologne, England and Trent

a. The Provincial Councils

The Scottish Catholic Reform movement which influenced Adamson’s education at St Andrews was associated with John Hamilton, archbishop of St Andrews 1546-71. After his enthronement in July 1549, he held Provincial Councils in August 1549, November 1549, January 1552 and March-April 1559; the next Council appointed

---


15 'Crepitus sacrifici refrigerat animas in purgatorio’, the *crepitus* is defined as *flatus* two lines later, Adamson, *De Papistarum*, A3v; OLD, 457.
for February 1560 was overtaken by events. There are also mentions of Councils called in 1547, 1550 and 1556 but the only extant statutes are those of the Councils of 1549, 1552 and 1559. Study of these Councils has tended to focus on why their reform failed, and also on the nature and aims of their reforms and on their relationship to contemporary European reform movements. With the exception of a brief comment by Alec Ryrie on the eucharist, historians have not noted the centrality of liturgy and sacraments to the reforming programme of the Councils. It is in legislation concerning these subjects that liturgical interpretation will be found in the conciliar decrees.

Although Hamilton’s reform was centred on St Andrews and Edinburgh, where most of the Councils were held, the Aberdeen Catholic reformers also made a major contribution. Allan White described Hamilton’s programme as ‘the co-ordinated effort of academics from both St Andrews and Aberdeen’ and he noted the incorporation of two Aberdeen academics, Alexander Anderson, the sub-principal of King's College, and John Watson, the Tridentine preacher discussed in chapter 3, at

16 There had been earlier Provincial Councils and Michael Lynch argues that the architect of the reforming programme carried out under Hamilton and centred on the Councils and St Mary’s College, St Andrews, was actually Cardinal Beaton who was familiar with the French Provincial Councils of the 1530s and founded St Mary’s in 1544, *Scotland: A New History*, 194.

17 These only survive in an unsatisfactory late-seventeenth century transcription by Étienne Baluze (1630-1718), BnF MS Latin 1559, fols 136-167. This was published in David Wilkins’ *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae* (London, 1737), iv, 46-60, 69-73, 204-217, and again with corrections, after an attempt to reconstruct the text by Alexandre Teulet, by Joseph Robertson in *Concilia Scotiae: ecclesiae Scotianae statuta tam provincialia quam synodalia quae supersunt*, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1866), from which David Patrick translated his *Statutes of the Scottish Church* (Edinburgh, 1907). The lost manuscript from which Baluze transcribed the statutes was probably in the Scots College Paris, where Baluze also transcribed the manuscript Glasgow Registers (BnF MS Latin 5540), Wilkins, *Concilia*, iv, 204; Robertson, i, cxviii. There is also a manuscript fragment which is possibly part of an index of a collection of canons of the Provincial Councils, NRS CH8/46.


St Mary’s in 1551. The Aberdeen Dominican and Catholic apologist John Black was also on the staff of St Mary’s in the 1550s. The sederunt of the Councils is only extant for 1549 but this was headed by Bishop William Gordon of Aberdeen and included others associated with the Aberdeen reform: John Grierson OP, Alexander Anderson of King’s, John Scot OFM Obs., canons Patrick Myrton and Arthur Talifer, as well as Bishop Robert Reid and Dean John Sinclair. Most of these featured in chapter 3 on the Aberdeen Liturgists and so it is not surprising to find an emphasis on understanding the liturgy in the reform programme.

b. Preaching and liturgical interpretation

The 1549 Council identified the main problem it faced as heresy, caused by clerical corruption and ignorance. One of its principal areas of concern was worship, as shown by the eleven articles to be used by the Inquisitors, which began with the sacraments themselves and ‘the ceremonies, rites and observances received by the Church and used in the administration of the sacraments’(225, cf. 220, 221). It was, however, in the sections on liturgy and sacraments in the regulations for preaching and teaching that liturgical interpretation was found.

Preaching, encouraged by the reform programme of Lateran IV, was ‘an almost obsessive concern of the Western church from the thirteenth century onwards’. There is conflicting evidence concerning Catholic preaching in Scotland before 1560. There were complaints about its absence or quality, but these generally came from

---

20 Early Records of the University of St. Andrews: the Graduation Roll, 1413 to 1579, and the Matriculation Roll, 1473 to 1579, ed. James Maitland Anderson (Edinburgh, 1926), 254; White, ‘Religion, Politics and Society’, 129-30; M.J. Protheroe, ‘William Cranston: sedis apostolicae in regno Scotie protector’, IR 62.2 (2011), 213-231, at 224 n.56 and 218, where it is suggested that the Catholic reformer William Cranston, who attended the 1549 Council and appears next to Watson in the list, may have been a graduate of King's.

21 Cameron, ‘St Mary’s College’, 50.

22 ‘Imprimis contra eos qui adversa ipsa sacramenta aut ceremonias, ritus, et observantias ab ecclesia receptas in sacramentorum administratione obganniunt’, Robertson, Concilia, 120. The numbering of statutes is that used by Robertson and Patrick.

Protestant or Catholic Reform sources, such as Knox’s *History* or Hay’s 1540 *Panegyricus*, where they were part of the rhetoric of reform (one plays up the evils to encourage a response). On the other hand there was evidence of good practice: Bishop George Brown of Dunkeld (1483-1515) sent Gaelic-speaking friars to preach in his diocese; Bishop Robert Reid legislated for preaching in his 1544 statutes for Kirkwall Cathedral; and Catholic preachers were appointed in accordance with the decrees of Trent and the Provincial Councils at Aberdeen by Bishop Gordon and St Andrews by Archbishop Hamilton, at Dunfermline Abbey by Commendator George Durie and at Paisley Abbey under Archbishop Hamilton as commendator. Even Knox records that in 1558 John Sinclair, Dean of Restalrig, began to preach in a way that suggests an eirenistic Catholic Reformer. There are also thirty-five extant volumes of printed sermons on the liturgical year from Scotland from this period which suggest a concern for Catholic preaching, although there is little evidence of what was actually preached. The examples of good practice comes from Catholic Reformers and most of the owners of these sermon books were clerics associated with Catholic Reform from Aberdeen and St Andrews dioceses: William Hay of King’s, William Hay of Turriff, Henry Sinclair, Alexander Anderson, Thomas Methven, John Watson, Bishops Robert Reid and William Gordon.

As well as commenting on the liturgical lectionary, contemporary evidence suggests that it was also expected that sermons should contain liturgical interpretation. Wenzel’s study of late-medieval English preaching noted that one of the aims of vernacular preaching was ‘to explain the meaning of the Church’s liturgy’,


27 The marginalia in John Watson’s volumes gives some idea but they mainly concern the exegesis of scriptural readings, Gilbert Hill, ‘The Sermons of John Watson, Canon of Aberdeen’, *IR* 15.1 (1964), 3-34. Commentary on liturgical readings is found in the *Rationale*, e.g. the chapter on the first Sunday of Lent interprets its epistle in the light of the four cardinal virtues (6.32.7).

28 Details are in ESL; of the 35 volumes 13 are from Aberdeen diocese and 10 from St Andrews.
sometimes commenting on liturgical texts rather than scriptural readings, and that the liturgical commentaries of Beleth and Durandus were the two main liturgical authorities quoted in English late-medieval sermons.\textsuperscript{29} Georg Witzel, whose works were owned by John Sinclair and Bishops Gordon, Reid and Leslie, recommended that preachers should ‘explain the meaning of the gestures and ceremonies’ when preaching on the sacraments.\textsuperscript{30} This concern with explaining the liturgy was also present in the Scottish Provincial Councils. The 1549 statute, ‘Of the method and order of preaching’ (199), prescribed that the first part of a sermon expound the scriptural readings at mass while the second half should be devoted to ‘catechism’, which included an explanation (\textit{expositio}) of the sacraments.\textsuperscript{31} Chapter 1 has shown that ‘\textit{expositio}’ can mean liturgical interpretation and the 1549 statute, ‘Of the preaching of God’s Word’ (223), confirms this, ordering that ‘the true uses of the Church’s ceremonies be moderately, soberly and discreetly preached’.\textsuperscript{32} The catechism produced by Archbishop Hamilton’s programme of Catholic Reform gives more information on the type of liturgical interpretation expected to be used in this \textit{expositio}.

\textit{c. Hamilton’s Catechism}

The 1552 Council confirmed the 1549 statutes and ordered the publication of a catechism which would have a section on the sacraments and provide ‘a plain and easy statement and explanation (\textit{institutio et doctrina}) of the rudiments of the faith’ (253). The language used of this catechism showed a concern to explain and interpret the faith, deploying words such as \textit{interpretatio} and \textit{expositio}, as well as to pass on orthodox teaching.\textsuperscript{33} The interest in liturgical interpretation should be understood in

\textsuperscript{29} Siegfried Wenzel, \textit{Latin Sermon Collections from Later Medieval England: Orthodox Preaching in the Age of Wyclif} (Cambridge, 2005), 8, 60, 63-64, 320.


\textsuperscript{31} This is similar to English episcopal constitutions, Wenzel, \textit{Latin Sermon Collections}, 230-33, 346-53.

\textsuperscript{32} ‘\textit{Veri ceremoniarum ecclesiasticarum usus praedicentur, modeste, sobrie et prudenter}’, Robertson, \textit{Concilia}, 118.

\textsuperscript{33} Robertson, \textit{Concilia}, 136.
this context. Study of the 1552 *Catechism* has concentrated on how ‘Catholic’ it is and on its ‘Erasmian’ and Protestant sources which include Johannes Gropper’s *Enchiridion* (1538), the Henrician *King’s Book* (1543), Luther’s *Larger Catechism* (1529) and the Edwardian *Homilies* (1547). Beyond this there has been no in-depth examination of the sacramental teaching of the *Catechism* or its use of liturgical interpretation.

The liturgy on which the *Catechism* and Councils commented was the standard late-medieval Latin liturgy. In Scotland this was the Sarum rite, the rites of the religious orders and an increasing use of the Roman rite including the Quiñones breviary. A simplified Roman Missal (Lyons, 1550), based on the Quiñones breviary and including a short allegorical liturgical commentary (*De ritu missæ*, fols 3v-7v), was also used in Scotland. Extant copies belonged to three clerics associated with Catholic Reform: Alexander Scott, chancellor of Orkney 1544-54 and associate of Bishop Reid; Andrew Durie (c. 1495-1558), bishop of Galloway and brother to the Catholic Reformer, George Durie, abbot of Dunfermline; and a ‘D. John Hamilton’, probably a monk of Paisley Abbey and kinsman of Archbishop Hamilton, abbot of Paisley until 1553. This commentary was designed for priests whereas the same type of liturgical interpretation in the *Catechism* was for the education of the laity.

The *Catechism* stated that it gave the ‘rudimentis of our christin doctrine’ to enable parishioners to easily understand the ‘hiear doctrine, contenit in the evangels and

---


epistils usit to be proponit and declarit to thame be precheouris of the word of God'.  

This recalls the ‘catechetical’ part of sermons as prescribed by the 1549 statute, ‘Of the method and order of preaching’ (199). The context and purpose of the Catechism was liturgical: curates were to read it to their parishioners at mass on Sundays and holy days and it was to prepare them to receive the Biblical doctrine in the mass readings expounded by preachers. This and the emphasis on interpretatio make it unsurprising that the third part on the sacraments, which is strongly scriptural and Augustinian, gave an interpretation of the liturgical rites and ceremonies.

The structure of this section was scholastic and included questions on the number, institution, matter and form, and effects of the sacraments. It was thus typical of late medieval and early modern religious education. Liturgical ceremonies beyond the basic matter and form were said to have been ordained by the Church for good order and ‘to geve instructioun to us quhat is done in the sacrament’, which gave adequate ground for liturgical interpretation but did not give space for the elaborate allegorisation found in parts of the Rationale. The sections on each of the sacraments commented on their rites and interpreted the ceremonies and elements used, frequently using words characteristic of liturgical interpretation such as ‘signify’ and ‘betaken’.

Chapter 4 ‘Of the cerimonyes usit in the ministratioun of baptyme’ provided a description and exegesis of the rite, justified thus:

In the sacrament of Baptyme the minister usis syndry cerimonies, quhilk quhen thai ar weil kend quhat thai betaken and signifyis, thai geve instructioun of all the misteryis and gratious giftis of God gevin in Baptyme.

---

37 Law, Catechism, 6.
38 Texts explicitly cited are mostly scriptural but there are also eight from Augustine, mostly on the sacraments in general, and one each from Cyprian, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, and Peter Lombard.
39 Law, Catechism, 182, cf 189.
40 For example in chapter 4 on the baptismal ceremonies ‘signify’ is used six times, ‘betaken’ five times, ‘declare’ and ‘do in representation’ once each, Law, Catechism, 189-93.
41 Law, Catechism, 189.
The previous chapter had explained that water was the ‘matter’ of baptism because of its ‘significatioun’ of washing (from sin), its ubiquity and its having being given power by Christ in his own baptism, and it also spoke of figures of baptism in the Old Testament such as the Flood, crossing the Red Sea, and circumcision as well as the effects of baptism. Similar interpretations were given of the various ceremonies of the rite: for example, breathing on the baby signified the expulsion of the evil spirit and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; the sign of the cross signified being made a Christian; the salt signified being seasoned with wisdom and preserved from sin; and the pouring of water or dipping three times represented Christ’s burial by which the Christian is raised from sin to new life. Each element was given one symbolic interpretation (or at most two), as has been found in the catechetical tradition.

A similar pattern was found in the treatment of the other sacraments. For ‘the sacrament of the altar’ there was no detailed discussion of the rite but, after covering Old Testament typology and the various names of the sacrament, the elements, bread and wine mixed with water, were said to symbolise nourishment, strengthening and making glad; they also ‘signifie and betaken the unitie of the mistik body of our salviour Christ’ as they are made of many grains of corn and grapes. The mixing of water with the wine was said to signify the union of humanity with Christ by baptism through the merits of Christ’s passion. Chapter 8 emphasised the real presence of Christ in the sacrament (a concern already seen in the texts on the sacrament houses in North-East Scotland) and said that one of its fruits was ‘setting furth of the passioun of Christ’. There was, however, no interpretation of the order of mass as a dramatic representation of the events of the passion or of the vestments in terms of the passion. With this exception, the Catechism provided a coherent and simple system of liturgical interpretation close to Scripture and drawn from the late medieval educational tradition.

---

42 Law, Catechism, 183-89.
41 Law, Catechism, 201-05.
d. Catholic Reform and liturgical interpretation in Germany and England

This use of simple liturgical interpretation in a catechetical work associated with a humanist reforming programme was not uncommon in the period. Johann Gropper edited the canons of the 1536 Council of Cologne and published them in 1538 with his own *Enchiridion christianae institutionis* which directly influenced Hamilton’s Catechism.\(^{45}\) Clare Kellar noted that the canons and *Enchiridion* ‘set a contemporary standard for humanist-inspired Catholic reform’ in Scotland and England.\(^{46}\) The Cologne canons ordered that the laity be taught the meaning of the sacramental rites and they give the symbolic meaning of the bread and wine of the mass.\(^{47}\) They directed the clergy to the section of the *Enchiridion* on the sacraments where each is interpreted (‘*quod signet*’).\(^{48}\) On baptism, after discussing Old Testament prefigurations, Gropper turned to the *mystici ritus* and gave a full interpretation of the liturgical rites in just over four pages, using *significare* ten times and generally giving one interpretation of each ceremony, so that the faithful may understand the mysteries of Christ (*vulgus ad intelligendum... mysteria Christi*).\(^{49}\) The same was done for the other sacraments and on the eucharist he noted that there exist many books which openly explain one by one all its rites, all of which have meaning. He also gave a five-page interpretation of the symbolic meaning of bread and wine mixed with water very close to that in Hamilton’s Catechism.\(^{50}\)

The same emphasis on liturgical interpretation was present in England in the Henrician Church after the break with Rome. It was found, for example, in the Ten Articles of 1536, the 1537 Bishops’ Book, the proclamations of 16 November 1538

\(^{45}\) Law, *Catechism*; Cameron, ‘Cologne Reformation’; Cameron, ‘Catholic Reform’; Johann Gropper, *Canones Concili Quartius Coloniensis* (Cologne, 1538).


\(^{47}\) Cameron, ‘Cologne Reformation’; Gropper, *Canones*, fols 25v, 26v, 28r.

\(^{48}\) Gropper, *Canones*, fol. 26v.

\(^{49}\) Gropper, *Canones*, fols 81r-82r. He begins the interpretation of the rites of confirmation by saying ‘*iam ad signorum et rituum expositionem pergermus*’, Gropper, *Canones*, fol. 89v.

\(^{50}\) ‘*Complures libelli extent qui hos omnes [sc. ritus missae] sigillatim et ex professo explicent... Nullam ceremoniam... otiosam, quae non suam peculiarem vim significandi habeat*’, Gropper, *Canones*, fols 95r, 92v-94v.
and 26 February 1539 ordering priests to instruct their people in the meaning of ceremonies, and the 1543 King’s Book; the 1540-43 drafts of official liturgical commentary, Ceremonies to be used in the Church of England, covered some of the same areas as the Rationale such as the church-building and cemetery, vestments, baptism, ordination, the mass, holy water and holy bread.\textsuperscript{51} It is difficult to know how to understand the Henrician evidence, whether with Bernard and Wooding as a consistent royal religious policy or with MacCulloch, Rex and others as the result of a power struggle between radicals and conservatives.\textsuperscript{52} At the level of official pronouncements, however, the attitude of the Henrician Church to liturgical interpretation was consistent and coherent: a distinction was made between pious and impious ceremonies; the former were to be retained on the educational grounds that they reminded Christians of the spiritual things they signify; and these ceremonies were to be interpreted. The Bishops’ Book, King’s Book and Ceremonies also tended to give the liturgy a double symbolic interpretation, Christological and tropological. For example: the sprinkling of holy water recalled baptism and the shedding of Christ’s blood on the cross; the priest’s stole ‘as touching the mystery signif[yeth] the ropes’ which bound Christ to the pillar of flagellation, ‘and as touching the minister it signif[yeth] the yoke of patience’.\textsuperscript{53} Both Duffy and Bernard see this Henrician method of liturgical interpretation as a departure from Catholic popular devotion and Rex characterises it as ‘Erasmian’, but it was actually a reassertion of the late-medieval tradition of liturgical interpretation in a way characteristic both of contemporary catechetics, with its lack of multiform interpretations, and of humanist

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{51} Tudor Royal Proclamations, Paul Hughes and James Larkin (New Haven, 1964), i, 273-76 (no. 186); 278-80 (no. 188); Richard Rex, Henry VIII and the English Reformation, 2\textsuperscript{nd} edn (Basingstoke, 2006), 80; G.W. Bernard, The King’s Reforma[ti]on: Henry VIII and the Remaking of the English Church (New Haven, 2005), 484-5, 490-92, 494; The Rationale of Ceremonial, 1540-1543, ed., Cyril S. Cobb (London, 1910); MacCulloch, Cranmer, 267, 276. The 1540-43 book is commonly called the Rationale of Ceremonies but this has no warrant in the manuscripts, although when speaking of it in the Commons Thomas Cromwell did use the term ‘ratio’ to explain the distinction between ceremonies and their meaning, Cobb, Rationale, vi, xlix.
\item \textsuperscript{52} MacCulloch, Cranmer; Lucy E.C. Wooding, Rethinking Catholicism in Reformation England (Oxford, 2000), 63; Bernard, King’s Reformation; Rex, Henry VIII and the English Reformation. MacCulloch notes, for example, evidence of the two sides in the drafts and reception of the Ten Articles, Cranmer, 162-64.
\item \textsuperscript{53} Henry VIII, A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christen Man (London, 1543), fols M1r-M2v; Cobb, Rationale, 16-17, 41.
\end{itemize}
Catholic reform in 1530s Cologne and 1550s Scotland. Kellar relates the influence of Henrician texts on Hamilton’s reform to the legacy of the English attempts to influence the Scottish Church in the 1540s.

In the 1550s, parallel to the Scottish Provincial Councils, the English Church under Mary Tudor made a similar use of liturgical interpretation in official texts. Bishop Bonner’s 1554 visitation articles for the diocese of London, which Kellar says were ‘strongly reminiscent of Hamilton’s Provincial Council decrees’, used the Henrician Book of Ceremonies in requiring clergy to ‘declare, set forth and instruct the people the true meaning of the ceremonies of the church’. The 1558 convocation ordered clergy to use the liturgy as the basis for a re-education in Catholicism and Thomas Watson’s, Holsome and Catholyke Doctryne Concerninge the Seuen Sacramentes, which explained the ceremonies of each sacrament, was ordered as a replacement for Bonner’s book by Pole’s Legatine Synod of 1555-56. Watson’s sermon 13, ‘Of the godly prayers and ceremonies used in the sacrifice of the Masse’, was a full liturgical commentary beginning with the passion symbolism of the vestments but, apart from this, was largely descriptive and not allegorical. The main interest of Watson’s book was in disputed areas such as transubstantiation (sermons 7 and 8). Bartolomé Carranza’s 1555 Lenten sermons at the court of Philip and Mary also showed liturgical interpretation being used as part of the re-Catholicisation process. Kellar

54 Duffy, Stripping of the Altars, 393-4; Bernard, King’s Reformation, 290; Rex, Henry VIII and the English Reformation, 79. Bernard does hint at this when he notes that ‘late medieval churchmen would have endorsed’ such interpretations.


56 Duffy, Stripping of the Altars, 530-35; Wooding, Rethinking Catholicism, 153, 156.


58 Duffy, Fires of Faith, 18, 69, 192; Thomas Watson, Holsome and Catholyke Doctryne Concerninge the Seuen Sacramentes (London, 1558).

has noted that the religious policy of Marian England ‘took account of the same priorities which characterised Hamilton’s plans for the Kirk’, but that political antagonism between Tudor and Guise governments meant that there was no cooperation.\(^{60}\) Liturgical interpretation, drawn from the late-medieval educational tradition under the influence of the educational priorities of humanism, was thus an important feature of mid-sixteenth century humanist Catholic Reform.

e. The 1559 Council and a decline in interest in liturgical interpretation?
An interest in liturgy was again found in the statutes of the 1559 Scottish Provincial Council. The articles which the Regent passed on to the Council from some temporal Lords emphasised the importance of knowledge of the sacraments and reverence for the eucharist but the knowledge desired was of the effects, institution and benefits of the sacraments rather than of the meaning of the ceremonies, although the articles did affirm the traditional ‘lovable ceremonies and rites tharof usit in Haly Kirk’.\(^{61}\) The Council itself accepted their demand for vernacular exhortations on the sacraments and one, for the eucharist, has survived. This and the eight conciliar articles on uniformity of doctrine to be used by preachers, however, dealt with controverted doctrinal points rather than the interpretation of sacramental ceremonies prescribed by the humanist Catholic Reform programmes discussed in the last section. While traditional ceremonies were ordered to be used there was no mention of their explanation to the people. This may reflect the turning of the minds of some of the Council Fathers to a more radical form of Reformation, to which they would adhere later in 1559, but it is also likely to be part of a Catholic retreat, associated with the Council of Trent, from traditional liturgical interpretation. This was already seen in the 1546 Assertion and Defence of the Sacrament of the Aulter of Richard Smith, who was at St Mary’s, St Andrews 1551-53 and made a contribution to Hamilton’s reform before returning to England.\(^{62}\) This book concentrated on the presence of

---


\(^{61}\) Patrick, *Statutes*, 156-160. Jane Dawson suggests that these articles were ‘probably written by clerics’, *Scotland Re-formed*, 202.

Christ in the sacrament to the exclusion of liturgical interpretation and Smith wrote that

Sacramentes be institute not onely for this purpose that we by theme maye be ledde from visible sygnes and tokens unto the thynges that are invisible for if they so were then it were inoughe... to have some good preacher or teacher to open or declare what everye action didde sygnifye... but they are instituted also (and that cheifelye and pryncypalye) to the intente we shoulde by the use of theym... gette and receive by thethem grace and favoure in deede.  

This allowed for liturgical interpretation, indicated by the verb ‘signify’, and the educational purpose found in humanist Catholic Reform, but it pushed it into a poor second place to the theological reality received in the sacrament.

In chapter 1 it was noted that liturgical interpretation was absent from the Roman Catechism of 1566 and this was also true of the decrees of the Council of Trent, where the only liturgical interpretation was an association of the mixed chalice with the blood and water from Christ’s side and the union of Christ with his Church. The Council affirmed traditional ceremonies and said they are to be taught in seminaries and explained to the people, but when it spoke of the meaning of the ceremonies of the mass it said their purpose was to enhance the majesty of the sacrifice and raise minds to the mysteries hidden within it. The latter could have referred to the traditional allegorical interpretations but ‘the mysteries’ were more likely to have been the doctrinal themes of Christ’s presence and sacrifice defined by the Council. The catechism Summa doctrinae Christianae (1555) of Peter Canisius, published in Scots by Adam King at Paris in 1588, likewise affirmed sacramental ceremonies as stirring up devotion but the only liturgical interpretations present were simple explanations of water signifying washing the soul in baptism and oil the gift of grace.

---

63 Smith, Assertion and Defence, fols 68r-v. The nearest the book comes to liturgical interpretation are a discussion of the meaning of bread and wine and a section on the separate consecrations of bread and wine representing the passion, fols 27r-33v, 52r. The same is true of Smith’s, Defence of the Blessed Masse and the Sacrifice thereof (London, 1546).

64 Chapter 1, pages 39-40. Council of Trent, Decree on the Sacrifice of the Mass (September 1562), chapter 7 (Tanner, Decrees, 735).

65 Council of Trent, Decree on the Sacrifice of the Mass (September 1562), chapters 5 and 8; Decree on Reform (July 1563), canon 18 (Tanner, Decrees, 734-5, 751)
in confirmation and strengthening in extreme unction.\textsuperscript{66} This was similar to the Calvinist interpretation of water, bread and wine which shall be encountered later in this chapter; the only differences are due to the different number of sacraments and the omission of consideration of the meaning of bread and wine, probably because transubstantiation shifted interest from the mere appearances of bread and wine to what they had become.\textsuperscript{67}

While these examples marked a decline of interest in liturgical interpretation in Tridentine Roman Catholicism, the 1568 catechism of the English recusant Laurence Vaux was published with an appended liturgical commentary, ‘Concerning the holy ceremonies of God’s churche’, which interpreted the order of mass and the rites and ceremonies of the Church’s year frequently using the verbs ‘to signify’, ‘to betoken’ and ‘to represent’.\textsuperscript{68} Lucy Wooding claimed that this marked a ‘reappearance of ceremonies in Catholic writing’, but it was in fact in continuity with the use of liturgical interpretation in Henrician and Marian religion (Vaux had been ordained in 1542 and served in the Marian Church) and the pre-1560 use of liturgical interpretation in catechesis for young people.\textsuperscript{69}

\textit{f. Liturgical interpretation in Hamilton’s Catholic Reform: Conclusions}

There are four main conclusions or distinctions concerning the use of liturgical interpretation in the official texts of mid-sixteenth century Scottish Catholic Reform. Firstly, Hamilton’s reform movement shared the interest in liturgical interpretation seen in Part B among the ‘Aberdeen Liturgists’ and in Scottish Catholic culture in general. This was of the tradition found in the \textit{Rationale} but more specifically of the type found in the catechetical tradition with one or a few interpretations attached to

\textsuperscript{66} Peter Canisius and Adam King, \textit{Ane Catechisme or Schort Instrvction of Christian Religion} (Paris, 1588), fols 66r, 82v; 68v, 73r, 102r-v.

\textsuperscript{67} It does say that the external ceremonies give to the senses ‘a representation of our lords death’ but, although there are marginal references to liturgical commentaries by Innocent III and others and a reference to Trent, \textit{On the Sacrifice of the Mass}, chapters 5 and 7, it is not made explicit how this is so, Canisius and King, \textit{Catechisme}, fols 81r-v.

\textsuperscript{68} Laurence Vaux, \textit{A Catechism or Christian Doctrine} (Louvain, 1568), fols 112r-135v.

\textsuperscript{69} Wooding, \textit{Rethinking Catholicism}, 265.
each ceremony and a clear educational intent. This was typical of the ‘humanist’ type of Catholic Reform associated with Gropper in Cologne, the Henrician Church and one strand of thinking in the Marian Church in England.\textsuperscript{70} Secondly, in the 1559 Council there were hints of the marginalisation of liturgical interpretation in Catholic religious culture that chapter 1 associated with the Council of Trent and its catechism. Thirdly, the apotropaic way of understanding the liturgy was absent from the didactic genre of liturgical interpretation encountered here. It was, however, present not only among the people, as recorded in kirk session records during the century after 1560, but also probably in clerical circles, as suggested by the ‘mass chain’ of the type legislated against at Trent copied into the \textit{Kalendar of Ferne}.\textsuperscript{71} Finally, the similar uses of liturgical interpretation in the official texts of Cologne, Scotland and Henrician and Marian England came not only from a common inheritance of Catholic Reform but also from a common Latin liturgy. This would be swept away by the Reformed Church of Scotland after 1560 and the next section will investigate the place of liturgical interpretation in the official texts of the Reformed Church and the principle behind this radical liturgical change.

\textbf{3) The interpretation of liturgy in Protestant Scotland 1560-1590}

\textit{a. The centrality of worship and the sacraments}

The Scottish Protestant Reformation was primarily an attempt to restore true worship and eliminate the false worship of idolatry. This caused the emphasis on worship and liturgical interpretation in Scottish Catholic Reform to become a battleground. In his 1569 oration at the purging of the Catholic faculty from the University of Aberdeen, George Hay described the Reformation thus:

\begin{quote}
In the present age a great debate is taking place concerning a very important subject, I mean the true worship of God.\textsuperscript{72}
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
It was not only in Aberdeen that Scottish Protestant Reformers put the restoration of true worship first. Knox did the same in the preface to his *History of the Reformation* and in 1560 the *Scots Confession* and *First Book of Discipline* both placed worship in their first sections. The humanist critique of superstition and idolatry in Lyndsay’s *Ane Dialog betwix Experience and ane Courteour* (1552), was mainly concerned with image-worship but Protestant works from the 1550s showed a shift of focus to liturgy, especially the mass, associated with the influence of George Wishart and John Knox. Although much recent scholarship on the Scottish Protestant Reformation has been concerned with polity and politics, for contemporaries it was worship that took centre stage, whether this was disputes about the mass among the theologically literate or the physical changes to churches and Sunday worship that were experienced by all Scots.

In her magisterial study, *The Culture of Protestantism in Early Modern Scotland*, Margo Todd showed how the change ‘from sensual to logocentric religion’ effected by the Scottish Protestant Reformation was accompanied by a less-noticed continuity in worship where Communion in particular ‘remained a seasonal event with characteristic material symbols and experiences, antecedent fasting, ritual use of physical movement and space, and a perceived spiritual significance’. Given the centrality of worship for the Reformers, if spiritual significance was given to material symbols, ritual movement and use of space, one expects to find a Protestant version of liturgical interpretation along the lines suggested by Adamson’s poem. The subject of this Reformed liturgical interpretation was the liturgy of the Reformed Kirk, the English *Book of Common Prayer* of 1552 which was gradually replaced by

---


74 *The Poetical Works of David Lyndsay*, 3 vols, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh, 1879), iii, 10-42.

75 See Introduction, page 7, footnote19.

the *Book of Common Order (Book of Geneva)* approved by the General Assembly in 1562.\textsuperscript{77}

\textit{b. The scriptural principle of worship}

The fundamental principle for the regulation of Reformed worship was Scripture and this provided the essential basis for Reformed liturgical interpretation. The continuity in the use of liturgical interpretation by Catholics before 1560 and Protestants afterwards was hidden under a much more visible discontinuity in liturgical practice caused by this principle. Many of the leaders of the Reformed Kirk after 1560 had previously, however, been active in Catholic Reform circles and would have shared the interest in liturgical interpretation found there, as will be seen in the example of John Winram mentioned below. One problem in understanding this continuity is that most extant evidence relates to Knox, who does not share this background, whereas much less survives from his colleagues in the early years after 1560 who did. This difference in background may help explain an ambiguity about the fundamental principle of worship discussed below. This principle, however, and not any basic difference in method, distinguished Catholic and Protestant liturgical interpretation.

The exclusive form of this principle was expressed by John Knox in the major premise of a syllogism in a sermon preached in 1550 before Bishop Tunstall of Durham:

\begin{quote}
All wirschipping, honoring, or service inventit by the braine of man in the reliugioun of God, without his own express commandment, is Idolatrie.\textsuperscript{78}
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{78} From *A Vindication of the Doctrine that the Sacrifice of the Mass is Idolatry*, Knox, *Works*, iii, 34; the syllogism continues: ‘The masse is inventit be the braine of man, without any commandment of God: Thairfor it is idolatrie’. Cf. also his 1559 *A Brief Exhortation to England*, Knox, *Works*, v, 515-16.
The first extant articulation of this principle in Scotland seems to have been by Knox’s teacher, George Wishart, at his trial in 1546 when he said of the ceremonies of baptism:

If they were conformable to the Word of God, I would commend them; but in so far as they are not conformable to the commandment and Word of God, I reprove them.\(^{79}\)

In the 1547 disputation between Knox and John Winram and Alexander Arbuckle, three of the nine articles concerned non-scriptural ceremonies and Winram chose this issue to begin the debate: ‘Why may not the kirk, for good causes, devise ceremonies to decor the sacraments?’ He defended ceremonies using liturgical interpretation and revealed himself to be in the tradition of Catholic Reform described above:

It is in faith that the ceremonies are commanded, and they have proper significations to help our faith - as the hards in baptism signify the roughness of the law, and the oil the softness of God's mercy. And, likewise, every one of the ceremonies has a godly signification.\(^{80}\)

Knox defined the issue at stake as ‘God's true worshipping’, and expressed his exclusive scriptural principle in words from Deuteronomy:

‘All that the Lord thy God commands thee to do, that do thou to the Lord thy God: Add nothing to it; diminish nothing from it.’\(^{81}\)

Against the Observant Franciscan Alexander Arbuckle, who offered to prove that ceremonies were commanded by God, he made this important distinction:

Such as God has ordained we allow, and with reverence we use them. But the question is of those that God has not ordained, such as, in baptism are spittle,

\(^{79}\) From an account printed in 1548 by John Daye and included in Knox’s History and Foxe’s Book of Martyrs, Knox, History, ii, 239.

\(^{80}\) Knox, History, i, 88.

salt, candle, cuide (except it be to keep the bairn from cold), hards, oil, and the rest of the papistical inventions.  

While allowing that Knox is himself reporting this about twenty years later and was concerned to show himself in a good light, the 1547 debate is important in showing the centrality of worship, the importance of the exclusive scriptural principle for regulating worship and the place of liturgical interpretation in Catholic Reform.

In official Protestant texts this basic exclusive principle was found in 1560 in the *Scots Confession*, which rejected ‘mennis inventiounis’ in worship such as the use of oil, salt and spittle in baptism, and in the *First Book of Discipline* which defined idolatry as ‘all honouring of God not conteined in his holy word’; in 1581 the *Negative Confession* likewise condemned all ‘vain allegories, ritis, signes, and traditions brought in the Kirk, without or againis the Word of God and doctrine of this trew reformed Kirk’. Concerning the two Reformed sacraments, the *First Book of Discipline* taught that they are rightly ministered when ‘to them nothing is added, from them nothing diminished, and in their practise nothing changed besides the Institution of the Lord Jesus and the practise of his holy Apostles’.

Apart from the sacraments, this application of *sola scriptura* to worship occurred primarily in discussions of the prohibition of idolatry in the second commandment and in opposition to ‘papist’ worship. Carlos Eire has shown that this is characteristic of Calvin’s theology and, as Scottish Protestantism from the 1550s was heavily influenced by Calvin, this is clearly a major source of this view of worship. Calvin taught that God ‘disapproves of all modes of worship not expressly sanctioned by his word’ and ‘wills to be the sole lawgiver of his own worship’, and the same is found in official Reformed texts such as the *Belgic Confession* (1561) and the *Heidelberg Catechism*.

---

82 Knox, *History*, i, 90.
Catechism (1563) which says that one may not worship God ‘in any other way than he has commanded in his word’.\textsuperscript{86} This is what modern Reformed theology calls the ‘regulative principle of worship’, which may be understood as: ‘only do things in worship if there is scriptural warrant to do so’.\textsuperscript{87} The sources suggest that it was Knox, himself taught by Wishart, who made this principle central to the Scottish Protestant Reformation and thereby drew a clear line between Reformed Protestantism and the various forms of reforming Catholicism characteristic of the Scottish Church under Hamilton, Cologne in the 1530s and Henrician and Marian England.

There was, however, an ambiguity about this principle in early Scottish Protestantism. The 1560 Confession allowed some ‘ceremonies sic as men have devysit’ (presumably as long as they are not ‘repugnyng to Goddes haly word’) and noted that they can differ according to time and place and ought to be changed when they foster superstition rather than edify the Church.\textsuperscript{88} The First Book of Discipline also recognised that there may be things in worship not expressly commanded in Scripture as long as they are grounded in Scripture and not superstitious or contrary to Scripture: an inclusive scriptural principle of worship.\textsuperscript{89} The Second Helvetic Confession, approved by the General Assembly in 1566 (except chapter 24 on feast-days), condemned the accumulation of human ceremonies in worship but likewise allowed ‘a few pure and moderate rites consistent with the Word of God’, and the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[86]{John Calvin and Henry Advocate Beveridge, Tracts and Treatises on the Reformation of the Church, 3 vols (Edinburgh, 1958), i, 128; Institutes 4.10.23 (John Calvin and John T. McNeill, Institutes of the Christian Religion, 2 vols [London, 1961], 1201); Belgic Confession 7 (and 32) (Hazlett, 325-26, 339); Heidelberg Catechism 96 (Gerhart, E. V. et al., The Heidelberg Catechism, in German, Latin and English [New York, 1863], 240-41).}
\footnotetext[88]{Hazlett, 280, 243.}
\footnotetext[89]{Cameron, First Book of Discipline, 95.}
\end{footnotes}
Preface to the *Book of Geneva* allowed ‘ceremonies grounded upon God’s Woorde’ while warning that ceremonies ‘man hath invented’ ought to be abolished, but only if they were abused or promoted superstition.\(^90\)

This was close to the official teaching of the Reformed Church of England as expressed in Cranmer’s preface to the *Book of Common Prayer*, ‘Of ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained’, and article 34 of the Forty-two Articles of 1552 which said that Churches may regulate ceremonies as long as they are ‘not repugnant to the word of God’.\(^91\) Modern understanding of the early Churches of Scotland and England has been distorted by the conflicts of the first half of the seventeenth century and ideas about what is ‘Presbyterian’ and ‘Anglican’, but early Scottish Protestants had close connections with England and used its Prayer Book. Both Churches at this time were firmly in the Reformed camp so one should not be surprised by this similarity. One should also beware of positing a monolithic unanimity among the Scottish Protestant Reformers. Many had diverse contacts with the continent and some, such as John Winram and John Douglas among the ‘six Johns’ who authored the *Scots Confession*, were former Catholic Reformers.\(^92\)

This ambiguity about the fundamental theology of worship was probably also caused by the meeting of three aspects of Reformed thought: on the one hand a revulsion at Roman Catholic worship and a strict interpretation of the second commandment in the light of texts such as Deuteronomy 12:32 which produced the exclusive principle; on the other a recognition that Scripture did not give rules for all things done in worship and so the Church could regulate ceremonies by an inclusive scriptural principle. This issue is important here because one must be clear about the nature of Scottish Protestant liturgy before seeing how it was interpreted in official documents.


\(^92\) Hazlett, 212.
The absence of certain ceremonies and their interpretation, such as the use of oil in baptism, is not evidence of the absence of liturgical interpretation.

c. Interpreting the liturgy in official Scottish Reformed texts

There was a Reformed version of liturgical interpretation grounded in Augustine’s teaching on signs, as seen in Adamson’s poem. Away from the condemnation of idolatry and concerns about the boundaries of true worship, the official texts of the Scottish Protestant Reformation interpreted the basic elements of Reformed sacramental worship. The *Scots Confession* twice insisted that the Protestants of Scotland condemn those who claim they say ‘Sacramentis to be nathing ellis bot nakit and bair signis’.93 This was an echo of Wishart’s translation of article 21 of the *First Helvetic Confession* (1536), designed to repudiate a popular view of Zwinglian memorialism: sacraments are ‘not of naked sygnes, but they are of sygnes and verities together’.94 The sacramental signs thus represent ‘that quhilkis is significit (significatur) be them’, and this Augustinian doctrine of signification where the visible sacramental sign (signum) signifies an invisible reality (res) opened the door to liturgical interpretation.95 This movement from sacramentum to res was seen as a spiritual activity because the action of the Holy Spirit enabled the one eating and drinking the bread and wine at the Lord’s Supper to be carried above visible things ‘to feid upon the body and blude of Christ Jesus’; the physical eating and drinking signified Christ becoming ‘verray nurischment and fude of our saulis’.96 The eating and drinking also, in the words of 1 Corinthians 11:26, ‘shaw furth... the Lordis deith’, which was to be preached and praised in the sacrament.97 Unlike the ‘vain allegories... without or againis the Word of God’ condemned in the *Negative Confession*, these ‘significations’ were directly taken from Scripture.98

---

93 Hazlett, 282, cf. 286.
95 Henderson, 86; Hazlett, 286. See chapter 2.
96 Hazlett, 283, 282.
97 Hazlett, 291.
98 Henderson, 107.
The *First Book of Discipline* taught that the ‘Table of the Lord’ was rightly ministered when it ‘approacheth most neare to Christ’s own action’ at the Last Supper, as with the practice of sitting at table. It also ordered that at the eating and drinking of the bread and wine there should be ‘declaration what both the one and the other is’ – the body and blood of Christ – and it was said to be necessary that ‘some comfortable places of the Scripture be read which may bring in mind the death of Christ Jesus and the benefit of the same’.99 This liturgical practice was not commanded by Scripture but it was justified by noting that Scripture said that in the sacrament ‘we ought chiefly to remember the Lord’s death’ and so the reading provides an interpretation of the liturgical action.100 The *Book of Geneva* also provides for this reading:

To the intene that our eyes and senses may not onely be occupiede in these outwarde signes of bread and wine, which are called the visible woorde: but that our hartes and myndes also may be fully fixed in the contemplation of the lordes death, which is by this holy Sacrament representede’.101

This was a good description of the method of liturgical interpretation, based on Augustine’s teaching that a sacrament is a ‘visible word’, and the interpretation of the eucharist provided was very close to that of the Catholic commentators who interpreted the mass as a dramatic re-presentation of the passion.102 The *First Book of Discipline* demanded an examination before admission to communion which concentrated on the Lord’s Prayer, creed and decalogue of the traditional catechetical tradition but also noted that those who do not ‘know the dignitie and mysterie of that action [the Lord’s Supper] cannot eate and drink of that Table worthily’.103 This required an instruction in the meaning of the sacraments and interpretation of their elements as found in the Protestant catechisms used in Scotland.

---


100 Cameron, *First Book of Discipline*, 92.


102 Augustine, *In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus cxxiv*, 80.3 (CCSL 36, 529).

103 Cameron, *First Book of Discipline*, 184-86.
d. Liturgical interpretation in Catechisms

The Book of Geneva and editions of the Book of Common Order published in Scotland from 1564 to 1611 included Calvin’s Catechism (1541) which the First Book of Discipline called ‘the most perfect that ever yet was used in the kirk’ and ordered to be taught to children on Sunday afternoon.\(^{104}\) To it was sometimes added a brief Little Catechism... to Examine Children before they be Admitted to the Supper of the Lord. Other catechisms used in Scotland in the sixteenth century included: Patrick Adamson’s Catechismus Latino Carmine (1572, 1581), in Latin verse and based on Calvin’s Catechism; the Parvus Catechismus (1573) in Latin verse by Robert Pont; A Short Summe of the Whole Catechisme (1581) by John Craig, who also produced Ane Forme of Examination before the Communion (1592); and the Heidelberg Catechism printed at Edinburgh in 1591.\(^{105}\) All shared the same Reformed understanding of the sacraments which was also found in two other Reformed works well known in Scotland in this period, Calvin’s Institutes and the Second Helvetic Confession.\(^{106}\)

These official catechetical texts of the Scottish Protestant Reformation all had a clear doctrine of sacramental signs derived from Calvin and Augustine: ‘a sacrament is an outward token of God’s favour, which by a visible signe doeth represent unto us

\(^{104}\) Maxwell, Genevan Service Book, 65; Cameron, First Book of Discipline, 182; William Cowan, A Bibliography of the Book of Common Order and Psalm Book of the Church of Scotland: 1556-1644 (Edinburgh, 1913), 11; The CL Psalmes of Dauid in English metre. With the forme of prayers, and ministration of the sacraments... [Book of Common Order] (Edinburgh, 1575), 1-148; Horatius Bonar, Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation (London, 1866), 1-88.

\(^{105}\) Patrick Adamson, Catechismus Latino carmine redditus... (Edinburgh, 1581); Robert Pont, Paruus catechismus quo examinari possunt iuniores qui ad sacram coenam admittuntur (St Andrews, 1573); The Miscellany of the Wodrow Society, ed. David Laing (Edinburgh, 1844), 301-18; John Craig, A Short Sum of the Whole Catechisme, ed. Thomas Graves Law (Edinburgh, 1883); Catechesis religionis christianae...in ecclesiis & scholis Palatinatus (Edinburgh, 1591). A catechism, partly in verse, was published with The Gude and Godlie Ballates, printed in the sixteenth century in 1565, 1567, 1578 and 1600, but put together, probably by the Wedderburns of Dundee from the 1530s, The Gude and Godlie Ballates, ed. Alexander F. Mitchell (Edinburgh, 1897), 2-18.

\(^{106}\) For copies of the Institutes in sixteenth century Scotland see SL, 116, 303; ESL, 131; Finlayson, Clement Litill and his Library, 33. The catechism in Gude and Godlie Ballatis is Lutheran, Mitchell: Gude and Godlie Ballatis, 242-44.
spiritual things’. Christ commanded the use of bread, wine and water and so visible signs were essential according to the scriptural principle of worship; but these material elements did pose a challenge to Calvin’s theology. His ‘hermeneutic of transcendence’ and emphasis on ‘spiritual worship’ produced a suspicion of material things which meant that ‘God is always improperly worshiped in the visible symbol’; this was not because the material world is bad but because of the spiritual nature of God and the ever-present danger of idolatry in the fallen human mind. This produced a somewhat reluctant justification of material sacred signs based on human nature:

Forasmuche as we ar clogged with earthly bodies, it was nedeful for us, that God did institute sensible signes, to represent unto us spiritual and heavenly things: for otherwise we colde not comprehend them. Moreover it is necessary for us, that all our senses be exercised in his holy promises, that we might be the better stablished in the same.

The same anthropological point was made more positively in the Institutes: ‘because we have souls engrafted in bodies [God] imparts spiritual things under visible ones’ (4.14.3). In the Catechism Calvin went on to ask whether relying on sensible signs may be a ‘token of a weak faith’. He accepted this, because humans are weak, but emphasised that the efficacy of the sacraments is through the working of the Spirit not by the signs themselves. Pont’s Catechism made the same point briefly, ‘Cur instituta sacra sunt haec symbola? Infirma nostra ut sublevetur hinc fides’. The former Dominican John Craig taught the same: ‘Are we not infideles, when we nede signes? No, but rather we are waik in faith’ - but also expressed it more positively:

108 Eire, War against the Idols, 200-01.
109 Book of Common Order (1575), 127.
110 Calvin and McNeill, 1278. The Institutes (4.17.1) do, however, speak of our weakness in this context, ‘visible signs best adapted to our small capacity’, Calvin and McNeill, 1361.
111 Book of Common Order (1575), 130, 128-29, 125-26; cf. 140, 144 and Calvin, Institutes, 4.10.14, 4.17.1.
112 Pont, Parusus catechismus, fol. 6v, ‘Why were these sacred symbols instituted? that our weak faith might be raised up hence.’
It is natural to us, to understand heavenlye thingis by sensible and earthly thingis... [sacraments] speake to the eye, and the worde to the eare... May the worde be fruteful without the sacramentis? No doubt, but it worketh more plenteously with them... so [the] senses are moved to the conforte of our faith.\textsuperscript{113}

The basic doctrine of signs in the catechisms was, however, the same and it provided the necessary ground for liturgical interpretation, as is confirmed by the frequent use of the verb ‘signify’ and cognates such as ‘represent’ and ‘figure’ (‘significare’, ‘signare’, ‘figurare’).\textsuperscript{114} As with traditional liturgical interpretation this was taught in a context of allegorical or figurative interpretation of the Scriptures: for example Christ was anointed by the oil of the Holy Spirit, ‘whereof the outward anointing in the olde Testament was a figure’, and the Sabbath is ‘a figure to represent our spiritual rest’ and this figure ‘leadeth us to the truth of that thing whereof the Sabbath day is a figure’.\textsuperscript{115}

Behind this can be seen Calvin’s teaching on ceremonies as expressed in his Institutes. He criticised Catholic liturgical interpretation by attacking ‘those ceremonies under which the Romanist masters would have it that great mysteries exist’ (4.10.12) and ironically saying of the interpretation of the tonsure that ‘everything is in symbols, obviously because the veil of the Temple has not yet been rent’ (4.19.25).\textsuperscript{116} His criticism of the interpretation of the tonsure is interesting as he gave an historical explanation for the practice - the cutting off of long hair - but claimed it received its allegorical interpretation when the original reason was lost: ‘in a more corrupt age... because they saw no reason for clerical shaving... they resorted to mystery’ (4.19.27).\textsuperscript{117} Catholic ceremonies, however, were said to have been

\textsuperscript{113} Craig, A Short Sum, 69-71.

\textsuperscript{114} Book of Common Order (1575), 138-39; Pont, Paruus catechismus, fol. 7r; Adamson, Catechismus, 33-36; Craig, A Short Sum, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77-79.

\textsuperscript{115} Book of Common Order (1575), 15, 65, 69.

\textsuperscript{116} Calvin and McNeill, 1190, 1473. On the sacrament of extreme unction he states against the tradition of liturgical interpretation that ‘no deeper mystery underlies such ceremonies’ (Institutes 4.19.18), Calvin and McNeill, 1466.

\textsuperscript{117} Calvin and McNeill, 1475.
derived from paganism and Judaism and were thus illicit but, as has been seen in his *Catechism*, Calvin did allow a positive appreciation of Christian ceremonies, even those added to the sacraments in the post-Apostolic era ‘to enhance the dignity of the mystery’ (4.10.19).\(^{118}\) They should be educational (4.10.12); they should show forth Christ (4.10.14) and lead people to him (4.10.15; 4.10.29); and they should be ‘exercises of piety’ (4.10.29). The purpose of preaching on the sacraments was to interpret the liturgy, or to ‘make us understand what the visible sign means’ (4.14.4), because ‘the signification [of the sacrament] is contained in the promises which are implicit in the sign’ (4.17.11).\(^{119}\) Calvin thus shared the concern of humanist Catholic Reformers with the educational purpose of liturgical interpretation. His attack on traditional liturgical interpretation was not an attack on symbolic interpretation of the liturgy in general but rather on the interpretations attached to rites that do not accord with his fundamental scriptural principle for the regulation of worship. He followed Augustine in saying that rites which do accord with this are few and simple:

> Instead of many signs there are now but a few signs, simple when performed, inspiring when understood, and holy when practised, given to us by the teaching of the Lord himself and the apostles, such as the sacrament of baptism and the celebration of the Lord’s body and blood. When an individual understands these, he recognises with an inner knowledge what they relate to.\(^{120}\)

This Reformed Augustinian theology of sacramental signs was found in all the Scottish catechisms and can be seen in the way that they interpreted the visible signs of baptism and the Lord’s Supper.

*e. Interpreting baptism in the Reformed catechisms*

There were two essential material signs in the Reformed rite of baptism: the water and putting it on the baby’s head.\(^{121}\) The only other aspect of the rite that was

---

\(^{118}\) Calvin and McNeill, 1198.

\(^{119}\) Calvin and McNeill, 1279, 1372.

\(^{120}\) DDC 3.31-32 (Green, 147); cf. *Institutes* 4.10.14.

\(^{121}\) *Book of Common Order* (1575), 91-115, at 113-14. The rest of the rite consists of the request for baptism, an exhortation, the recitation and explanation of the creed and prayers.
interpreted in the catechisms was the baptism of infants which was said to symbolise ‘the expresse signe of God’s bountiful mercie towards our children’, as in the Old Testament sacrament of circumcision. The two essential signs were given two interpretations in the ‘Little Catechism’ of the Book of Common Order:

First [baptism] signifieth that we have forgiveness of our sins by the blood of Christ. Secondly it setteth before our eyes our regeneration or new spiritual birth.

Calvin’s Catechism, which was closely followed by the other Scottish catechisms, began with these two ‘significations’ and asked ‘what similitude hath water with those things that it may represent them?’ Ezekiel 36:25 and Hebrews 10:22 taught that forgiveness of sins was represented by washing with pure water and Hughes Old noted that this washing was the primary signification of baptism for Calvin whereas Zwingli, emphasised union with the burial of Christ. In speaking of washing, Calvin emphasised the separation of signum and res by insisting that the use of water was not a washing of our souls, something which is done by the blood of Christ alone and simply symbolised by the sprinkling of water.

The symbolism of regeneration had two aspects and Calvin’s Catechism taught that the mortification of our nature and our becoming new creatures by the Spirit was signified by: a) water being poured on the head ‘to signify that we are dead or

---

122 Book of Common Order (1575), 137.
123 Book of Common Order (1575), 152. The same two points are given in Pont, Adamson and Craig’s catechisms: Pont, Parusus catechismus, fol. 7r; Adamson, Catechismus, 68; Craig, A Short Sum, 74, and in the rite of baptism itself, Book of Common Order (1575), 95.
124 Book of Common Order (1575), 131.
125 Hughes Oliphant Old, The Shaping of the Reformed Baptismal Rite in the Sixteenth Century (Grand Rapids, 1992), 274-76. The same is found in the Second Helvetic Confession, chapter 20, ‘Of holy baptism’, Arthur C. Cochrane, Reformed Confessions of the Sixteenth Century (London, 1966), 282-83. The poem ‘The effect of the sacrament of baptism’ in the Gude and godlie ballatis, while criticising ‘dum ceremonies’ and referring the reader to ‘the Catechisme buke’, teaches ‘That worde and water outward represent... that Christis blude wescheis away the sin inwart’ but it also says that baptism is a sign of the drowning of the old Adam, of being buried in the death of Christ that one may rise with him, Mitchell, Gude and Godlie Ballatis, 14-16.
126 Book of Common Order (1575), 133.
buried’; b) the fact that the pouring lasts a short time and that one is not drowned is a figure of ‘rising to new life’. This was an adaptation of Paul’s teaching in Romans 6:3-4 that in baptism Christians die and are raised with Christ. Calvin applied this to a rite which only involved pouring or sprinkling water rather than the early Christian practice of full immersion which gave a much clearer and more dramatic symbolic portrayal of Paul’s doctrine. Zwingli had attempted to restore baptism by immersion, as the scriptural principle of worship would seem to have required, and thus he was able to retrieve the Pauline symbolism of burial but Calvin and the Scottish Kirk compromised and so were left with an unconvincing interpretation of the liturgy.

Hamilton’s Catechism dealt with the same problem of the discrepancy between scriptural teaching and contemporary ceremonial by relating the three pourings of water in the Catholic rite to the three days Christ lay in the tomb. In Calvin’s Institutes (4.15.9), where the two interpretations of mortification and washing are related to Israel crossing the Red Sea, Old noted that ‘the sign of mortification and vivification is, for Calvin, not to be found in a dramatic representation of the death and resurrection of Christ in baptismal immersion, but rather in the associations which water has come to have in the history of God’s mighty acts’. Craig’s Catechism followed Calvin very closely and had no greater emphasis on the action but, in his shorter commentary on baptism, he did give proportionally more space to ‘the death, burial and resurrection of Christ’. Scottish Calvinist liturgical interpretation thus focused on the element (water) rather than the action (pouring/immersion) and was also scripturally impoverished as it restricted emphasis on Paul’s major theme of participation in the death and resurrection of Christ. The baptismal rite and catechism of the Book of Common Order were likewise

127 Book of Common Order (1575), 132; Craig, A Short Sum, 75.
128 Maxwell, Genevan Service Book, 110. In the Institutes (4.15.19), Calvin recognises the antiquity of immersion but says with the medieval Schoolmen that immersion, pouring once or thrice or sprinkling are ‘details of no importance’, Calvin and McNeill, 1320; Old, Shaping of the Reformed Baptismal Rite, 264-74, 282.
129 Law, Catechism, 192.
130 Old, Shaping of the Reformed Baptismal Rite, 281.
131 Craig, A Short Sum, 75.
impoverished as they omit the baptismal symbolism of the Israelites passing through
the waters of the Red Sea and the salvation of Noah by water (1 Peter 3.20-21) which
were both found in the Book of Common Prayer.\footnote{132}

\textbf{f. Interpreting the Lord’s Supper in the catechisms}

Craig asked how baptism differed from the Supper and responded ‘In the elements,
action, rites and signification’.\footnote{133} The word ‘signification’ shows the importance of
liturgical interpretation in the Scottish Protestant understanding of the eucharist. In
the catechisms the interpretation of the eucharistic liturgy explained the signification
of both the bread and wine and the action in which they are used (‘the Action’ was a
common Scottish term for the Lord’s Supper).\footnote{134} Calvin’s \textit{Catechism} began the
discussion of the signification of the Supper by saying that the Lord represents his
body and blood to us by bread and wine,

\begin{quote}
To signifie unto us that what propertie the bread hath towards our bodies, that
is to fead and susteine them in this transitorie life, the self same propertie his
body hathe touching oure souls, that is, to nourishe them spiritually. And in
like manner, as the wine doeth strengthen, comfort and rejoyce man, even so
his blood is our ful joye, our comfort and spiritual strength.\footnote{135}
\end{quote}

As with Catholic interpretations, the \textit{Catechism} related the eucharist to the passion.
Bread and wine were used because they directed the faithful to the body and blood of
Christ, offered and shed in sacrifice, and so ‘the Lord’s Supper doeth direct us to the
death and passion of our Saviour Christ, to the intent that we may be partakers of the
vertere thereof’ (143). The sacrament was even better than preaching in showing
Christians that they receive Christ in faith because in the Lord’s Supper this ‘is more
evidently and plentiously set forthe unto us’ (142). Both elements and action had
their signification: the two signs of bread and wine were instituted to help our

\footnote{132 Cummings, \textit{Book of Common Prayer}, 142.}
\footnote{133 Craig, \textit{A Short Sum}, 76.}
\footnote{134 Maxwell, \textit{History of Worship}, 59; \textit{Genevan Service Book}, 127.}
\footnote{135 \textit{Book of Common Order} (1575), 139. Subsequent references in the text are to the page numbers in
this edition.}
infirmity and show that Christ alone is the food and drink of our soul (144), and
communion is repeated, as baptism is not, to symbolise that God will feed us
continually (145). There was also an anagogical interpretation: ‘if we will have the
substance of the sacrament we must lift up our hearts to heaven’ (142, new
numbering). This was an interpretation of the ‘sursum corda’ (‘lift up your hearts’) in
the Catholic and Prayer Book eucharistic rites which was only implicitly present in
the Book of Geneva where the exhortation in the ‘Order for the Lord’s Supper’ had,
just before the prayer of thanksgiving where it occurs in the traditional liturgy: ‘the
only waye to dispose our soules to receive norishment... is to lift up our mindes by
fayth above all thinges worldlye and sensible and therby to entre into heaven’.136

Craig’s Catechism, although briefer than Calvin’s, went further in interpreting the
action of the Lord’s Supper. After commenting on the signification of the bread and
wine, he goes on to ask:

What signifieth that breaking of that bread? The breaking and suffering of
Christis bodie upon the cross / What meaneth the powring out of the wyne?
The shedding of his blood even to the death / Whereunto then doth the
Supper lede us? Directly to the Crosse, and death of Christ... / What meaneth
the giving of that bread and wyne? The giving of Christis bodie and bloode to
our soules... What signifieth the taking of that breade and wyne? The
spirituall receaving of Christis bodie in our soules / What meaneth our
corporall eating and drinking here? Our spirituall feading upon the bodie and
bloode of Christ... / What meaneth the neare coniunction we have with meat
and drinke? That spirituall union, quhilk we have with Jesus Christ / What
signifieth the confort quhilke we receave of meat and drinke? The spirituall
frutes, quhilk we receave of Christ / Why is bothe meat and drink given here?
To testifie, that Christ onlie is the whole foode of our soules.137

More than Calvin’s Catechism this provided an interpretation of the rite in the same
way as the Catholic catechetical commentaries on the mass and, like them, it was
predominantly Christological and related the liturgical action to the passion and

136 The first part of this exhortation is taken from the Book of Common Prayer but the last, including
the extract quoted, is taken from Calvin, Maxwell, Genevan Service Book, 124, 132. See chapter 7,
pages 249, 253.

137 Craig, A Short Sum, 78-79.
death of Christ with the rites of the breaking of bread and pouring of wine being a sort of dramatic presentation of the death of Christ. The Second Helvetic Confession had a long consideration of the Lord’s Supper which it related to the death of Christ, but it lacked the interpretation of the rites performed which was found in Craig’s much briefer text.\(^{138}\) Calvin’s long discussion of the Supper in Institutes 4.17, much of which is an attack on transubstantiation, likewise did not give an interpretation of the action. When it discussed the signification of the bread and wine it emphasised the symbolism of food and union with Christ (4.17.1-2) not the symbolism of the cross and passion, although Calvin did say in passing that ‘the Sacrament sends us to the cross of Christ’ (17.1.4). This may have been because he opposed the sacrifice of the mass so strongly in the following chapter and did not wish the Reformed rite to have any association with it; he said that Christ has ‘given us a table at which to feast, not an altar upon which to offer a victim’ (4.18.12).\(^{139}\)

g. John Craig and Aberdeen

There is a unity to the Reformed liturgical interpretation discovered here because of the centrality of Calvin, but Craig’s Shorte summe of the whole catechism, published with his Negative Confession in 1581, stands out as being more interested in the liturgical action and more centred on the passion of Christ. Like Adamson’s poem at the beginning of this chapter, Craig’s work was influenced by his time in Aberdeen and probably also reflected the influence of controversy with Aberdeen Catholic reformers. He himself came from Catholic Reform circles, entering the Scottish Dominican Province in the mid-1530s under John Grierson and transferring to the Dominicans of Bologna on the advice of Cardinal Pole.\(^{140}\) He converted to Protestantism after encountering Calvin’s Institutes in 1557-58 and returned to Scotland, composing liturgical texts for the Reformed Kirk and serving as minister of


\(^{139}\) Calvin and McNeill, 1440.

St Nicholas, Aberdeen from 1573 to 1579.\textsuperscript{141} He was part of a concerted attempt to Protestantise the diocese after 1569 with Alexander Arbuthnot, Principal of King’s, and George Hay, parson of Rathven.\textsuperscript{142}

Craig’s preface to his \textit{Catechism} was dedicated ‘To the professoures of Christis Evangell at Newe Abirdene’, and he noted that because of ‘the greate and grosse ignorance of some among you: notwithstanding the cleare Light of the Evangell of long nowe shyning there’, he added certain questions to the catechism ‘chiefly in the matter of the sacramentis’.\textsuperscript{143} The impression is given that Protestantism is under attack by Catholics, or ‘prophane Atheistes and Apostates’, which fits the general mood in the country of anxiety about the future of Protestantism around 1580. Allan White’s thesis shows that this was particularly appropriate to Aberdeen where, although Catholicism was in retreat from the public sphere in New Aberdeen after 1574, it remained a powerful force in the burgh as well as in Old Aberdeen and the Gordon lands.\textsuperscript{144} Craig’s special emphasis on the sacraments and liturgy was probably, as in Adamson’s poem, the result of the legacy of the Aberdeen liturgists. It probably marked the end of their direct influence as, in charting the retreat of North-East Catholicism from town to country in the late sixteenth-century, White notes that as the pre-1560 chapter and other recusant priests died off and were not replaced by missionary priests, the Catholic families in Aberdeen after 1574 were deprived of the sacraments and that Roman Catholicism which survived in the North-East came to take its character from the Jesuits and other clergy trained on the continent, not the Elphinstone tradition.\textsuperscript{145}

\textsuperscript{141} He was one of those who prepared the orders for the general fast (1566) and for excommunication (1569) and he contributed fifteen psalms to the \textit{Psalm Book (Book of Common Order)} of 1564. Durkan, ‘Heresy in Scotland’, 356; AGA, 99, 166; Millar Patrick, \textit{Four Centuries of Scottish Psalmody} (London, 1949), 48-49.


\textsuperscript{143} Craig, \textit{A Short Sum}, 2-3.

\textsuperscript{144} Craig, \textit{A Short Sum}, 5-6; White, ‘Religion, Politics and Society’, 284-299.

\textsuperscript{145} White, ‘Religion, Politics and Society’, 172-77.
Conclusion

The official texts studied in this chapter show that liturgical interpretation had an important place in both rival versions of *reformatio ecclesiae* in mid-sixteenth century Scotland. In Hamilton’s Catholic Reform movement of the 1550s this was probably influenced by the ‘Aberdeen Liturgists’ and was certainly in continuity with the place of liturgical interpretation in Scottish Catholic religious culture uncovered in Part B. Worship was also central for the Protestant Reformers and their catechisms confirm the evidence of Adamson’s poem that there was a Reformed version of liturgical interpretation. This was primarily distinguished from the traditional version by explaining a liturgy determined by the (more or less) exclusive scriptural principle of worship. A Reformed Augustinian theology of sacramental signs provided the ground for this, as it had done for early Latin liturgical interpretation, and it thus used a very similar method to the traditional version, sharing with the humanist catechetical tradition a concern for education and simplicity. It seems to be more interested in material elements than the actions but this will be examined in the next chapter when these conclusions can be tested on controversial literature and Robert Bruce’s sermons.
Chapter 7: Controversy and Reformed Liturgical Interpretation

The last chapter demonstrated that there were two main styles of liturgical interpretation in this period, associated respectively with Catholic and Protestant Scottish Reformers. This chapter examines their place in the different stages of controversy between these two forms of *reformatio ecclesiae* and concludes by defining the nature of Reformed liturgical interpretation. As the brief references to Erasmus and Luther in chapter 1 have shown, liturgical interpretation was a controversial issue in early sixteenth-century humanism and evangelicalism.\(^1\) There is, however, no evidence of it being in dispute in Scotland until Wishart’s trial in 1546 and Knox’s 1547 debate with Winram.\(^2\) This suggests that the exclusive scriptural principle for regulating worship associated with Wishart and Knox combined with the Protestant attack on the mass and idolatry to bring liturgical interpretation for a short while to the centre of controversy. The main sources are Scottish controversial literature, which will be studied in chronological units to see how the place of liturgical interpretation changed over time, and two examples of Scottish Reformed liturgical commentary: *Ane Breif Gathering of the Halie Signes* (1565) and Robert Bruce’s 1590 sermons.

1) Liturgical interpretation in Scottish Reformation controversial literature

a. Background and the influence of Wishart and Knox

The humanist critique of the Scottish Church by Sir David Lyndsay, with its attack on clerical immorality and advocacy of preaching, was close to the programme of the Catholic Provincial Councils and generally avoided theological issues such as the sacraments.\(^3\) It criticised aspects of contemporary Catholic devotion such as image-worship and pilgrimages but was not concerned with the liturgy as such, although

---

1 Chapter 1, pages 37-38.

2 See chapter 6, pages 215-16.

3 Carol Edington, *Court and Culture in Renaissance Scotland: Sir David Lindsay of the Mount* (Amherst, 1994), 47-48, 186-93.
liturgy does appear in Lyndsay’s works. He was aware of liturgical interpretation, as seen in his interpretation of the white rochet of a canon regular as symbolising a ‘clene lyfe’, but it was not a matter of dispute. He did, however, in his Complaynt (1530) call for the clergy to ‘trewly use the sacramentis / efter Christis institutionis / Levying thare vaine traditionis’, and made a similar point almost two decades later in Ane Dialog. If this were only found in the latter work it could be taken for evidence of the influence of Knox but it more likely reflected the Erasmian critique of ceremonies.

Like Lyndsay’s works, the explicitly Protestant Gude and Godlie Ballatis became a standard text in early Protestant Scotland. Probably put together by the Wedderburn brothers in the 1540s, some of the pieces also criticised human traditions in worship and called on priests to celebrate the sacraments as Christ had commanded in the New Testament. Unlike Lyndsay’s work, however, they contained an explicit attack on the mass and the one passing mention of liturgical interpretation, of the tripartite division of the host, is in the context of this attack. Although there were various examples of iconoclasm in the 1530s and 40s, the sacraments and liturgy do not, however, seem to have been of central importance in the controversial strategies or devotional life of early Scottish Protestantism.

As for example the mention of liturgy ‘Secundum Usum Sarum’ and the Mattins of St Mungo in The Testament of the Papyngo, Lyndsay Selected Poems, 82 (700, 704). Edington suggests that he may have avoided commenting on the sacraments because it was too dangerous, Edington, Court and Culture, 189.

Lyndsay, Selected Poems, 54 (416-18); Lyndsay, Poetical Works, iii, 37 (2573-77) cf. 116 (4821) and 131 (5239-41).

Mitchell, Gude and Godlie Ballates.


Mitchell, Gude and Godlie Ballates, 210. It is similar to the mention of the same interpretation in Adamson’s poem, chapter 6, page 196.

Gau’s *The right way to the Kingdom of Heuine* (1533) and were not prominent in the charges against Patrick Hamilton.\(^{10}\) Alec Ryrie has demonstrated that before 1559 there were few if any ‘privy kirks’ outside the small group in Edinburgh and he has argued that for Scottish Protestants before 1559 the Lord’s Supper ‘was still a peripheral part of their religious lives’.\(^{11}\)

Ryrie has also argued that the Scottish Protestant movement before 1559 was ‘more diverse, more disorganised and more doctrinally untidy’ than traditional historiography allows.\(^{12}\) It would appear to have been Knox who attempted to tidy it up, both historiographically in his *History* and in practice by his preaching, teaching and influence. Associated with Knox’s influence is a turn in Scottish Protestantism from the late 1540s, noticed by Ryrie who associates it with a turn from Lutheranism to Calvinism, towards putting the sacraments, and thus the liturgy, at the centre of controversy.\(^{13}\) Two of Knox’s core principles seem to have been important in this, firstly the exclusive scriptural principle of worship discussed in the last chapter and secondly an insistence on total abstention from idolatrous worship, as in Calvin’s campaign against the Nicodemites. Ryrie calls the latter ‘perhaps [Knox’s] most distinctive contribution to the Scottish Reformation’.\(^{14}\) It was seen in action when Knox and his companions refused to hear mass while in captivity, when he persuaded some of the leading Protestants at the house of Erskine of Dun in 1555 to avoid attending mass and when he and his companions refused compromise in

---


12 Ryrie, ‘Congregations’, 58.


14 Ryrie, ‘Congregations’, 73.
Knox made this principle a central plank of the Scottish Protestant Reformation, as shown by his Perth sermon on 11 May 1559 and his opposition to the Queen’s mass.\footnote{Knox, \textit{History}, i, 107-08, 120-21, 147, 152.}

It was, however, the exclusive scriptural principle that provoked the first extant uses of liturgical interpretation in controversy in 1546-47, as discussed in the last chapter, and three years later Knox used various aspects of liturgical interpretation in his sermon preached before Bishop Tunstall of Durham, \textit{A Vindication of the Doctrine that the Sacrifice of the Mass is Idolatry}. The first aspect was an historical analysis which took issue with the common Catholic teaching on the development of the mass that traced its origin from Christ and recorded the various ceremonies added over time by Popes. This is found, for example, in the \textit{Liber Pontificalis} and \textit{Rationale}. Already in the thirteenth century Durandus had noted heretics who objected to such additions to the ‘primitive mass’ (\textit{Rationale} 4.1.8), but Knox, while accepting the historical information that Popes did add ceremonies, went further by denying that there was any connection between the sacrament ordained by Christ and the mass, a theme developed in \textit{Ane Breif Gathering} (1565) to be studied below.\footnote{Chapter 7, pp.258-64. Knox, \textit{Works}, iii, 48-49. The critical edition of the \textit{Rationale}, i, 240-41, gives references to the \textit{Liber Pontificalis}.}

The second aspect was an etymological analysis which questioned the false derivation of the word ‘\textit{missa}’ from the Hebrew ‘\textit{Missah}’ or oblation, cited by Johann Reuchlin (1455-1522) and used against Zwingli in the First Zürich Disputation of 1523.\footnote{Keith D. Lewis, ‘\textit{Unica Oblatio Christi}: Eucharistic Sacrifice and the first Zurich Disputation’, \textit{Renaissance and Reformation} 17.3 (1993), 19-42, at 29; Johannes Reuchlin, \textit{De rudimentis hebraicis libri III} (Pforzheim, 1506; reprint: Hildesheim, 1974), 289. This use of humanist learning is also reflected in Knox’s criticism of the barbarous Latinity of the Roman Canon, Knox, \textit{Works}, iii, 49.} Knox’s purpose was to argue that the association of the mass with a sacrificial offering was a human invention, but Durandus interpreted the etymology of ‘\textit{missa}’ correctly as a Latin derivation from the liturgical dismissal ‘\textit{ite missa est}’ and he...
allegorised it as relating to Christ who was sent (missa est) from the Father (Rationale 4.1.48-49).\textsuperscript{19}

If history and etymology are not definitive proof that Knox was arguing on the territory of liturgical interpretation, this was provided when he criticised the addition of ‘enim’ to the words of consecration in the Roman canon (‘hoc est enim corpus meum’; ‘for this is my body’). In this he invoked a third aspect of its method, allegory. The addition of ‘enim’ first appeared in the thirteenth century, possibly inserted to affirm the doctrine of transubstantiation defined at Lateran IV, but Durandus only commented on the four words ‘hoc est corpus meum’ (Rationale 4.41.15) and actually attacked any addition to this formula as a sin (Rationale 4.41.46).\textsuperscript{20} Knox, however, called ‘enim’ a human invention and attacked the allegorical interpretation of the new five-word formula as relating to Mary’s five words at the Annunciation ‘fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum’ (‘let it be done to me according to your word’ - thus linking transubstantiation and the incarnation), exclaiming ironically, ‘O! Hier mak thai a great matter, and heir lyeth a secreit misterie’.\textsuperscript{21} The ironic use of ‘mystery’ is not uncommon in attacks on Catholic liturgical interpretation but the context is usually polemic against non-scriptural elements in worship, not against liturgical interpretation itself.

A fourth aspect of liturgical interpretation was attacked when Knox criticised sacerdotal vestments because they were based on the vestments of the Old Testament priesthood (as Durandus had admitted in Book 3 of the Rationale) not on the example of Christ and the Apostles.\textsuperscript{22} This reveals a fundamental divergence in the theology of liturgy. For classical Catholic liturgical interpretation, the ceremonies of the liturgy developed over time, vary in time and place and these diverse ceremonies may be interpreted using the whole of Scripture, Catholic theology and natural

\textsuperscript{19} Knox, Works, iii, 47; Jungmann, Mass of the Roman Rite, i, 173-75. A similar discussion is found in, Ane Breif Gathering, 22-23.


\textsuperscript{21} Knox, Works, iii, 50.

\textsuperscript{22} Knox, Works, iii, 66-67.
symbolism. Christian vestments may thus be related to those of the Old Testament, but for Knox this association with the vestments of the Law was a denial of the new covenant in Christ: ‘will thai set up agane the Leviticall Preistheid?’ Knox’s attack here was more explicitly on the traditional method of liturgical interpretation even if the main target was non-scriptural vestments. His simple literalism, which has no explicit place for liturgical development, was set against traditional liturgical interpretation’s rich but somewhat ahistorical symbolism grounded in an implicit acceptance of historical development.

b. Interpreting the sacraments against the Protestants on the eve of the crisis
The only vernacular Catholic controversial treatise printed in Scotland in the 1550s, *Ane Compendius Tractive* (Edinburgh, 1558) by Quintin Kennedy (c.1520–1564), discussed liturgical ceremonies but only alluded to liturgical interpretation. Evidence of the use of the methods of liturgical interpretation in controversy with Protestants is, however, found in the printed chapter sermons of Adam Eldar, monk of Kinloss (Paris, 1558) and the undated marginalia in a Bible owned from 1540 by a monk of Pluscarden Priory.

Kennedy was abbot-commendator of Crossraguel from 1547 and was educated at St Andrews and Paris. Members of his family were prominent Protestants, for example his brother the Earl of Cassillis and his cousin the Earl of Argyll, but the eirenic tone of the treatise, its conciliarism, criticism of abuses and praise of ‘the excellent clerke Erasme’, together with his presence at the Provincial Council of 1549, places him firmly as a Catholic Reformer of the same stamp as Archbishop Hamilton. The *Tractive* went to the heart of the Reformation debate, the question of Christian authority, by teaching that the Church assembled in General Councils and

---

not Scripture alone, was itself the judge of the right understanding of God’s Word. This implicitly rejected the Reformed principle for the regulation of worship and Kennedy called for a middle way (‘the myddis’) between defending superstitious abuses and condemning all new developments that have come into the Church after the apostolic age. He taught that ‘thair ar divers thingis mon be belevit quiklikis are agreeable with Goddis word and ar not expreslie contenit in Scripture’, and that matters of religion such as ceremonies might be altered as times and conditions change. This is very different from Knox’s view but the point about the alteration of ceremonies agreed with the official teaching of the Reformed Church of England and was to be made two years later in similar words in the Scots Confession. Divisions between ‘Catholic’ and ‘Protestant’ were not as simple as Knox’s History suggests.

Kennedy did not directly engage with the interpretation of the liturgy in his treatise but he did speak of the danger of ‘usand and interpretand the sacramentis’ according to private opinion and of the educational purpose of the liturgy:

Be the outwart ceremonies we ar brocht to ye mair perfect knowledge of God conforme to the doctrine of al men of godlie learnyng.

This recalls the educational use of liturgical interpretation discussed in chapter 4 and it implies that ceremonies and their right interpretation are thus part of the ‘rycht understandyng of Goddis Worde’ which is under threat from sola Scriptura Protestantism.

Adam Elder (d.1567) had also studied at Paris before becoming a Cistercian monk under Robert Reid at Kinloss c.1530. His Latin chapter discourses, published at

---

27 Wodrow Miscellany, 99-103.
28 Wodrow Miscellany, 143.
29 Wodrow Miscellany, 127, 155.
30 Hazlett, 280. See chapter 6, page 218.
31 Wodrow Miscellany, 130, 146.
Paris in 1558, contained a number of violent attacks on Protestantism especially in the Corpus Christi sermon. They also included many references to the liturgy. In his sermon on the feast of the dedication of the abbey church he defended the liturgy for the consecration of a church against the Protestants. He argued that as the priests of the Old Law, who offered animals, had sacred vestments, it is even more fitting that the priests of the New Law, who offer the body and blood of Christ, should be clothed in sacred vestments; likewise he argued that the dedication of a Christian church should be even more honourable than the dedication of the old Temple. This is exactly the same argument used by Durandus in Rationale 1.6.1, which does not prove that Elder derived it from a liturgical commentary but does show that an aspect of the methodology of liturgical interpretation was used to defend Catholic liturgy against the Protestants.

Thomas Ross (c.1525-c.1595) was a Benedictine monk of Pluscarden Priory in Moray, near Kinloss, who continued a Catholic ministry in the area until the 1590s. His Vulgate Bible was given to him in 1540, probably when he entered the monastery. It contains many marginal notes and underlinings by Ross which cannot be dated exactly but seem to have been made in the first half of his monastic life, as some suggest a young man getting to grips with Latin and the Scriptures and others suggest a Catholic responding to the impact of Protestantism in his locality. In the Bible’s paratext is a collection of scriptural verses entitled ‘ad sacrarum litterarum studium exhortatio ex sacris literis’, in which Ross has marked a composite of the words of Moses in Deuteronomy 4:2, 12:8 & 32:

32 W. Forbes Leith, Pre-Reformation Scholars in Scotland (Glasgow, 1915), 56; Stuart, Records of Kinloss, 51.
33 Adam Eldar, Strenae sive Conciones Capitulares (Paris, 1558), 43, 82-93, 106, 186. The sermons on Corpus Christi and St Bernard are also printed in Stuart, Records of Kinloss, 66-91.
34 Eldar, Strenae, 186, 188.
36 Vulgate Bible (Lyons, 1514 x 1531), NLS BCL.A648 (ESL, 140), henceforth Ross Bible.
You shall not each do what seems good to yourself; but what I command you, this only should one do for the Lord: neither add anything, nor take anything away.\textsuperscript{37}

As noted in chapter 6, these texts were important for John Knox’s formulation of the exclusive scriptural principle of worship in 1547 and he did explicitly use this composite.\textsuperscript{38} That the Catholic Ross marked this text, and also added to his Bible the Reformed numbering of the commandments with its second commandment against idolatry, suggests that he was engaging with Protestantism on controverted liturgical topics.

Confirmation of this is found in his marginalia which marked a number of disputed areas. He wrote ‘\textit{sacramentum penitentiae}’ (sacrament of penance) by 4 Esdras 2:4-7, ‘go, my sons, and ask mercy from the Lord’, thus implying that this is a direct foreshadowing of the Catholic sacrament of penance.\textsuperscript{39} On the same page he also marked the words ‘the names of those who reject my sacrament (\textit{sacramentum}) will be blotted out from the earth’, which suggests the Protestant rejection of five Catholic sacraments including penance. Elsewhere he wrote ‘\textit{aqua sancta}’ (holy water) by Numbers 5:16-17 and ‘\textit{exorciste}’ by Acts 19 on the false exorcists, a text used by Calvin against the Catholic minor order of exorcists (\textit{Institutes} 4.19.24).\textsuperscript{40} When Ross wrote the numbers one to nine in the margins of Job 7 to 19 and added ‘\textit{parce mihi, Domine}’ to the top of the first page, he reveals he has marked the nine readings of the \textit{Dirige}, matins of the office of the dead, which began with these words.\textsuperscript{41} He may have simply done this for practical use in the liturgy but, as the

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{Exhortation from the Bible to study the Bible’}, \textit{Ross Bible}, p.vii.

\textsuperscript{38} See chapter 6, pages 215 and 218. Knox used the composite in \textit{A Brief Exhortation to England} (1559); a 15 October 1559 letter to Anna Lock; and \textit{An Answer to a Letter of a Jesuit Named Tyrie} (1572); a slightly different version is in \textit{A Vindication of the Doctrine that the Sacrifice of the Mass is Idolatry}, Knox, Works, v, 515; vi, 84; vi, 488; iii, 37.

\textsuperscript{39} \textit{Ross Bible}, fol. 201v. He writes ‘\textit{sacramentum}’ by each use of this word in Ephesians 1-3, fol. 506v.

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Ross Bible}, fols 52v and 483v.

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{Ross Bible}, fols 230r-232v. The numbers are at the incipits of each reading.
readings and responses were generally supplied in breviaries, he may have marked the passages to provide scriptural grounding to defend prayer for the dead.

Ross also marked a series of passages found in the liturgical texts of rites rejected by Protestants (and also found in the Rationale). He may have used these Old Testament texts from the liturgy to defend these rites on the scriptural grounds suggested by the quote from Deuteronomy he had marked in the paratext, as Alexander Arbuckle had offered to do in debate with Knox in 1547. Six times Ross wrote the word ‘altare’ in the margin, beginning with the first altar in salvation history, built by Noah (Gen 8:20), then moving through Genesis and Exodus until the last ‘altare’ by the instructions for the making of the altar of burnt offerings in Exodus 38:1. It seems at first as if he was simply marking each occurrence of the word up to the making of the Tabernacle, as he elsewhere noted all the Old Testament covenants, but he left out certain altars (such as those in Genesis 13:18 and Exodus 17:15) and wrote ‘lapis bethel altare’ by Jacob’s erection of a pillar at Bethel (Gen 28:18) where the word ‘altare’ is not used in the text. What he was actually doing was marking all the Old Testament altars mentioned in the liturgical prefaces for the consecration of an altar and a portable altar in the Pontificale. Similarly he wrote ‘unctio’ (anointing) by four Old Testament texts which were all found in the Rationale of Durandus. When he wrote sacra unctione by the return of the dove to Noah’s ark, where there is no mention of oil or anointing, Ross revealed his liturgical source to have been the preface for the consecration of chrism by the bishop on Holy Thursday which included the image of the return of the dove to the ark and all the texts marked by Ross - the only place in the liturgy where all occurred together.

---

42 See chapter 6, page 215.

43 Ross Bible, fols 3v, 5r-v, 8v, 10v, 11v, 29v, 37r; Andrieu, Pontifical roman, iii, 492-93, 503.

44 Ross Bible, fols 3v (Genesis 8:11; Rationale 6.84.29-33); 34r (Exodus 30:31-31:10-11; Rationale 1.8.1-2); 246v (Psalm 44:8; Rationale 1.7.30 and 6.74.36); 257r (Psalm 103:14-15; Rationale 6.84.29-33); Andrieu, Pontifical roman, i, 224; iii, 578.

45 This preface is first found in the Gelasian Sacramentary; it then, slightly modified, entered the Pontifical of Durandus and the Roman Pontifical, Pierre de Puniet, Le Pontifical Romain: Histoire et Commentaire, 2 vols (Louvain, 1930), ii, 319-42; Petrus Sifferin, Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Aeclesiae (Cod. Vatican. Regin. Lat. 316) Sacramentarium Gelasianum (Rome, 1959), 385-88;
The use of the Old Testament texts in these liturgical prefaces to interpret Christian liturgy was characteristic of the method of liturgical interpretation found in the *Rationale* whereas Hamilton’s *Catechism* only used New Testament texts in discussing anointing. While the monastic writer of the marginalia in the Dunfermline copy of Biel’s *Scrii canonis missae expositio* discussed in chapter 4 was interested in the controverted theological subjects of transubstantiation, prayer for the dead and invocation of the saints, Ross’s marginalia suggests that he was using his Bible as a resource to defend Catholic liturgy, not sacramental theology (texts used to defend the real presence and sacrifice of the mass are not marked). He seems to have been responding to those who held the exclusive scriptural principle of worship, suggested by the Deuteronomy text he marked in the paratext, by defending Catholic liturgy on scriptural grounds in the same way as Eldar defended the Catholic rite for the consecration of a church from the Old Testament. This is not certain but is implied by the cumulative evidence. It thus seems possible that Pluscarden, or at least Ross, was influenced by the liturgically-aware Catholic Reform associated with Aberdeen and Kinloss.

c. Polemical literature from Mary’s personal rule

Liturgical interpretation was most likely to be found in controversy about the liturgy and sacraments. Although religious controversy continued throughout the period, the most significant polemical texts on these subjects after the Protestant Revolution of 1559-60 fall into two groups, one published during the years 1561-65 and the other from 1577-81.

The key figure in the first group, from the first years of the personal rule of Mary, Queen of Scots, was Quintin Kennedy from whom, in addition to his *Compendious Tractive*, there are three manuscript tracts, the *Breif Tractate, Ane Oratioune*, addressed to the Lords of the Congregation, and *Ane Compendious Ressonyng*, together with the records of his Maybole disputation with Knox. There are also two

extant treatises attacking him by John Davidson and George Hay, together with a hostile 1564 epitaph by Adamson at the end of his *De papistarum superstitionis*.46 In addition to this there is also the record of a dispute between René Benoist, chaplain to the Queen, and David Ferguson, minister of Dunfermline, and the writings of the most important Catholic controversialist of the generation, Ninian Winzet. At the end of this period, *Ane Breif Gathering of the Halie Signes* (which will be discussed at the end of this chapter) was published in 1565 at Edinburgh as a response to Winzet’s 1563 *Buke of Four Scoir Thre Questionis*.47 These texts will be examined to see if and how they use liturgical interpretation.

Kennedy was said by Knox to have been an associate of Archbishop Hamilton and his 1561 manuscript tracts link him with the Catholic Reformers of Aberdeen and Lothian studied in Part B.48 The only complete copy of *Ane Litil Breif Tracteit* was copied on 3 August 1561 by Alexander Wood, chaplain in Old Aberdeen and an incomplete copy was owned and corrected by John Greenlaw of Haddington who had it bound with his copy of Kennedy’s 1558 *Compendius Tractive*, to which he also added in his own hand a version of the appendix to Kennedy’s *Compendius Ressononyng*.49 The *Breif Tractate* used John 6 to defend the real presence of Christ and taught that the body of Christ in the sacrament had ‘flesche, bluide and bonis’, recalling the texts on the Galloway group of sacrament houses studied in chapter 5.

Kennedy’s main concern in his three manuscript tracts was the defence of the mass against the attacks of the preachers of the Congregation, especially Knox.50 Transferring the argument against *sola Scriptura* used in his *Compendious Tractive* to the field of eucharistic theology, his main target of attack was Knox’s syllogism in his 1550 *Vindication*.51 *Ane Oratioun* directly refuted the syllogism using the Bible,

---

47 *Ane Breif Gathering*, fols A3r-v.
49 Kuipers, *Kennedy*, 104-08.
51 See chapter 6, page 214.
Fathers, Luther and even the Book of Common Order. The Compendious Ressonyng set up the syllogism at the head of the debate and then, as Kennedy also does in the Breif Tractate, demonstrated that the mass was instituted by Christ and is in accord with the teaching of Scripture as well as with Church tradition. All the treatises touched on aspects of the method of liturgical interpretation such as the etymology of ‘missa’, liturgical history, the meaning of the ceremonial law of the Old Testament, allegory and the presence of the passion in baptism and the eucharist.52

The Compendious Ressonyng took the form of a dialogue between Kennedy and his youngest brother, James Kennedy of Ochterlour. After James agreed that the mass was instituted by Christ, he then asked his brother to explain ‘the oratiouns and cerimoniiis usit in the mess’ which he did in an appendix to the tract that in part has the form of a liturgical commentary.53 The abbot made a distinction between discussing these ‘prayers and ceremonies’ and the ‘substance and effect’ of the mass: the distinction between liturgical interpretation and sacramental theology. The inclusion of an appendix on liturgical interpretation and Greenlaw’s decision to copy it as a discrete unit suggests that after the revolution of 1559-60, when Knox was the main preacher of the Congregation, the ceremonies he rejected as idolatrous rather than merely indifferent became an important part of the inter-confessional debate. If one could have shown that they were legitimate and that their interpretation had a significant educational or spiritual role, then a deadly blow would have been struck against the Reformed critique of Catholic worship. Kennedy responded to criticisms that the mass was not instituted by Christ, that mass is offered for animals and that its vestments and ceremonies are illicit in the same order in which these topics occur in Knox’s Vindication which suggests that he was responding directly to this work.54

In the Ressonyng James Kennedy criticised Catholic ceremonies in the name of ‘we of the new learning’ and the abbot responded by showing that the ‘outwart ceremoniiis’ used in the mass ‘ar aggreable with Goddis worde’, and that they

52 Kuipers, Kennedy, 117, 135, 155, 157, 159.
53 Kuipers, Kennedy, 174-83.
testifeis the inwarte fervour and devotioun, and geifis gude exemple to utheris, as did oure salveour quhen he wische his disciplis feit. Lykwyse be outwarte cerominiis we ar brocht to the mair perfyt knawlege of God, conforme to the doctrine of all men of godlie learning; sua that, gif ye tak away the cerominiis and uther godlie customes usit in the kirk for to decoir the service of God be proces of tyme the peple in the warld sall forget thair is ane God.\textsuperscript{55}

Liturgical ceremonies were thus an outward sign of inward devotion; they gave a good example and adorned the sacraments. The last is rather like Trent’s teaching that ceremonies ‘enhance the majesty of the sacrifice’. Unlike Trent, however, which concentrated solely on sacramental theology, Kennedy’s teaching was directly related to allegorical liturgical interpretation: for example, the sign of the cross recalls Christ’s victory; raising hands in prayer in the liturgy recalls Moses in Exodus 17; the elevation of the host at mass causes one to remember Christ on the cross; the adoration of the uplifted host recalls the adoration of the Magi; and the priest’s vestments represent Christ in his passion.\textsuperscript{56} His interpretation of the priest’s vestments followed the passion symbolism found in the \textit{Rationale} and in Watson’s 1558 \textit{Holsome and Catholyke Doctryne}.\textsuperscript{57} At the end of the appendix Kennedy used the same argument as Adam Eldar: if God’s word commanded the priests of the Old Law to have gorgeous vestments ‘how mekle mair it is aggreaile’ it is for the ministers of the new Law, who offer a greater sacrifice, to have decent apparel.\textsuperscript{58} In all this, the prime purpose of vestments and ceremonies for Kennedy was to remember such things as the passion of Christ because without them one would even forget God. This implies that these outward rites were particularly fitted to assist the

\textsuperscript{55} Kuipers, \textit{Kennedy}, 178-79.


\textsuperscript{57} See chapter 2, page 54-56. Kuipers suggests that Kennedy’s source was William of Middleton but he differs from both Durandus and Kennedy in not having the priest’s belt represent the scourge, Kuipers, \textit{Kennedy}, 212.

\textsuperscript{58} See above, page 239; Kuipers, \textit{Kennedy}, 180.
limitations of human nature. Knox’s scriptural principle of worship thus brought liturgical interpretation into controversy and provoked Kennedy to show that the ceremonies are both scriptural (or at least not contrary to Scripture) and useful.

Kennedy’s defence of the mass in the face of the political victory of the Congregation provoked a response. George Hay complained that

This our Abbote hath continually barked from the beginning of this mercyful visitation of our God and reformation in Scotland, yea, and set forthe some things that be planely red and everie where to be found.⁵⁹

Kennedy engaged Knox and Hay in debate, which produced two publications in 1563. In the same year John Davidson, Principal of Glasgow University and an Aberdonian educated at King’s whose conversion to Protestantism shocked Giovanni Ferrerio, published Ane Answer to the Compendius Tractive (Edinburgh, 1563).⁶⁰ Davidson’s Answer concerned the question of authority raised in Kennedy’s 1558 work and did not discuss liturgy, but the mass was the subject of the disputations with Knox and Hay.

In Knox and Kennedy’s 1562 scholastic disputation on the mass, printed by Knox in 1563, Kennedy began by directing attention to ‘the substance, institution and effect’ of the mass. Knox swiftly tried to divert him from sacramental theology to ‘the ceremonies used in the mass’ because these were held to be ‘substantiall partes thereof’, but Kennedy resisted this.⁶¹ Knox was trying to move this discussion on the origins of the mass to what he believed to be his opponent’s weak point, thus showing how the interpretation of ceremonies became important in controversial literature after 1560. Kennedy did agree to show that the ceremonies are ‘aggreable with Goddes word’, but Knox stuck doggedly to the syllogism in his Vindication and

⁵⁹ George Hay, The Confutation of the Abbote of Crosraguels Masse (Edinburgh, 1563), 1r [B1r].

⁶⁰ Durkan and Kirk, University of Glasgow, 216-17; Knox, History, ii, 57. A proposed disputation with John Willock in 1559 on the mass did not happen, Wodrow Miscellany, 265-77.

⁶¹ John Knox, Heir Followeth the Coppie of the Ressoning which was betuix the Abbote of Crosraguell and John Knox, in Mablyill concerning the Masse (Edinburgh, 1563); Knox, Works, vi, 196-97.
this remained the controlling principle for all these controversial texts. The disputation, however, got bogged down in disputes about Melchisedek and the sacrifice of the mass and did not in fact move on to the ceremonies. It ended with a quotation from Jesus’ attack on the human traditions of the Pharisees in Matthew 15:13, ‘Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up’, which is also on the title page of Adamson’s 1564 poem and the 1563 Breif Gathering. The use of this text suggests a consistent Protestant controversial policy which only directs attention to the interpretation of ceremonies in order to destroy both them and the mass. What has been missing so far is evidence of Reformed liturgical interpretation as found in the Protestant Catechisms.

George Hay’s *Confutation of the Abbot of Crossraguel's Masse* (Edinburgh, 1563), a refutation of Kennedy’s *Compendious Ressonyng*, also had Matthew 15:13 on its title page and proclaimed Knox’s syllogism as its basic principle. Hay attacked the mass and the word ‘missa’ as of human origin but made the important distinction that while Deuteronomy taught that some ceremonies ordained by God may not be changed, others may be changed according to time and place ‘at the determination of the church’, for example changing the time of the celebration of the Lord’s Supper from evening to morning. Celebrating the Supper in the morning was justified by an allegorical interpretation: ‘the morning tyme is a certain monument of the Resurrection of our Saviour which is not to be despysed in this holy mysterie’. Hay gave other examples of Protestant liturgical interpretation. The bread and wine of the Lord’s Supper meant ‘refection, nurishment, feading and confert of man’s body’ and were ‘a figure’ of the Christian’s nourishment from the body of Christ and spiritual drinking of the blood of Christ; they also, with a reference to Aristotle, signified friendship. The Lord’s Supper was prefigured by the paschal lamb.

62 Hay, *Confutation*, fol. 5r, cf 8v. It also says that any boy reading Calvin’s catechism could refute Kennedy, fol. 3v.

63 Hay, *Confutation*, fols 38r, 40v, cf 39r.

64 Hay, *Confutation*, fol. 38r. The same interpretation is found in *Rationale* 4.1.20 on celebrating mass in the morning.

65 Hay, *Confutation*, fols 59v, 38r.
something Catholics used to defend the sacrifice of the mass, but Hay preserved this figure for Protestants by a distinction:

The sacrament of the Pasover conteynd a Sacrifice and a banked [banquet], the one to forewarne of that eternal Sacrifice of the Croce, whiche was ones perfyted and never reiterated, the other to instruct of the Lordes Table.\textsuperscript{66}

Hay had a humanist suspicion of allegory, saying that Paul only used it for decoration and Fathers such as Origen often got carried away by it. He did, however, allow a place for allegories: ‘in some places being used modestlie, they may be receaved in doctryne of admonition’.\textsuperscript{67} When, however, he came to Kennedy’s appendix on ceremonies with its liturgical interpretation he said it was ‘unworthy of any answer’, as ‘partly manifestly fals, partly wicked, impius, unlearned and blasphemus’.\textsuperscript{68} Hay thus rejected Catholic worship and liturgical interpretation on the grounds of the scriptural principle of worship but he also gave an interpretation of the simpler Reformed rites using the methods of liturgical interpretation found in official Protestant texts. There is also an Aberdeen connection because Hay, who was later to purge Catholics from Aberdeen University, was from the late 1550s Prebendary of Rathven in the diocese of Aberdeen, admittedly as a pluralist, and thus a colleague of the Aberdeen liturgists.\textsuperscript{69}

In 1563 David Fergusson, minister of Dunfermline, published \textit{Ane Answer to ane Epistle by Renat Benedict... to John Knox}. René Benoist (1521-1608), a Parisian doctor of theology, came with Mary Queen of Scots to Scotland as her chaplain in August 1561 and left at the end of the next year. Benoist’s original letter of 19 November 1561 was an eirenical appeal to the Protestant preachers, largely concerning the mass, and it concluded with a request that they set forth what they

\textsuperscript{66} Hay, \textit{Confutation}, fol. 61r.

\textsuperscript{67} Hay, \textit{Confutation}, fol. 63r.

\textsuperscript{68} Hay, \textit{Confutation}, fol. 95r.

\textsuperscript{69} Haws, \textit{Scottish Parish Clergy}, 204.
believe about the eucharist.\textsuperscript{70} Part of Fergusson’s method in his reply was to give a sort of liturgical anti-commentary using history - describing the history of the mass using Platina’s *De vitis pontificum* to show it is a human invention - and allegory - for example interpreting the clerical tonsure as the mark of the Beast.\textsuperscript{71} He described the vestments and rites of the mass, quoting the *Manipulus curatorum*, in order to mock both them and the traditional method of liturgical interpretation. He said of priests that while Christ wore ordinary clothes ‘every piece of their cote contains a mysterie’; he attacked bishops for being ‘decked like a player in mistical apparell’; and, like Knox, he criticised the allegorical interpretation of the five words of consecration.\textsuperscript{72} Fergusson, however, like Hay, also gave an interpretation of his own liturgy, for example connecting the natural meaning of the signs of bread and wine to the spiritual nourishment received in the sacrament. At the same time, responding to Benoist’s charge that the Protestants have ‘intruded a figure for Christ’s body in the sacrament’, he interpreted the ancient liturgical response, ‘*sursum corda; habemus ad Dominum*’, to mean that the worshipper must raise his heart to heaven and eat and drink Christ there by faith while his body consumes bread and wine.\textsuperscript{73}

The last works to be examined from this period are by Ninian Winzet (1518/19–1592). A teacher and chaplain in Linlithgow, shown in chapter 3 to have been connected to John Greenlaw and other Catholic Reformers, he defended the eucharist against Knox at Linlithgow in 1559 and translated at least one of Benoist’s


\textsuperscript{71}Fergusson, *Tracts*, 18-21.

\textsuperscript{72}Fergusson, *Tracts*, 20, 27, 45-46.

\textsuperscript{73}‘Lift up your hearts; we lift them up unto the Lord’. As noted in chapter 6, page 228, this response was in the *Book of Common Prayer* but not in the *Book of Geneva*. Fergusson, *Tracts*, 33. This is the question of ‘naked signs’ to which the 1560 *Confession* responds.
Knox testified to his importance as a controversialist, calling him ‘procurator for the papists’, and Winzet issued various controversial treatises before and after his flight from Scotland in September 1562. His *Certane tractatis for reformation of doctryne and maneris* (Edinburgh, 1562) defended the celebration of liturgical feasts and accused the Scottish Catholic bishops of causing the Protestant Reformation by, inter alia, neglecting liturgical interpretation: ‘your dum doctrine in exalting ceremoneis only, without ony declaration of the samin’. Given the place of liturgical interpretation in Scottish culture and Catholic Reform before 1559 shown in the last four chapters, this seems too harsh, but it does reveal a reforming and humanist concern that liturgical rites should be interpreted for educational reasons.

In *The buke of fourscoir-thre questions* (Antwerp, 1563) Winzet turned to the question of liturgical rites in the light of the scriptural principle of worship and convicts the Protestants of using non-scriptural ceremonies (which may explain Hay’s distinction on this subject). He also affirmed Catholic rites and traditions as not contrary to the Scriptures and, while generally simply demonstrating their antiquity and conformity with the necessity of good order, defended some using the method of liturgical interpretation. The mixed chalice, for example, was defended using an allegorical interpretation of the wine and water as signifying the blood and water shed by Christ. Another of Winzet’s concerns connected to liturgical interpretation was the relation of the worship of the Old Testament to that of the Church. He criticised the Protestants for blurring the distinction between them, thus making the sacraments bare signs and implying that the Lord’s Supper is less significant than the Old Testament manna. He also used the same type of argument as Adam Eldar and Quintin Kennedy: if Belshazzar was punished for desecrating the

---

liturgical vessels of the Old Law how much more sacred are the vessels of the New (and thus more worthy of punishment are those who desecrate them). Literature interpretation was thus an important part of religious controversy in Scotland 1561-65 because of Knox’s exclusive scriptural principle of worship and the important place of liturgical interpretation in Catholic Reform.

d. Polemical literature from around 1580

While religious controversy continued in Scotland during the political upheavals from the turbulent end of Mary’s personal rule, most Scottish religious controversial literature from the three decades after 1560 seems to have been produced around 1580 (with the exception of Knox’s literary exchange with the Jesuit James Tyrie in 1572-73). This was a period of concern among Protestants about resurgent Catholicism, expressed in Craig’s vigorously anti-Catholic Negative Confession of 1581, and also the time of a new Jesuit mission to Scotland beginning with the visits of the Jesuits John Hay and Robert Abercromby in 1578-79 and 1580. Many of the Catholic Reformers active in the 1550s had died by this time: John Grierson OP, John Greenlaw, Quintin Kennedy, Henry Sinclair and John Sinclair all died between 1564 and 1566; Archbishop Hamilton was executed in 1571; Bishop William Gordon and his canons James Strachan and Alexander Adamson died between 1576 and 1577; and Giovanni Ferrerio died in Paris in 1579. On the Protestant side, too, many of those who had served in old Church died, like Knox in 1572, John Douglas in 1574 and John Winram in 1582. The time around 1580 thus seems to have been a turning point in the religious history of Scotland. The loss of most clergy formed in Catholic Scotland in the way described in chapter 4 coincided with the arrival of Roman Catholic clergy formed on the continent in the theology and spirituality of the post-Tridentine Church. Thierry Wanegffelen and Luc Racaut speak of a

80 Winzet, Tractates, i, 85, 94.
82 Dawson, Scotland Re-formed, 339-40. Ninian Winzet did, however, live on to 1592, Bishop John Lesley to 1596 and Archbishop James Beaton to 1603. Eamon Duffy makes a similar point about the
Tridentinization of the clergy in late-sixteenth century France and the same could be said of the late-sixteenth century Scottish Roman Catholic clergy, many of whom were educated in France.\textsuperscript{83}

In the last year of his life John Knox published \textit{An Answer to a Letter of a Jesuit Named Tyrie} (St Andrews 1572), responding to a letter in which Tyrie attempted to reclaim his brother from Protestantism, and Tyrie replied with \textit{The Refutation of ane Answer Made by Schir Johne Knox} (Paris, 1573).\textsuperscript{84} This exchange was mainly concerned with the identity of the true Church and so had nothing to say on liturgical interpretation, although Knox again taught that worship must be according to God’s word, rejected human ceremonies, and suggested that ‘superstitious worshipping of God’ was the central issue in dispute.\textsuperscript{85} What is surprising is that, with one small exception, liturgical interpretation was also absent from the seven controversial tractates published around 1581 even though they did discuss the sacraments and liturgy.\textsuperscript{86}

In this period not all converts stayed in their new Churches.\textsuperscript{87} Archibald Hamilton (d. 1593) was educated at St Mary’s, St Andrews in the 1550s, became a Protestant, but returned to the Roman Church after reading Tyrie’s reply to Knox. Thomas Smeaton (1536–1583) was also educated at St Andrews in the 1550s, at St Salvator’s College, went into exile with other St Andrews Catholics and became a Jesuit but returned to

---

\textsuperscript{83} Wanegffelen and Chaunu, \textit{Une difficile fidélité}; Racaut, ‘The Sacrifice of the Mass’, 36-37. This seems true of theological emphases, on matters such as the papacy and the sacrifice of the mass, but the decrees of Trent were officially received in Scotland over half a century before they were in France.


\textsuperscript{85} Knox, \textit{Works}, vi, 492-93.

\textsuperscript{86} Winzet’s, \textit{Flagellum Sectoriorum...accessit Velitatio in Georgium Buchananum} (Ingolstadt, 1582) has not been included as these two treatises are concerned with the authority of Kings and Protestant ministers: Winzet, \textit{Tractates}, i, lxxiii-lxxxvii.

\textsuperscript{87} Mullan, ‘Writing the Scottish Reformation’, 27-28.
Protestantism in the 1570s. Hamilton left Scotland for Paris in 1576 and published *De confusione Calvinianae sectae apud Scotos ecclesiae nomen ridiculè usurpantis, dialogus* (Paris 1577) to which Smeaton replied in *Ad virulentem Archibaldi Hamiltoni apostate dialogum... Orthodoxa Responsio* (Edinburgh, 1579). Hamilton later published *Calvinianæ Confusionis Demonstratio, contra maledicam ministrorum Scotiae responsionem* (Paris, 1581). Both these authors were educated in Catholic Reforming circles in St Andrews but their works have different emphases from those of the 1560s. There is more interest in the Papacy than shown by Kennedy and Winzet and, although Hamilton and Smeaton’s main interest is the Church and ministry, the mass and worship are less prominent than in the earlier period and there is therefore no use of liturgical interpretation.

The four final controversialists from this period to be examined were of a later generation. John Hay (1547–1607) was from Aberdeenshire, went to Rome in 1566 and entered the Jesuits. After a brief visit to Scotland in 1579 he published *Certain Demandes concerning the Christian Religion and Discipline proposed to the Ministers of the New Pretended Kirk of Scotland* (Paris, 1580), which touched on many points of controversy in 166 short questions. He criticised the *sola scriptura* principle of the Protestants on the basis of their use of liturgical practices not commanded in Scripture, such as infant baptism and Sunday observance, and many of his questions concerned liturgy, for example asking, as Kennedy and Winzet had done, how Protestant sacraments were better than those of the Old Testament. Liturgical interpretation, however, was only used when he criticised the Calvinist teaching, related by Fergusson to the response *sursum corda*, that in communion the

---


Christian is lifted up into heaven.\(^{91}\) The relative absence of liturgical interpretation in a work which covers the liturgy in as many as 51 of the 166 questions may be explained by its form, short questions and answers, but it may also reflect its waning popularity.

John Hamilton (c.1547–1610/11), related to Archibald Hamilton, was parson of Dunbar and a supporter of Mary Queen of Scots who taught philosophy in Paris from 1573 and was tonsured in 1581.\(^{92}\) In the same year he had a violent debate in Paris about praying before images with a Scottish student who had previously studied at St Leonard’s College, St Andrews, William Fowler (1560/61–1612).\(^{93}\) Hamilton had earlier challenged the Protestant ministers to a debate which produced a short reply from Fowler, \textit{An Answer to the Calumnious Letter}, which referred to Hay’s \textit{Demands} and treated of such questions as the true Church, the papacy, prayer to saints, holy images, prayer for the dead, and the real presence of Christ in the eucharist.\(^{94}\) Hamilton’s own treatise came out two months later, \textit{Catholik and Facile Traictise...to Con firme the Real and Corporell Praesence of Chrystis Pretious Bodie and Blude in the Sacrament of the Alter} (Paris 1581). Fowler’s treatise contained no liturgical interpretation, although it did discuss things liturgical, and nor did Hamilton’s, which kept to sacramental theology.

The only controversial treatise of this period which did have some liturgical interpretation is Nicol Burne’s \textit{Disputation concerning the Controversit Headdes of Religion}, which is based on his interrogation by Andrew Melville and other ministers while imprisoned in Edinburgh Tollbooth.\(^{95}\) Burne (fl. 1574–1598), an exact

\(^{91}\) Law, \textit{Catholic Tractates}, 45; Fergusson, \textit{Tracts}, 33. It may also be relevant when he says the Protestant abolition of feast days such as Christmas and Easter ‘tendes to the abolition of all memorie of our Lord Jesus Christ’ as liturgical interpretation is ordered to fostering the memory of redemption. Law, \textit{Catholic Tractates}, 66.


\(^{94}\) William Fowler, \textit{An Answer to the Calumnious Letter and Erroneous Propositions of an Apostat Named M. Io. Hammilton} (Edinburgh, 1581), fol. A2v.

\(^{95}\) Nicol Burne, \textit{Disputation concerning the Controversit Headdes of Religion} (Paris, 1581); Law, \textit{Catholic Tractates}, 107-72. The version of the treatise in Law omits parts 1-6, 8, 10-13, 15-16, 19-23, 25, 27, 30, 35, 38-39 and abridges some of those that remain.
contemporary of Fowler at St Leonard’s, was brought up a Calvinist and converted to
Roman Catholicism through his reading, after which he vigorously defended his new
opinions against the Earl of Morton, Thomas Smeaton and others.\(^{96}\) In 1581 he fled
to Paris where he published his *Disputation*, some copies of which were bound with
a polemical poem, *Admonition to the Unchristian Ministers in the Deformed Kirk of
Scotland*, possibly also by him, and little more is known of him except the story that
he became a Dominican in Spain.\(^{97}\)

The *Disputation* included liturgical interpretation, such as: the water of baptism
represents the water from the side of Christ and the ‘vesching of the saul’; holy water
recalls the water from the side of Christ and the water in which Naaman washed (2
Kings 5:10-14); chrism is used in confirmation, ‘to signifie that thairby ve becum
campions of Christ’; the exterior ornaments of the church, which symbolises the
Church triumphant, represent the abundant joy of the saints; in extreme unction the
oil represents ‘the invart grace of consolatione gevin be the haly Gaist; and lights are
lit before relics to show the saints are in the eternal light of glory.’\(^{98}\) In addition to
these allegorical interpretations he repeated the argument that Protestant sacraments
are no better than those of the Old Law; mentioned the etymology of *missa* from the
Hebrew ‘missah’ meaning offering; defended the vessels and ornaments of the
liturgy from the Fathers and from history; and used the same type of argument that
Adam Eldar used to defend vestments: if the ark of the covenant was clad in gold,
how much more should the relics of the saints who are the temples of the Holy
Spirit.\(^{99}\) He also defended the ceremonies of the liturgy from the charge that they
were taken from the gentiles by saying that Numa Pompilius, the legendary second
King of the Romans, got his regulations for Roman worship from Moses.\(^{100}\) It is thus
clear that he deployed liturgical interpretation in defence of Catholic liturgy. At the

---

\(^{96}\) Burns, ‘Nicol Burne’; J.H. Burns, ‘Burne, Nicol (fl. 1574–1598)’, ODNB, accessed 15 August
2012. Burns suggests that the example of the two Hamiltons may have contributed to his conversion


\(^{98}\) Burne, *Disputation*, fols 10r, 11r, 13r, 58v, 62r-v, 178v.

\(^{99}\) Burne, *Disputation*, fols 31v, 39r, 56r-59v, 178r.

\(^{100}\) Burne, *Disputation*, fol. 58v, cf. 48v.
same time, his intent was strongly polemical and, unlike the earlier writers, he had long sections of the prerogatives of the Popes.\footnote{Burne, \textit{Disputation}, fols 80v-103r, 154r-156v.}

Liturgical interpretation thus did still have a place in the religious controversy of the 1580s but it was less prominent than in earlier texts, possibly because of the loss of the memory of Scottish pre-1560 Catholic culture studied in Part B. One small sign of its continuing place in Scottish Roman Catholic culture is a copy of the \textit{Rationale} purchased by the Scots College Paris in the late sixteenth century.\footnote{\textit{Rationale divinorum officiorum}, incomplete (fols 20-519), stamped ‘Colleg. Scotor. in Acad. Paris’, Paris, Old Library of the Irish College, B 1717.} Liturgical interpretation did also survive in a different form in Scottish Protestant culture.

2) Reformed liturgical interpretation

In the Protestant texts studied above there were two main ways of interpreting public worship: an ‘anti-commentary’ on Catholic liturgy and a liturgical commentary on the two Reformed sacraments (no interpretation of non-sacramental Reformed worship from this period has been encountered). Both had methodological similarities with the traditional liturgical interpretation and liturgical commentaries studied in Parts A and B. Beginning with a note on Protestant use of copies of the \textit{Rationale}, this final section will define Reformed liturgical interpretation more closely by examining two books published in Protestant Scotland in 1565 (during the first embattled years of the Protestant regime) and 1590 (when Protestantism was firmly established and beginning an internal conflict that was to mark it for the next century).\footnote{Wormald notes that ‘even in Edinburgh there were more Catholics than Protestants in 1565’, \textit{Court, Kirk and Community}, 133. Mullan, \textit{Scottish Puritanism}, 3-4, 17.} This will add a new strand to ‘the culture of Protestantism in early modern Scotland’ described by Margo Todd in her 2002 book.

\textit{a. Protestant use of liturgical commentaries and two English archbishops}

Catholic liturgical commentaries were found in hands of sixteenth-century Protestant Scots. A \textit{Rationale} was donated to what would become Edinburgh University Library in 1581, St Leonard’s College, St Andrews purchased Duranti’s commentary
at the end of the century and Andrew Melville (1545-1622) owned a copy of Gabriel Biel’s commentary on the mass. A study of Scottish Protestant controversial literature in the first half of the seventeenth century has, however, revealed that the Rationale remained an important source for Presbyterian and Episcopalian divines, both as an example of superstition and as a reliable source for liturgical history. The Rationale thus retained a place in Reformed interpretation of the liturgy. Adamson’s poem used it as evidence of superstition but there is little other evidence from sixteenth century Scotland. Chapter 3 saw Thomas Cranmer using it in the same way and Rationales owned by Cranmer and Archbishop Matthew Parker show its place in Reformed liturgical interpretation and, while English, demonstrate the same method of use that is found in early seventeenth century Scotland.

Cranmer’s marginalia showed strong disagreement with the Rationale but also revealed that he used it as a reference book for the structure of the liturgy, putting subheadings in the margin by the parts of the daily office and noting the structure of the paschal vigil and rogation processions. This suggests he used it as an historical source for his liturgical revisions which produced the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552. He also took the heading for the twenty-seventh of his 42 Articles of 1553, ‘Of the unworthiness of the ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacrament’, from his Rationale where he underlined the words, ‘non ergo sacerdotes iniquitas impedit effectum sacramenti’ which Durandus had extracted from the commentary on the mass of Innocent III. When this article was revised by Matthew Parker (archbishop of Canterbury 1559-75) for the 39 Articles, Cranmer’s text was in part made closer to Durandus’s words. Parker seems to have obtained a copy of the

104 Finlayson, Clement Litill and his Library, 58. Jean Etienne Duranti, De ritibus ecclesiae catholicae (Cologne, 1592), St Leonard’s College Library, St Andrews University Library TypGC.B92GD, which may be item 110 or 166 in the 1597/99 library catalogue (SL, 284-85). Biel, Sacri canonis missae expositio (Tübingen, 1499), GUL Sp Coll Bl5-e.2.

105 Holmes, ‘Out of their Reasonless Rationalls’.

106 Rationale, BL C.77d.117, fol 89r-92v, 144v-150v, 161r.


108 Holmes, ‘The Title of Article 27 (26)’. 
Rationale when he was 16 but he did not mark this text in either of his own copies of the *Rationale*. He does, however, add a note in one of his copies in his own distinctive italic hand which expresses well this new Protestant way of using the *Rationale*:

> Writers of this kind can give the reader abundant evidence about what was the form of doctrine throughout the whole church at the time when this author flourished, and whether for this reason it is to be preserved.

The *Rationale* was no longer an authoritative compendium of tradition and the bearer of a method which can be used creatively in new situations. It was a relic of a past age of the Church which was under the judgement of the present and could thus be used both as an example of false doctrine or as a quarry for facts about the past: the two ways in which Cranmer’s marks show that he used his copy of the *Rationale* and the two ways it was used in seventeenth-century Scotland. This was, however, the Protestant use of a Catholic liturgical commentary, not Protestant use of the method of liturgical interpretation in general. The most significant aspect of Scottish Reformed liturgical interpretation was the way the methods used by Durandus were deployed to interpret the Reformed liturgy. This can be seen in two Reformed liturgical commentaries.

**b. Ane Breif Gathering of the Halie Signes (1565)**

One of the first books produced in Protestant Scotland was, *Ane Breif Gathering of the Halie Signes, Sacrifices and Sacramentis Instituti of God sen the Creation of the Warlde. And of the Trew Originall of the Sacrifice of the Messe. Translatit out of Frenche into Scottis be ane Faithful Brother*, printed at Edinburgh by Robert Lekprevik in 1565. The fourteen previous Protestant books printed in Scotland were almost all official and controversial texts, reflecting the priorities of establishing and defending the new Kirk. The *Breif Gathering* was in the latter category although it

---

109 CCC EP.G.14 has the date 1520 on the title page in Parker’s hand, he was born in 1504.

110 CCC SP 51 (1503), title page. ‘*Huius generis scriptores possunt lectori testari abunde, quae fuerat doctrinae forma per totam ecclesiam confirmata quo tempore hic author claruit et vel ob hac causam servandus est*’.

111 ‘Scottish books 1505-1660 (Aldis updated)’, ed H.G. Aldis and NLS,
was a Reformed treatise against the mass rather than a response to a Catholic controversialist as were most of the others. It was a translation of an anonymous French work, *Sommaire recueil des signes sacrez, sacrifices et sacremens instituez de Dieu depuis la creation du monde. Et de la vraye origine du sacrifice de la messe*, published at Caen and Geneva in 1561 and traditionally attributed to Théodore de Bèze, although Max Engammare has recently argued that it is by Augustin Marlorat du Pasquier (1506-1562).112

The translator was William Stewart, a neglected figure who conspired against Regent Moray and was executed for witchcraft at St Andrews in 1569.113 In his preface he said he had translated it as an answer to the part of Winzet’s 1563 *Buke of Fourscoir-thre Questions* which concerned the mass.114 This confirms the centrality of liturgy and sacraments to contemporary controversy and it is significant that liturgical interpretation was at the heart of the book. In the translator’s preface, Stewart wrote that ‘some subtil interpretatiouns of the Papis new Theologis’ have been printed in small type. An inspection reveals that these ‘interpretatiouns’ have been taken from liturgical commentaries, mainly that of Franz Titelmans, but also those of Gabriel Biel, William Durandus and Innocent III, as well as some passages of interpretation of which he does not give the author.115 The author’s preface mentions commentaries on the mass, ‘Descriptiouns, Centouns, and Ingynes concerning the Messe’, and, associating Catholicism with Islam, he called Biel’s commentary ‘his Alcoran of the


114 *Ane Breif Gathering*, fol. 3r.

interpretation of the Mess’ and referred to liturgical commentators as ‘Alcoranists’ and ‘Messalians’.\textsuperscript{116} He offered his book, with conventional modesty, as a stopgap until the reader can ‘haif the buikis of the Commentaries in thair integritie’.\textsuperscript{117}

\textit{Ane Breif Gathering} is probably best understood as a Protestant, or more strictly Reformed, liturgical commentary using the positive and negative aspects of Reformed liturgical interpretation (commentary on the Reformed liturgy; anti-commentary on the Catholic liturgy). It was composed in three parts. The first was a history of holy signs and sacraments which showed that the signs ordained by God in the Old and New Testaments were always corrupted by men. This was a liturgical version of the strong Reformed doctrine of original sin, as shown when the author defines the Fall as Adam abusing ‘the halie sign’ of the tree in the garden.\textsuperscript{118} It began with the Old Testament sacraments, showing how they foreshadowed Christ (fols 5r-7r), were corrupted by men (fols 7v-11v) but were then fulfilled in Christ and thus abolished (fols 11v-12v). The same was done with the sacraments of the New Law (fols 12v-13v), showing how they were corrupted by restoring Jewish ceremonies and importing pagan rites (fols 13v-17v) and then it ended with a description of the pagan Roman liturgy, codified by Numa Pomilius (753-673 BC) the legendary second King of Rome, which was said to have been the origin of much ‘papist’ worship (fols 17v-22r). The second part (fols 22r-36r) was called ‘our litil treatise of ye Messe’ and was modelled on a Catholic liturgical commentary beginning with the etymology of the word ‘\textit{missa}’ and moving on to the vestments (fols 23v-24v), the parts of the mass (a commentary on the whole \textit{ordo missae}, fols 24v-32v), the Popes’ additions to the mass (fols 32v-34v) and a return to the origins of the mass in pagan Rome with special reference to the round altar-bread (fols 34v-35r).\textsuperscript{119} The final part of the treatise (fols 36r-46r) was an attack on transubstantiation related to the

\textsuperscript{116} \textit{Ane Breif Gathering}, fols 2r, 29v, cf 23r, 31v, 35v. ‘Alcoranistis’ is also used of Muslims (‘Mahometistis’), and the word \textit{missa} is related to Mecca and ‘Messalmans’ (Mussulmen). \textit{Ane Breif Gathering}, fols 9v, 22v.

\textsuperscript{117} \textit{Ane Breif Gathering}, fol. 2r.

\textsuperscript{118} \textit{Ane Breif Gathering}, fol. 7v, cf. 4r.

\textsuperscript{119} ‘All the members of the sacrifice of the Messe haif thair beginning of the Pompelian Religious’ \textit{Ane Breif Gathering}, fol. 23v.
commentary on the mass. This may seem to have been distinct from the rest of the treatise as it concerned sacramental theology, but the liturgical commentaries of Durandus and Biel both included sections on transubstantiation when they commented on the mass.120

The negative interpretation of Catholic liturgy recalls Becon’s The Displaying of the Popish Mass and Adamson’s De Papistarum superstitionis ineptis, both published the year before. It was grounded in history but also in theological anthropology: the ‘principal abus’ and ‘original of all Idolatrie’ was that carnal (fallen) humans ‘dois rest thaim self mair in the visibil signes, and outwarde ceremonies, than in the things signifiit be the Sacramentis’.121 This involved a false epistemology where one came to know the sign but not that which it signifies. The use of the verb ‘signify’ suggests that a true epistemology requires a true (Reformed) liturgical interpretation. Anabaptists were attacked for this error as well as ‘papists’, but the latter from the time of the Apostles were guilty of another error by adding to the divinely ordained signs rites from Roman paganism and elsewhere, as in the ceremonies of baptism.122

This led on to a sustained criticism of allegorical liturgical interpretation: for example, it is said that in the second century Pope Alexander I added water to the sacramental wine, following Numa Pompelius, and justified it allegorically by relating it to the water from the side of Christ crucified.123 Other allegorical interpretations attacked include: the seven kisses of the altar signifying the seven deadly sins; the three collects symbolising the Trinity; incense signifying prayers, grace or Christ anointed by Mary Magdalene; the lowering of the elevated host figuring the burial of Christ; the silence after the Lord’s Prayer being the silence of Christ in the tomb; and the Gospel being sung towards the north because the north is

120 Rationale 41.16-27; cf. chapters 1 and 2, pages 40, 66-67, 76. The author repeatedly says that the transubstantiated host is said to become flesh and bone, recalling the dispute behind the inscription on the 1551 Deskford sacrament house, cf. chapter 5, page 172, Ane Breif Gathering, fols 36r, 39r-v.
121 Ane Breif Gathering, fol. 9v.
122 Ane Breif Gathering, fol. 14r.
123 Ane Breif Gathering, fol. 16r-v.
cold and bad. This was not an attack on allegory as such because the author used allegory freely in his interpretation of the Reformed and Old Testament sacraments: for example, he taught that the burning bush represented Christ in the womb of Mary. It was simply another layer of criticism added to the attack on the illicit additions. There was a right allegory and a wrong allegory, with the distinction between them depending on the fundamental scriptural principle of worship.

The positive interpretation of the Reformed sacraments was also grounded in theological anthropology and epistemology. The author taught, with Calvin, that, to accommodate himself ‘to the infirmitie of man’, God ‘hes ordenit to him fra tyme to tyme, common signes, for notis and markis of the assurance of the thing signifiit’. He also taught that as Adam and his successors were ‘corporeal men’, ‘thair ware ordenit be God corporal signes, to prove the better his obedience’. This was part of God’s plan. Ane Breif Gathering used the same Augustinian epistemology of signs as the Durandus tradition of liturgical interpretation, but it emphasised that this was a concession to human infirmity (in order to strengthen faith) as well as a requirement of embodied humanity. Holy signs required interpretation, a word used in the book a number of times, but this was implicitly distinguished from the style of interpretation used by the ‘Messmongers’. Authentic sacred signs were simple. With Augustine the author said that the signs of the new Covenant were few, simple and common, and he taught that the style of interpretation must not to be too complicated: it should be done ‘without inquiring over subtillie of the meanis, uthers than the interpretatioun of Jesus Christ that the flesche profitis not bot the Spirit quickins’. The simple elements of the sacraments were interpreted in ways that are familiar from the texts discussed above. The water of baptism was prefigured by the passing of the Israelites through the Red Sea and it signified the washing of rebirth in the blood of Christ and

124 Ane Breif Gathering, fols 29r, 29v, 30r, 31v, 33v.
125 Ane Breif Gathering, fol. 37v, cf. 40v, 43r.
126 Ane Breif Gathering, fol. 4r.
127 Ane Breif Gathering, fols 12v, 37v, 42v. Augustine, DDC 3.31-32 (Green, 147), cf. chapter 6, page 224.
a renewing by the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{128} The various uses of bread in the Old Testament were discussed and bread and wine were said to signify Christ’s body and blood because they gave nourishment and life.\textsuperscript{129}

The doctrine of transubstantiation gave Catholics a clear distinction between the sacraments of the Old Testament and those of the New, between shadow and reality, causing Catholic polemicists such as Winzet and John Hay to accuse Protestant sacraments of still being types and shadows. On the other hand the Durandus tradition of Catholic allegorical interpretation blurred the line between the two Covenants as both gave access to truth by the interpretation of symbolism. These two aspects were also found in the Protestant \textit{Ane Breif Gathering} but for different reasons. It had a strong sense of the unity of the two Covenants, saying that ‘they [Israel] and we are the Kirk of God’ and teaching that the Old Covenant sacraments ‘really and sacramentally representit that quhilk was figurit be thaim’. It also had a firm divide between the Old and New Testaments based on the abolition of the old ceremonial Law by Christ while allowing that the sacraments of the New Law have their roots in the Old.\textsuperscript{130}

The Reformed liturgical interpretation in \textit{Ane Breif Gathering}, however, was firmly rooted in the interpretations given by Jesus and Paul in the New Testament. The following passage at the end of the book taught from the Bible that the sacrament symbolised Christ’s passion and the Church’s unity. It also developed the Pauline theme of unity in the eucharist on the basis of all sharing the same bread (1 Corinthians 10:17) using the post-biblical interpretation, based on \textit{Didache} 9.4 and found in Cyprian, Augustine and Hamilton’s 1552 Catechism, that Christian unity is symbolised by one loaf made of many grains (cuirnis [curnis]).\textsuperscript{131} This confirms that

\textsuperscript{128} \textit{Ane Breif Gathering}, fols 5r, 13r.
\textsuperscript{129} \textit{Ane Breif Gathering}, fols 13v, 40v.
\textsuperscript{130} \textit{Ane Breif Gathering}, fols 12v, 37r.
Ane Breif Gathering was concerned with liturgical interpretation and that it went beyond the interpretations found in Scripture.

It behuifs us to be reulit after the halie interpretatioun of our halie Doctour Jesus Christ, and of his Apostils, to honour and reverence his halie sacramentis, institutit of him be outward signes, to lift our Spirit to hevin, to comprehend that quhilk is be the signes representit... Lat us than be assurit in Jesus Christ, as members of his bodie, lat us reduce us all to unitie, to communicat the self same bread, and drink the self same wine, made of monie cuirnis, unitit and knit together... speciallie in his halie Sacramentis, qukilk he hes left to us as plegis... for memorie and remembrance of the death and Passioun of our salviiour Jesus Christ. Amen.\textsuperscript{132}

c. Bruce’s Sermons on the Lord’s Supper (1590)

Robert Bruce (1554–1631) received his theological education in Andrew and James Melville’s ‘anti-seminary’ at St Mary’s, St Andrews (1583–87) and David Mullan called him the main father of the early covenanting movement and a prime example of ‘puritan mysticism’.\textsuperscript{133} He was called to St Giles, Edinburgh in 1587 and in 1589 preached his Sermons upon the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper which were published in Edinburgh by Robert Waldegrave with a dedication dated 9 December 1590.\textsuperscript{134} The sermons were attacked by the English Roman Catholic priest William Reynolds (1544?–1594) in A Treatise Conteyning the True Catholick and Apostolike Faith of the Holy Sacrifice and Sacrament (Antwerp, 1593) but Reynolds almost entirely engages with matters of sacramental theology rather than liturgical interpretation. Bruce was Moderator of the General Assembly in 1592 when it commended John Craig’s Catechism, which Thomas Torrance regarded as giving the

\textsuperscript{132} Ane Breif Gathering, fol. 46v.

\textsuperscript{133} Mullan, Scottish Puritanism, 17-18; James Kirk, ‘Bruce, Robert (1554–1631)’, ODNB, accessed 26 July 2012.

\textsuperscript{134} Robert Bruce, Sermons vpon the Sacrament of the Lords Supper (Edinburgh, 1590?). They were republished in English at London in 1617 and an edition of the original Scots, edited by William Cunningham, was published in 1843 by the Wodrow Society. Page references to this volume (Bruce) are to the second pagination for the sermons, Robert Bruce, Sermons by the Rev. Robert Bruce... Reprinted from the original edition of M.D.XC. and M.D.XCI. With collections for his life, by the Rev. Robert Wodrow...; ed. William Cunningham (Edinburgh, 1843).
theological context of his sermons. While Bruce was a foundational figure for the Scottish Presbyterian, Puritan and Covenanting tradition and stood at the beginning of the period covered by Mullan’s *Scottish Puritanism 1590-1638*, his teaching on the sacrament summed up and developed the positive side of Scottish Reformed liturgical interpretation.

The Reformed liturgy was interpreted in the first three of the five sermons, on the sacraments in general (1) and on the Lord’s Supper (2 and 3); the last two sermons were on preparation for the Lord’s Supper. Bruce’s teaching was strongly Augustinian. He said of the Catholics, ‘they would have spoken mair advisedlie, gif they had sought counsell of Augustine’, and directed them to Book 3 of *De doctrina christiana*. The whole work was informed by Augustine’s doctrine of sign and sacrament and Bruce used the Augustinian descriptions of a sacrament as a ‘visible word’ and ‘a word.. and ane element concurrand’. His adoption of the Augustinian distinction between the sensible sign and the spiritual thing signified meant that Bruce’s method was truly a form of liturgical interpretation. He began by giving an anthropological justification of the outward signs of the sacraments:

For that doctrine man be maist effectuall and moving that walkens and steirs up moniest of the outward senses; that doctrine that walkens not onely the eare, bot the eye, the taist, the feeling, and all the rest of the outward senses, man move the hart maist, man be maist effectuall and pearcing in the saul. Bot sa it is, that this doctrine of the sacraments movis, steirs up, and walkins moniest of the outward senses.

A new subjective emphasis on ‘heart-work’, characteristic of ‘Scottish Puritanism’, was added here to the standard Reformed teaching on the sacraments. Bruce

---

136 Bruce, 86.
137 Bruce, 19, 74.
138 Bruce, 5-6.
justified the economy of signs by the simple fact that ‘the thing signified is spirituall and we are corporall’ – only by signs can one attain ‘the sight of spirituall things’. He thus, like Craig’s *Catechism*, went beyond Calvin’s view of this need for sensible signs as a regrettable weakness, even calling it a ‘wonderfull weaknes’, and he invoked the doctrine of the spiritual senses, ‘the inwarde senses’, by which the outward reception of bread and wine is accompanied by an inward reception of Christ. In responding to the Catholic objection that the Reformed sacraments, with their purely spiritual presence, gave the believer nothing more than he or she received from the Word, Bruce agreed that one receives the same thing but argued that the sensible signs mean that one ‘gets a better grip of that same thing... mair fullie... with a surer apprehension’. Bruce also goes beyond Calvin in his doctrine of the spiritual senses. Sarah Coakley noted that in Calvin and his followers the pre-modern doctrine of the spiritual senses was ‘transmuted into a discussion of the (generalised) *sensus divinitatis*’, but Bruce went beyond this reduction and had a more subtle and traditional model including discrete spiritual taste, sight and touch. While these can be understood in the context of ‘Scottish Puritanism’, they were also perhaps a sign of continuity with pre-1560 Catholic Reform in Scottish Divinity.

In words reminiscent of the *Rationale*, Bruce taught that

> every signe and ceremonie hes the awin spirituall signification, sa that there is not a ceremonie in this haill action that wants the awin spirituall signification.\(^{143}\)

As with the Catholic liturgical commentators, the word ‘signify’ was of great importance for Bruce because of his doctrine of signs.\(^{144}\) He taught that the signs

\(^{140}\) Bruce, 38.

\(^{141}\) See chapter 6, pages 222-23. Bruce, 30, 14, 29, 55, 63, 96-97. On the spiritual sense, see Paul L. Gavrilyuk and Sarah Coakley, *The Spiritual Senses: Perceiving God in Western Christianity* (Cambridge, 2011).

\(^{142}\) Bruce, 14, 96 (taste); 29 (sight); 97 (touch).

\(^{143}\) Bruce, 43.

\(^{144}\) Examples of the use of signify/signification in Bruce’s sermons: Bruce, 7, 8, 10, 18, 19, 38-44.
worked by means of a ‘mutual relation’ producing a ‘spirituall conjunction’ between sign and thing signified, with the word ‘conjunction’ being a way of expressing the presence of Christ in the sacrament. This could, however, only work if ‘the Lord wald illuminat the eyes of your mindes be his Spirit’; Durandus prayed for divine help that he might describe the significations of the liturgy but Bruce had an even stronger pneumatology, presumably because he had a weaker Reformed view of the capacity of human nature to know divine things.

Most of the Reformed liturgical interpretation examined above related to the sacramental elements: bread, wine and water. Bruce, however, made a distinction between two types of sacramental sign, the ‘elementall’ and the ‘ceremonial’, for example bread and the breaking of bread. Alluding to the scriptural principle of worship he noted that both are commanded by Christ and so there are right ceremonies as well as vain ceremonies. As only God can perform the ‘conjunction’ and he will only do this for what he has commanded, non-scriptural worship could only have empty signs; this provided a theological basis for the ‘anti-commentary’ mocking Catholic worship which was a part of Reformed liturgical interpretation.

Interpreting the elements ordained by Christ, Bruce used significations that have already been encountered. The water of baptism symbolised being washed and cleansed by the blood of Christ; the bread and wine symbolised the nourishment of souls by the body and blood of Christ. The sermons, however, gave special attention to the symbolism of the ceremonies or actions, recalling the educational use of liturgical interpretation in Catholic Scotland:

146 Durandus, Rationale, Prologue 1. Bruce, 47, 56, 66.
147 Bruce, 9.
148 Bruce, 11, 73, 78. Bruce does include some of this anti-commentary but it is not as prominent as in Adamson’s poem, Bruce, 74-78.
149 Bruce, 38, 40-41, 69-71.
Christ is als bissie working inwardlie in your saull as the minister is working outwardlie toward your bodie. Look how bissie the minister is in breaking that bread, in pouring out that wine, in giving that bread and wine to thee; als bissie is Christ in breaking his awin body to thee, and in giving thee the juyce of his awin bodie after a spirituall and invisible manner.\textsuperscript{150}

Bruce’s interpretation of the actions is important evidence for liturgical practice in Reformed Scotland as the \textit{Book of Common Order} gave few rubrical directions. For Bruce the outward signs were important because they were conjoined to an inward reality performed by Christ to the soul. The breaking of bread signified the breaking of Christ’s body in sorrow; the pouring of wine signified that ‘his blood was severed fra his flesh, and the severing of the twa makes death’; and the giving and eating and drinking symbolised the application of the fruits of the passion to the soul.\textsuperscript{151} This was a typical use of the method of liturgical interpretation and was similar to the way in which the separate consecration of the elements was said by some Catholic commentators, such as Bruce’s contemporary the Jesuit Gabriel Vasquez (1549–1604), to symbolise the death of Christ in which his blood was separated from his body.\textsuperscript{152}

Bruce also interpreted other aspects of the Lord’s Supper. It must be a public not a private action to show that it is a communion with Christ, who is not a private possession, and to symbolise that thanksgiving to the Father (which is the meaning of the sacrament) should be done by all together.\textsuperscript{153} Reformed sacramental theology insisted that preaching accompany the sacraments and so the minister must ‘open up’ the Word (meaning the Biblical institution narrative) to interpret what is done in the rite. This must be expounded in a sermon to the communicants, ‘to informe their faith how they aught to receive Christ his bodie and his blood, signified be that bread

\textsuperscript{150} Bruce, 27, cf. 43.
\textsuperscript{151} Bruce, 43.
\textsuperscript{152} Robert J. Daly, ‘Robert Bellarmine and Post-Tridentine Eucharistic Theology’, \textit{Theological Studies} 61 (2000), 239-60, at 255. This teaching is also found in the \textit{Parochiale curatorum}, chapter 4 page 139, and Richard Smith’s 1546 \textit{Assertion and Defence}, chapter 6, page 210, footnote 63.
\textsuperscript{153} Bruce, 71-72.
and that wine'.\textsuperscript{154} This preaching of the Word is contrasted with the Catholic emphasis on consecration by five words; in the true Lord’s Supper prayer and thanksgiving are made ‘for the sanctification of the element’ to show that it is the Lord and the Spirit that consecrate, not human words.\textsuperscript{155} Bruce’s interpretation of the Lord’s Supper was also strongly Christological. Christ was the one thing signified by all the signs and the virtue of his passion is what was active in the sacraments by the power of the Spirit and was called to mind in obedience to the command ‘do this in remembrance of me’ – something signified in the rite by the reading of the passion narrative as directed by the \textit{Book of Common Order}.\textsuperscript{156}

In all these things the attention was not on the signs but on that which they signified, the Christian was called to ‘remove all your outward senses... and follow the sight and information of the Spirit of God’; the Spirit led the soul up a ladder or cord that joins heaven and earth.\textsuperscript{157} The presence of Christ in the sacraments was compared to the heat from the sun which is absent, but present on earth in its effects, or to the title of ownership of land which one holds even if it were ‘in the fardest part of Orknay’.\textsuperscript{158} In Bruce’s interpretation of the Reformed Lord’s Supper there was a dynamism of presence and absence which marked it out as true liturgical interpretation and which was destroyed among Roman Catholics by the doctrine of transubstantiation which, when separated from liturgical interpretation, replaced absence by real presence. There is thus a sense in which Scottish Reformed Protestantism was a more faithful heir to the liturgical interpretation of Amalarius and Durandus than was post-Tridentine Roman Catholicism.

\textbf{Conclusion}

Sacraments and ceremonies became a key site for controversy between the two rival forms of \textit{reformatio ecclesiae} in Scotland because of the exclusive scriptural principle of worship championed by Wishart and Knox, as shown by its prominent

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{154} Bruce, 76.
\item \textsuperscript{155} Bruce, 74.
\item \textsuperscript{156} See chapter 6 page 220; Maxwell, \textit{Genevan Service Book}, 126-27, 139-40; Bruce, 41, 39, 62.
\item \textsuperscript{157} Bruce, 59.
\item \textsuperscript{158} Bruce, 58, 95, 57.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
place in Wishart’s trial, Knox’s 1547 disputation and 1550 sermon, Kennedy’s works, the Ross marginalia and Hay’s Confutation. Catholic controversialists such as Kennedy, Eldar, Ross and Winzet used liturgical interpretation to defend traditional liturgy as part of their attack on this Reformed principle while Protestants such as Knox and George Hay tried to divert the argument to ceremonies and their interpretation because they saw this as a weak point in the Catholic case. In the controversial literature from around 1580, however, the emphasis was on disputed points of authority, ecclesial polity and sacramental theology, and liturgical interpretation was largely absent. This written evidence is all that remains of many vigorous debates in the period, but it does give an impression that liturgical interpretation was marginalised in post-Tridentine Scottish Roman Catholicism.

The Protestant attack on traditional liturgical interpretation which produced the ‘anti-commentaries’ of Adamson and Fergusson was really an attack on idolatrous worship not on liturgical interpretation. Adamson, Fergusson, George Hay, the Breif Gathering and Bruce’s sermons confirm the importance of the Reformed version of liturgical interpretation already noted in the Protestant catechisms. Rooted in the same Augustinian doctrine of signs as traditional liturgical interpretation, it was distinguished from it mainly by its subject: the simple Reformed sacramental rites ordered by the scriptural principle of worship. It also differed from the method of the Rationale in its simplicity and in relating the elements and ceremonies only to the mystery celebrated in the sacrament and not to the Christian faith as a whole. In this, however, it was close to the humanist, catechetical version of liturgical interpretation which was characteristic of Catholic Reform. Scottish Reformed liturgical interpretation had its proximate roots in Calvin’s Augustinian theology but it was also almost certainly directly influenced by traditional liturgical interpretation. This may have been because many Protestant Reformers were formed as young men in the tradition of Scottish Catholic Reform. It may also have been a result of their reaction against the Catholic form of liturgical interpretation as seen in the controversies with the Aberdeen liturgists of Adamson, Craig and George Hay.
Conclusions

1) General conclusions
Establishing the nature of liturgical interpretation and discovering its place in the religious culture of renaissance Scotland has led to a number of conclusions about the subjects studied, a suggestion for a change in terminology and approach in the study of the Scottish Reformation and some ideas for further research.

The main conclusion, which has not been established before, is that liturgical interpretation was a significant element in the religious culture of Catholic Scotland before 1560. It was an essential part of the school curriculum, associated particularly with grammar education, and it was taught in the universities although less central there. The *Examen ordinandorum* and the presence of *Rationales* in choirs suggest that it was a central element in the education of the clergy and, although there are no extant lay-manuals from Scotland, it is probable that it was taught to the laity, as elsewhere in Europe, as a way of participating in the mass.

To uncover this lost aspect of pre-1560 Scottish culture it was first necessary to give a clearer definition of liturgical interpretation than has hitherto been attempted. This also involved breaking new ground. The term ‘liturgical interpretation’ was chosen for the literary genre. Although it was not a contemporary term and others could have been used, it is the best available. Liturgical interpretation is essentially the application of the methods of patristic and medieval biblical exegesis to the complexus of the liturgy (text, performance, material culture and use of space). It differs from biblical exegesis primarily by its subject. Liturgical interpretation was shown to be dependent on a particular epistemology with its roots in Augustine and Christian Platonism and it involved a ‘vocabulary’ and ‘grammar’ of interpretation which meant it was flexible, able to respond to liturgical developments and suitable for use in both sophisticated and simple texts. This flexibility, and the roots of the method in Scripture and Augustine, meant that it was able to be adapted for Protestant liturgy.
In opening up a previously unknown aspect of Scottish culture the thesis has shown how much can be done with the limited evidence available, particularly the use of books and other material objects and comparison with other parts of Latin Christendom. The use of Latin and association with European universities meant that Scottish clergy lived in a common European Christian culture. Examples from the rest of Europe enabled an argument to be made for the influence of liturgical interpretation on the design and understanding of Scottish churches, predominantly where educated clerical patrons were involved. The study of liturgical interpretation and the European context was fruitful for understanding extant religious material culture, for example uncovering evidence of the influence of Temple symbolism on church design and understanding the symbolism of the distinctive Scottish group of sacrament houses.

It may be objected that the centrality of educated clerical patrons means that this is a narrow study of elite clerical religion. The focus on the clergy is partly the result of the nature of extant evidence but Duffy, however, rightly points out in *The Stripping of the Altars* that it is misleading to speak of a division between the clergy and the population at large. It may be objected that the centrality of educated clerical patrons means that this is a narrow study of elite clerical religion. The focus on the clergy is partly the result of the nature of extant evidence but Duffy, however, rightly points out in *The Stripping of the Altars* that it is misleading to speak of a division between the clergy and the population at large. Liturgical interpretation was used by humanist scholars like Archibald Hay and taught to the laity via Hamilton’s 1552 Catechism and the Alexander Galloway’s crucifix plaque at Kinkell. It has been suggested that the sacrament houses at Deskford and Cullen were an example of cooperation between a learned cleric, Galloway, and the lay-patrons who erected them. The poorer sort could reflect on the meaning of the priest’s vestments, the lower clergy were taught allegorical interpretations of the rites they celebrated, while learned clergy wrote in the margins of their liturgical commentaries and built churches on Temple proportions. Liturgical interpretation did not require literacy, only an ability to think symbolically which was open to all. In general this is a study of intellectual history and its influence on people and material culture and, as Mullan said of his study of a later period, these ideas were pre-eminently the property of the clerics who studied them and taught them to other clerics and to their parishioners.

---

This study of Catholic Reform via the lens of networks of clergy interested in liturgical interpretation has contributed to a more positive picture of the Catholic church in Scotland before 1560. Despite the work of many scholars over the last half-century the religious history of sixteenth century Scotland is still escaping from the presuppositions of the Protestant historiography which began with Knox’s *History.*

The thesis shows Scottish Catholic Reform movements formed of groups of friends in close touch with new developments on the continent and actively working to reform the Church at home. This fits well with Alec Ryrie’s picture of the Protestant revolution of 1559-60 as ‘the sudden precipitation of a revolutionary moment’ rather than the culmination of general dissatisfaction.

The thesis contributes to the understanding of the origins of the distinctive religious culture of North East Scotland. Examination of books as material objects and carriers of relationships showed such a close link between interest in liturgical interpretation and commitment to Catholic Reform that the scope of the thesis was changed to include Church Reform in Scotland. The most significant network of reform-minded clergy was the ‘Aberdeen liturgists’. While the work of Leslie Macfarlane and others has demonstrated the existence of a group of reform orientated clergy interested in liturgy around Bishop Elphinstone, this thesis has demonstrated that this group continued in the diocese and under the leadership of Bishop Gordon continued beyond the Protestant revolution of 1559-60. It also influenced the other Scottish Catholic reform movement of Archbishop Hamilton. Adamson’s poem and Craig’s catechism suggest that the ‘Aberdeen liturgists’ proved formidable opponents for Protestants sent to the North East after 1560, provoked a more developed form of Protestant liturgical interpretation and contributed to the formation of an enduring religious culture in North East Scotland.

Although most of the thesis is about the Catholic Church before 1560, perhaps its most significant conclusions concern the ‘Scottish Reformation’. It suggests that if one steps outside the Catholic/Protestant division in Scottish history and makes

---

2 See, Holmes, ‘Historiography of the Scottish Reformation’.

‘Scottish Christianity’ the prime category, the history of the sixteenth century will look different. This may be compared to the way the work of Alan MacDonald and David Mullan has challenged conventional distinctions between ‘Presbyterians’ and ‘Episcopalians’ in the early seventeenth century.  

One major conclusion is that the revolution of 1559-60, while it obviously marked a radical religious change, was not an absolute break in Scottish religion, let alone Scottish culture. The thesis did not look for the continuation of Catholic liturgical or devotional practices in Protestant culture but it did find that there was a Reformed type of liturgical interpretation which both parodied the interpretation of the Catholic liturgy and used elements of the Catholic method to interpret the Reformed liturgy. The latter differed from Catholic interpretation primarily in the liturgy it interpreted, but was also distinguished by its simplicity and in relating the elements and ceremonies only to the mystery celebrated in the sacrament and not to the Christian faith as a whole. In this it was close to the pre-1560 catechetical and educational use of liturgical interpretation. Reformed liturgical interpretation adds a new strand to ‘the culture of Protestantism in early modern Scotland’ described by Margo Todd in her 2002 book.

Reasons for this continuity include the common formation in pre-1560 Catholic Reform circles of many Scottish Protestants, the challenge from the Aberdeen liturgists to Protestants such as Craig, and, providing the legitimation of the continuity, the fact that both Catholics and Protestants were Christians with a faith which, like liturgical interpretation itself, was rooted in the Bible and Augustine. The Protestant rejection of non-Biblical superstitious liturgical practices and their interpretation did not necessarily involve a rejection of a sacramental and symbolic liturgy in favour of a logocentric religion; something which recalls similar

---


5 This can be compared to Scottish protestant post-1560 penitential performance which had many connections to Catholic penitential practice, Todd, *Culture of Protestantism*, 127-82; cf. MacCulloch, *Reformation*, 596-600.
interconfessional adaptations discerned by scholars in other areas of contemporary religion.⁶

2) **New terminology required for the Scottish Reformation**

A major general conclusion of this research is the conviction that to use the term ‘the Scottish Reformation’ without qualification for the Protestant revolution of 1559-60 is inaccurate. This is so important that it requires a separate section deploying evidence to support it.

The Protestant use of ‘Scottish Reformation’ is derived from a contemporary partisan term, used for example in 1560 by the *Scots Confession, First Book of Discipline* (known in 1560 as the *Buik of Reformatioun*) and Scottish Parliament, and applied to history in the title of John Knox’s *History of the Reformation of Religioun within the Realme of Scotland*.⁷ It was also used for dating in the same way as one might use a royal or pontifical reign, for example the Dysart notary Henry Young dated a protocol of July 1564, ‘Anno Reformationis ecclesie Jesus Christi in Scotis quinto’ (‘the fifth year of the Reformation of the Church of Jesus Christ among the Scots’).⁸

In the annotations to his part-books, the Protestant musician and minister, Thomas Wode (d. 1592), also dated the Scottish Reformation to 1559 when he speaks of Lord James Stuart ‘being at the reformatioun pryour of Sanctandrous’.⁹

This was, however, Protestant terminology and other Scots in the period rejected this term as an accurate description of these events. Ninian Winzet in 1563 wrote of ‘the
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⁷ http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/A1560/8/3; Hazlet, 244, 276; Cameron, *First Book of Discipline*, 85, 198, 208; Donaldson, *Scottish Reformation*, 226, 228; *St Andrews Kirk Session Register*, i. 75. Gordon Donaldson noted the ambiguity of the term on the first page of *The Scottish Reformation* (1960).


new impietie callit by sum the Reformatioun of the Protestantis’, which was a ‘praetendit reformatioun’.

In 1581 the author of the poem *Ane Admonition to the Antichristian Ministers in the Deformit Kirk of Scotland* and the controversialist Nicol Burne spoke of the ‘deformation’, its ‘deformed religione’ and ‘the reformation (as the Ministeris callis it) of that deformit kirk in Scotland’. The last phrase suggests that it was not simply a case of people being for and against ‘the Reformation’ but of whether this title was appropriate for the events of 1559-60. In 1580 the Jesuit John Hay demanded of the Scottish Protestant ministers,

\[\text{Quhether gyt your reformation, quhilk ye have maid in the realme of Scotland, in pulling doune of the kirkes, is lykar to the reformation of Turkes and Paganes, nor to ane reformation maid be Christian men?}\]

While this suggests a neutral use of ‘reformation’, in general it is clear that the term ‘the Reformation’ to describe the events of 1559-60 belonged only to a section of Scottish society and that there was a different idea of reformation which belonged to another group of Scots. In 1600, for example, the Catholic John Hamilton wrote ‘we crave reformation’ and asked James VI to issue a command ‘to reforme the service of God’ and to make a ‘reformation’ of the Scottish Church according to the pattern of the primitive Church, which he believed would favour his side.

As seen in Part B there were strong movements of Catholic Reform in pre-1560 Scotland and these used the language of ‘reform’ and ‘reformation’, as reflected in the 1540 act of the Scottish Parliament ‘for reforming kirks and kirkmen’, the legislation for reformation of morals and teaching in the Scottish Provincial Councils of 1549-58 and the reform programmes of Archbishop Hamilton and the bishops of Aberdeen. The Catholic dean and chapter of Aberdeen wrote to Bishop Gordon in
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14 http://www.rps.ac.uk/trans/1540/12/55; Patrick, *Statutes*, 84, 89, 98, 124, 171.
January 1559 asking ‘for reformatioun to be maid’. Different theological opinions meant that there were differences as to what ‘reformatioun’ entailed, but to call the events of 1559-60 ‘The Scottish Reformation’ is to take sides with the victors in an ancient dispute, to ignore the Scottish tradition of Catholic Reform and to endorse historical bias. It is no less polemical than calling 1559-60 ‘The Scottish Deformation’.

What terminology, then, should one use and how is this relevant to this thesis? Although there has been a sustained assault by historians over the last sixty years on the Presbyterian historiography behind the use of this term, as long as the events of 1559-60 continue to be described as ‘The Scottish Reformation’ without qualification the denominational bias remains. It is a convenient term and it is hard to imagine living without it, but other ideologically-loaded historical terms, such as ‘The Indian Mutiny’ and ‘The Celtic Church’ have been dethroned. Jenny Wormald has noted a distinctively Scottish use of ‘the Reformation’ for the single set of events 1559-60 (which she calls ‘the Protestant explosion’ and Alec Ryrie ‘the first modern revolution’) compared to a less frequent use of the term in England where ‘there was more of a sense of long term process than dramatic event’. This Scottish use is found in contemporary documents such as Acts of Parliament and the documents of Young and Wode noted above where the date of the event is usually put in the first half of 1559. As, unlike ‘Celtic Church’, ‘Reformation’ is a contemporary term for this event and the protagonists styled themselves ‘Protestants’, the best term for 1559-60 is ‘the Scottish Protestant Reformation’, close to Winzet’s ‘Reformatioun of the Protestantis’.

Knox’s History, however, implies that the Protestant Reformation in Scotland was an ongoing process from the fifteenth century and it is possible to speak of a ‘Scottish
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15 Registrum Aberdonensis, i. lxi.
17 Wormald, Court, Kirk, and Community, 112. This may be compared with the dates 6 March 1559 to 1 September 1561 covered by the 1563 Act of Oblivion, The Records of the Parliaments of Scotland to 1707, http://www.rps.ac.uk/mss/A1563/6/1, accessed 24 August 2012.
Long Reformation’. This could be extended to the overthrow of Episcopacy in 1638, to the triumph of Presbyterianism in 1689-90 or even into the eighteenth century, but the concern here is not with the seventeenth century. This ‘Scottish Long Reformation’ only merits the title if it includes Catholic Reform movements such as that of Aberdeen which also began in the late fifteenth century. Thus, if we put to one side other ecclesial reformations such as that under the ‘Canmore dynasty’, we can speak of a ‘Scottish Reformation’ which includes the Scottish Catholic Reform movements which both produced and opposed the original Scottish Protestant Reformers and had an afterlife in recusant Scottish Roman Catholicism.

This is important for this thesis because, as has been demonstrated in Part B, liturgical interpretation was a key element of these Catholic movements but it has been ignored by a historiography which equates ‘Reformation’ with a ‘Protestantism’ which seems uninterested in allegorical interpretation of worship. To examine the sixteenth-century Reformation primarily as a series of movements within Scottish Christianity as a whole has allowed the discovery of Scottish Reformed liturgical interpretation and will be fruitful for future scholarship.

3) New directions in research

Research for this thesis has also suggested other areas which might be examined. If 1560 was less of a definitive break in the religious history of Scotland than previously imagined, Part C suggests that there was a shift in religious culture about three decades later. This is reflected in a declining interest in liturgical interpretation among Catholics, possibly caused by the dying out of clergy formed in pre-1560 Catholic Scotland, and the pietistic turn among Protestants noted by Mullan. This
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19 We see an early version of this in the scope of the 1962 volume, Essays on the Scottish Reformation, ed. McRoberts. Even excellent modern works that undermine denominational history such as Ryrie, Origins, perpetuate the old usage.
deserves further study and the thesis does little more than imply that it occurred. One possible reason for the shift suggested by the study of liturgical interpretation is that the emphasis on the doctrine of transubstantiation in post-Tridentine Roman Catholicism subverted the symbolic world of the liturgy, with its roots in patristic theology and Christian Platonism, by emphasising the reality of Christ’s presence (res) so much that it eclipsed the symbol (sacramentum). In the high middle ages scholastic Aristotelianism caused a crisis in liturgical interpretation reflected in Albert’s commentary. This and the invention of transubstantiation then resulted in a coexistence of the scholastic doctrine and liturgical interpretation as seen in Aquinas’s Summa and the Rationale (and later Biel’s commentary). The Protestant attack on Catholic eucharistic theology, however, and the Roman Catholic defence of it at Trent caused a strong emphasis on sacramental theology and a consequent decline in interest in liturgical interpretation which is reflected in Scottish Catholic controversial literature. Although this thesis is not an attempt to see how Scotland fits the ‘confessionalisation thesis’, it does chart the move from a common but polymorphous Catholic religious culture in Scotland to confessional division between Reformed Protestantism and a recusant Tridentine Roman Catholicism with a strong emphasis on transubstantiation. Further research could test and chart this change.

The thesis has produced a distinctive multi-disciplinary method for the study of liturgical interpretation, similar to that used by Éamonn Ó Carragáin in his Ritual and the Rood, integrating the study of texts, book-culture and material objects. This involves the identification of many different types of evidence of the use of liturgical interpretation and analysing them according to the methods appropriate to their nature while seeking their underlying symbolic grammar and links between the people associated with them. This can be applied to other Christian countries, areas or periods. One recent article has already extended the study of liturgical commentaries in Scotland into the seventeenth century and the same could be done for the Reformed liturgical interpretation defined in Part C. 20 This article has shown that individual liturgical commentaries belonging to Scottish Catholics and recorded
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20 Holmes, ‘Out of their Reasonless Rationalls’.
in this thesis were sometimes later used by Protestants, and the same was true of patristic and scholastic volumes. A study of the latter using the same methodology as this thesis, beginning with an examination of the books as material objects and the networks of scholars this reveals, could be just as fruitful as this study, for example uncovering links between the Catholic ‘Aberdeen liturgists’ of the sixteenth century and the Protestant ‘Aberdeen doctors’ of the seventeenth.
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Appendix 1. Copies of the *Rationale* Examined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Repository</th>
<th>Call number</th>
<th>Pr.1</th>
<th>Provenance 2</th>
<th>Marg.</th>
<th>Marg. Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14th c.</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Lincoln Lat. 50</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>donated by John Southam 1437</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 6-10, 11, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th c.</td>
<td>LLP</td>
<td>MS 68</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>Llanthony 2nd Priory OSA Glouc.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 6-10, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late 14th c.</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Laud Misc. 461</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>fol. 217v note on the Scots¹</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 3, 4, 8, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th c.</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Laud Misc. 311</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 6, 7, 9, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1451 Vn</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>MS.Add.D.39</td>
<td>It.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459 Mz</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>Velins-125</td>
<td>It.</td>
<td>OSB S. Gior. Mag. Venice 1461</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459 Mz</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>Velins-126</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>priest, chaplain 1472; canon 1478</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2, 6, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459 Mz</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>Velins-127</td>
<td>It.</td>
<td>priest 1462; OSA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8 (questions), 11, 14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459 Mz</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>C.14.e.6</td>
<td>[collection of Thos Grenville 19th c.]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459 Mz</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. 4.Q 1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459 Mz</td>
<td>OAS</td>
<td>LR.5.1.1</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>Bp James Goldwell 1465</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1463 Vn</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>MS. (canonici) Liturg. 361</td>
<td>It.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19 (and 3 ‘nota’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470 St</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>MS.Laud Misc. 100</td>
<td>Sco.</td>
<td>‘Liber conventus de.’</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 3, 6-12, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470 Ag</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>[marginalia dated 1504, 1512]</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6, 10.1/2/3, 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470 Ag</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>I.C.5413</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>O.Cart Buxheim</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3, 5, 6, 9, 14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470 Ag</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. 6 Q 1.3</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>Altomünster Bridgettine nuns</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1470 Ag</td>
<td>GUL</td>
<td>Sp Coll BD12-a.9</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>Bamberg OFM Obs.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Fol. 217v of Laud Misc. 461, containing Durandus’s section on the feast of St Andrew, has marginal notes at the foot of the page on the Scots together with an anti-Scottish poem of Ranulph Higden; the next page, 218r, has a history of the translation of the relics of St Andrew to St Andrews added at the foot of the page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1470 ab</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. 5 Q inf. 1.3</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>Baumberg abbey OSA</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 10, 10.5, 11, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473 Rm</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>canon</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473 Rm</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473 Rm</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-4 bis</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473 Rm</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IC.17290</td>
<td>It.</td>
<td>Nuns</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473 Rm</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. 1 Q 1.12</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>OSA hermits Munich</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 3, 6-8, 10, 10.3, 11, 12, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473 Um</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IC.9115</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>OSA Munich</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1473 Um</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. 5 Q 2.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475 Um</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-590</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>Jesuits, Alsace</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475 Um</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IC.9140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475 Um</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. 1 Q 1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>OFM Capuchins</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475 Cl</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-585</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>OFM recollects Koblenz</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475 Cl</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.2990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475 Cl</td>
<td>LLP</td>
<td>[ZZ]1475.3</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>clergy; John Fox martyrologist</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 2, 6, 8, 10.1-5, 11, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475 Pr</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-5</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>priest?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 2, 8, 10.3/4, 12, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475 Pr</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.39053</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>canon</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1475 Pr</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. Q sup. 2.2</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>monk? near Würzburg?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2, 7, 8, 14, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476 Bs</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-581</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476 Bs</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-582</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>O.Cist, Feuillants</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 6, 10, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476 Bs</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Inc.b.GS2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476 Sp</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-584</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>OSA Halle; OSB Brauweiler</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>One – 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476 Sp</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Inc.d.G8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3, 10, 10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476 Sp?</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.8517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477 Rm</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-591</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1(questions), 8, 10, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477 Rm</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477 Rm</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Inc.c.I2.1477.1</td>
<td>It.</td>
<td>friar</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 3, 6-11, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477 Rm</td>
<td>GUL</td>
<td>Sp Coll BD7-b.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Lib.</td>
<td>Inc.</td>
<td>Lang.</td>
<td>Title/Details</td>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1477</td>
<td>Bs</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IC.37024</td>
<td>It.</td>
<td>St Nicholas coll. church, Padua</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147?</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-6</td>
<td>(rubricated 1478)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147?</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-7</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>Basle. O.Cart</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147?</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-8</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147?</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-580</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>O.Carm.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147?</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-588</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>canon</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147?</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.1044</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1478</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-583</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>religious – parish church</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147?</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. 6 Q 1.4</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>priest; OSA hermits Ramsau</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147?</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. 5 Q 4.11</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2, 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147?</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>ONC</td>
<td>BT1.91.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11, 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1478</td>
<td>Vz</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-593</td>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1478</td>
<td>Vz</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.31812</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>OSB St Paul’s abbey, Carinthia</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1478</td>
<td>Vz</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. 1 Q 2.16</td>
<td>It.</td>
<td>monk? (‘Dom’)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1478</td>
<td>Vz</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Douce 296</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2, 4, 6, 10, 11, 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>Sz</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-1466</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>priest, curé; O.Praem.</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.1048</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>nuns, St Agnes, Trier.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>GUL</td>
<td>Sp Coll Bf71-a.4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3, 6-10, 10.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479 ?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-594</td>
<td>It.</td>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-595</td>
<td>It.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 3, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Vz</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-600</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>canon; OSA</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Vz</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. 6 Q 3.37</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Nm</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-597</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>canon</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Nm</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-598</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>OFM</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Nm</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.7200</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>OFM</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Nm</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. Q sup. 2.8</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Bs</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IC.37101</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>OFM</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1481</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-1455</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>priest</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1481 Nm</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-9</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>priests; religious</td>
<td>8, 9, 10, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1481 Nm</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.7235</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1481 Nm</td>
<td>OCC</td>
<td>e.5.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y 2, 6, 10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482 Vn</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.20889</td>
<td>It.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1482 Vn</td>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>EP.G.14</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>Abp Parker 1520; earlier marginalia</td>
<td>Y 1, 3, 6, 12, 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483 Sb</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.1936</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>OSB abbey of Asbach, Bavaria</td>
<td>Y few</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1483 Sb</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Broxb. 19.3</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>Erfurt</td>
<td>Y 1, 2, 6, 8-10, 10.4, 10.5, 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1484 Sb</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.1815</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>religious, St George Freising</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1484 Sb</td>
<td>LLP</td>
<td>L40.4.5 [ARC]</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>Nat. Torperley (1564-1632)</td>
<td>Y 1, 2, 4, 6-11 (10.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485 Vn</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.20550</td>
<td></td>
<td>priest?</td>
<td>Y 6, 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485 Vn</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. 2 Q 2.2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>monastery</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485 Vn</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Inc.c.I4.1485.1</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>Mehrerau abbey OSB</td>
<td>Y 6, 7, 10, 10.3, 10.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1485 Vn</td>
<td>OKE</td>
<td>Millard 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y 1, 6, 7, 8, 10, 10.4, 12, 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486 Sb</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486 Sb</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-602</td>
<td></td>
<td>OFM</td>
<td>Y 9, 10.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486 Sb</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.1852</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>priest?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486 Sb</td>
<td>OSJ</td>
<td>Cbd.b.3.u.s.12</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>friar? ‘f. Thomas colman’</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1486 Sb</td>
<td>SHL</td>
<td>Incunabula 88</td>
<td>Sco.</td>
<td>Duncan Shearer, Aberdeen cathedral</td>
<td>Y 2, 3, 6, 8-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1487 Vn</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-1469</td>
<td>It.</td>
<td>OFM</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488 Bs</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-603</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>OFM</td>
<td>Y 2, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488 Bs</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.37605</td>
<td>Emp?</td>
<td>monastery</td>
<td>Y 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488 Sb</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.1889</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>OFM Obs.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488 Sb</td>
<td>AUL</td>
<td>Inc 10a</td>
<td>Sco?</td>
<td>[John Forbes c.1700]</td>
<td>Y 1, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488 Sb</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. 3 Q 5.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>OFM (modern?)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488 Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>4°Z.Don 205 (23).</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>OSB, Grand Prior of Cluny</td>
<td>Y 10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1491 Vn</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-1499</td>
<td>It.</td>
<td>priest?</td>
<td>Y 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Catalogue</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Vn</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.22457</td>
<td>Emp. OSA Halle; OSB Brauweiler</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-604</td>
<td>Emp. OFM Obs. Gottingen</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>few</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.1913</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.1914</td>
<td>Emp. Y</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. 3 Q 5.35</td>
<td>Emp. priest?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-2510</td>
<td>Fr. priest; OFM</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>OMA</td>
<td>Arch.C.I.1.4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Vn</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.23934</td>
<td>It. date 1553 in marg.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 6, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Nm</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.7478</td>
<td>OFM</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Nm</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Auct. Q sup. 1.9</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-28981</td>
<td>Fr. priest; OFM</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 7, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.41962</td>
<td>Eng. “Duke of Sussex”</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5, 8, 13, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>Vn</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-10</td>
<td>It. religious</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1499</td>
<td>Vn</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>IB.23197</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-2511</td>
<td>Fr. priest? OSB, O.Cist. Feuillants</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6, 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>A*.5.31</td>
<td>Eng. Laurence Banks (c.1600)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2, 6, 7, 13, 15, 16, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>AA 150 Th.Seld.</td>
<td>Eng. Valentine Davy, priest</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6, 7, 9, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>Adams.4.50.1</td>
<td>Emp? German inscr. on f.e.p.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>CCCC</td>
<td>SP.51</td>
<td>Eng. Abp Parker</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>C.48.g.8</td>
<td>Fr. (French tr)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2, few notes in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Douce O 180</td>
<td>Fr. (French tr)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1504</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-1497</td>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1506</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>C.77.d.17</td>
<td>Eng. OSA (Burton); Abp Cranmer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-2512</td>
<td>Fr. Abp Cranmer</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>468.a.4</td>
<td>Eng. Abp Cranmer</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>OMA</td>
<td>m.17.6</td>
<td>Eng. ‘Sefton, howard, lyill’</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1, 2, 6-9, 10, 10.4, 11-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>D-533 (2)</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Lib.</td>
<td>Call No.</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>GUL</td>
<td>Sp Coll K.T. f26</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>Regensburg, religious</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>860.1.5</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>OSA Munich</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Vet. E1 d.39</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>OCC</td>
<td>Hyp.0.25</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1515</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>LLP</td>
<td>H1970.(D8) [**]</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>marginalia in English</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>DUL</td>
<td>St Chad’s B3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>LLP</td>
<td>H1970.(D8)</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>marginalia in German</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-27884</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1518</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>7.a.8</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>‘Thomas Wylyams’</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-604 (bis)</td>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>St Nicholas in Bruwyke</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>468.b.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1519</td>
<td>Vn</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>D 3.4 Th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-2513</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1528</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-2513 (bis)</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>ONC</td>
<td>BT1.130.12(2)</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>purchased by New College in 16th c.</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1535</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-3082</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>OFM recollect</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-1501</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>Royal Library</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>Vn</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Vet. F1 e.250</td>
<td>It.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1540</td>
<td>Vn</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>Vet. F1 e.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>OWA</td>
<td>i6.1</td>
<td>Eng?</td>
<td>donation at fd. of Coll. in 1610</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>GUL</td>
<td>Bk3-f.13</td>
<td>Sco.</td>
<td>Jas Strachan, canon of Aberdeen 1553</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560</td>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>SAL</td>
<td>AN.41</td>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>Scots College, Madrid; ‘Gallego’</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561</td>
<td>Vn</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>1221.g.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Repository</td>
<td>Call Number</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1562 Ap</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>A*.7.7</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>‘Jo Charde Gibbs’</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565 Ly</td>
<td>BL</td>
<td>843.d.14</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>‘Lumley’</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565 Ly</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>F.156d.4.1</td>
<td>Pol?</td>
<td>Prince Roman Sanguszko, 19th c.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565 Ly</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>BCL.B244</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scalant seminary, Scotland; Spain?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568 Vn</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-28977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2, 7, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568 Vn</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>Oban.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568 Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-7234</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>Sorbonne University</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568 Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-42283</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>priest?</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Few. 10, 10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570 Ap</td>
<td>CUL</td>
<td>G.2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>old CUL marks</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2, 6, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570 Ap</td>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>8° D 1 Th.</td>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1572 Vn</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-44406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2, 8, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574 Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-7235</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>OFM Cap.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574 Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-3505</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>bishop</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574 Ly</td>
<td>BNF</td>
<td>B-3505 (bis)</td>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>priests? university?</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581 Vn</td>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>CIM 338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REPOSITORIES**

AUL Aberdeen University Library (2)
BL London, British Library (37)
BNF Paris, La Bibliothèque nationale de France (57)
CCCC Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, Parker Library (2)
CUL Cambridge University Library (6)
DUL Durham University Library (1)
GUL Glasgow University Library (5)
LLP London, Lambeth Palace Library (6)
NLS Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland (3)
OAS Oxford, All Souls (1)
OBL Oxford, Bodleian Library (35)
OCC Oxford, Christ Church (2)
OKE Oxford, Keble College (1)
OMA Oxford, Magdalen College (2)
ONC Oxford, New College (2)
OSJ Oxford, St John’s College (1)
OWA Oxford, Wadham College (1)
SAL Salamanca, Real Colegio de Escoceses, Library (1)
SHL London, Senate House Library (1)
TOTAL COPIES EXAMINED 166
Including manuscripts (in *italics*) 7

PLACE OF PUBLICATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Augsburg</td>
<td>Rm</td>
<td>Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ap</td>
<td>Antwerp</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Salamanca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bs</td>
<td>Basle</td>
<td>Sz</td>
<td>Salzburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Cologne</td>
<td>Sp</td>
<td>Speyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hg</td>
<td>Haguenau</td>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>Strasbourg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ly</td>
<td>Lyon</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>St Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mz</td>
<td>Mainz</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Treviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nm</td>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>Um</td>
<td>Ulm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pr</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>Vn</td>
<td>Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vz</td>
<td>Vicenza</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROVENANCE AREAS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emp.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Pol.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sco.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Sp.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROVENANCE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishops and Cathedrals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Reformed Franciscans</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priests</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Carmelites (O.Carm.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Secular clergy]</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Bridgettines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictines (OSB)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nuns</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cistercian Feuillants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unidentified religious</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carthusians (O.Cart.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>[Regular clergy]</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustinians (OSA)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Laity</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premonstratensians (O.Praem.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franciscans (OFM)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COPIES WITH MARGINALIA

105 out of 166 63%

To 1477 34 out of 45 76%
1478-1485 26 out of 40 65%
1486-1509 27 out of 41 66%
1510-1581 18 out of 40 45%
## TYPES OF MARGINALIA & MARKS

| 1 | words from the text used as headings | (39) |
| 2 | underlining | (33) |
| 3 | manicules | (24) |
| 4 | marginal scriptural- and cross-references | (9) |
| 5 | manuscript tables added to the volume | (4) |

**Marginalia and marks in:**

| 6 | Book 1, on the Church | (36) |
| 7 | Books 2 & 3, on the clergy and vestments | (22) |
| 8 | Book 4, on the mass | (34) |
| 9 | Book 5, on the office | (19) |
| 10 | Books 6 and 7, the liturgical year: |
| 10.1 | Advent | [4] |
| 10.2 | Christmas | [6] |
| 10.3 | Lent | [8] |
| 10.4 | Easter | [8] |
| 10.5 | the triduum only | [9] |
| 11 | Book 8, calendar theory and practice | (24) |

**Marginalia and marks on:**

| 12 | scriptural interpretation | (15) |
| 13 | reformation controversies | (13) |
| 14 | rites for the dead | (19) |
| 15 | liturgy | (10) |
| 16 | miracles | (1) |
| 17 | images | (3) |
| 19 | corrections | (8) |
Appendix 2

a. Chapter 4.1
DUNDEE ANTIPHONAL FRAGMENT (text and image)
A page from a sixteenth-century antiphonal with the noted antiphon Omnes patriarchae for second vespers of the Epiphany, used in the binding of a book bound in Dundee, possibly a protocol book of the Dundee notary Robert Wedderburn (1546–1611). There are paintings of clerics and rubrical instructions for Epiphany ceremonies with an archbishop at the foot of the page.
Dundee Central Library, Lamb Drawer 1(3).

Text of the antiphon

Antiphona ad Secundas Vesperas Epiphaniae Domini
Omnes patriarchae preconati sunt te et omnes prophete annuntiaverunt te, pastoribus angeli ostenderunt te, celi per stellam declaraverunt te, et omnes iusti cum gaudio susceperunt te.

Text of the rubrical addition

Haec ant[ifon]a 1 canitur a minori Primicerio et Lectoribus in Chorona constitutis versus Altare et cum pervenerint ad ultiam: Et omnes Justi cum gaudio susceperunt Te, tunc ipsi canentes genuae flectunt, caput inclinant, et manus jungunt, et per hos Lectors Patriarchae denotantur, qui Christum proclamaverunt.

Secundo canitur a Mazeconiiś, seu Magistris Scholarum, stantibus ad eorum stadia, servato ordine ut supra et per eos denotant Prophetae qui Christum annuntiaverunt.

Tertio canitur a Majori primicerio, et clero centum ferularum, stantibus in loco eminentiori, servato ordine ut supra: Per Primicerium denotatur Angelus, qui Pastoriibus Christum annuntiavit et per sacerdotes centum ferularum denotantur Pastores.

Quarto et ultimo canitur per Archiepisopum et Prelatos at Ordinarios tantum, stantes in modum Coronae prope ac renibus Altari, et facie versis, sequentibus omnibus supra notatis et cum pervenerint ad ultiam clausulam: Et omnes Justi etc.

Tunc omnes facie versa ad altare, ac genuflexi, unasimul canunt dictam clausulam, stantibus semper ambobus subdiaconis in medio coronae cum candelabris et luminaribus accensis.

1 In PL this word only occurs in the prefatory Admonitio to the Monumenta Sancto Zenone in PL 11.198C: ‘Dein in calce libri recentiori manu haec annotatio apposita est: Ego presbyter Gervasius de Bracano Cappellanus Ecclesiae S. Mauritii, et Maziconius Sanctae Mariae Majoris devovo hoc meum Missale Ecclesiae Sancti Mauritii pro utilitate canendi Missam.’
Figure 20: Dundee Antiphonal Fragment
b. Table 5.1
SURVIVING MEDIEVAL PARISH CHURCHES FROM THE DIOCESE OF DUNBLANE (16 out of 38)
From the Corpus of Medieval Scottish Churches
http://arts.st-andrews.ac.uk/~cmas/sites.php#DioceseofDunblane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rectangular Churches</th>
<th>dimensions in metres</th>
<th>proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exmagirdle</td>
<td>9.68 x 5.48</td>
<td>1 : 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulliallan</td>
<td>?11 x 4.9?</td>
<td>1 : 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullichettle</td>
<td>14.8 x 6.1</td>
<td>1 : 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dupplin</td>
<td>?14.8 x 6?</td>
<td>1 : 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fossoway</td>
<td>?18.4 x 7.2?</td>
<td>1 : 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kincardine</td>
<td>19.8 x 7.15</td>
<td>1 : 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strowan</td>
<td>20.74 x 7.5</td>
<td>1 : 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullibody</td>
<td>19.22 x 6.8</td>
<td>1 : 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberuthven</td>
<td>19.6 x 6.67</td>
<td>1 : 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auchterarder</td>
<td>25.5 x 7.42</td>
<td>1 : 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strageath</td>
<td>26 x 7.9</td>
<td>1 : 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culross Old</td>
<td>23.2 x 6.5</td>
<td>1 : 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tullibole</td>
<td>?24.5 x 6.7</td>
<td>1 : 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fowlis Wester</td>
<td>31.75 x 8.2</td>
<td>1 : 3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two-cell Churches</th>
<th>dimensions in metres</th>
<th>proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunning nave</td>
<td>13.53 x 8.3</td>
<td>1 : 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunning chancel</td>
<td>7.15 x 6.92</td>
<td>1 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muthill nave (without aisles)</td>
<td>19.65 x 7.93</td>
<td>1 : 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muthill nave (with aisles)</td>
<td>19.65 x 15.32</td>
<td>1 : 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muthill chancel</td>
<td>14.52 x 6.13</td>
<td>1 : 2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5.2
**BRITISH UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CHAPELS BUILT BEFORE 1560**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>chapel date</th>
<th>dimension in feet</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCOTLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Salvator’s, St Andrews</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>28 x 107</td>
<td>1 x 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Salvator’s, St Andrews (without apse)</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 x 98</td>
<td>1 x 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Leonard’s, St Andrews</td>
<td>1512 x 1545</td>
<td>20.5 x 80</td>
<td>1 x 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Leonard’s, St Andrews (original)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20 x 42</td>
<td>1 x 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s, Aberdeen</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>28 x 122.5</td>
<td>1 x 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s, Aberdeen (without apse)</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 x 112</td>
<td>1 x 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAMBRIDGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ’s</td>
<td>1511</td>
<td>28.25 x 84.25</td>
<td>1 x 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s</td>
<td>1446-1515</td>
<td>76.5 x 289</td>
<td>1 x 3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s choir</td>
<td></td>
<td>43 x 166</td>
<td>1 x 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalene</td>
<td>1470s</td>
<td>20 x 63</td>
<td>1 x 3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalene (length)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 : 37 : 17</td>
<td>1 : 4 : 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke old</td>
<td>14th c.</td>
<td>21.25 x 60</td>
<td>1 : 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens old</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>19.75 x 67</td>
<td>1 : 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>1555-1564</td>
<td>34 x 204.5</td>
<td>1 : 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity choir</td>
<td></td>
<td>34 x 135</td>
<td>1 : 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Hall</td>
<td>late 14th c.</td>
<td>18.5 x 54</td>
<td>1 : 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Hall choir</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.5 x 40.5</td>
<td>1 : 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OXFORD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Souls</td>
<td>1442</td>
<td>27.5 x 95.5</td>
<td>1 : 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Souls choir</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.5 x 70.5</td>
<td>1 : 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>21 x 74</td>
<td>1 : 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalene</td>
<td>1474-80</td>
<td>19.5 x 76.5</td>
<td>1 : 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalene choir</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.5 x 51</td>
<td>1 : 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merton choir</td>
<td>1289-94</td>
<td>28 x 102</td>
<td>1 : 3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New College</td>
<td>1380-86</td>
<td>33 x 139</td>
<td>1 : 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New College choir</td>
<td></td>
<td>33 x 102</td>
<td>1 : 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John’s</td>
<td>c.1530</td>
<td>26.5 x 79</td>
<td>1 : 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3: Scottish Sacrament Houses

| 1. St Salvator’s Collegiate Church, St Andrews, Fife. |  
| Archdiocese of St Andrews. | 1450s. |
|---|---|---|
| St Salvator’s college was founded in 1450 by Bishop James Kennedy (1440-65) and the chapel was dedicated in 1460. The sacrament house is immediately to the east of the founder’s tomb and forms one unit with it. The cornice has the royal arms and the arms of Bishop Kennedy together with an erased centre shield which probably bore the arms of the Pope. The sill is blank and may have had a painted inscription. It is supported by angels in albs and amices holding a monstrance. This is probably the first occurrence of the ‘angels with monstrance’ motif in Scotland. |

| 2. Pluscarden Priory, Moray. |  
| Diocese of Moray. | 15th century? |
|---|---|---|
| Pluscarden priory was founded in 1230 for Valliscaulian monks and united with the Benedictine abbey of Dunfermline in 1454. The sacrament house is in the north wall of the choir and was probably made after 1454 when the church was remodelled. Over the aumbry two angels in albs hold a monstrance in a composition similar to that at St Andrews. McRoberts described it as, ‘a rather poor affair made up of bits and pieces’ and claimed it was bodged together from existing elements after 1560. |
| 3. St Marnan’s Collegiate Church | The collegiate church was erected in 1446 and McRoberts dated the sacrament house to c.1453. It is at the north side of the east end of the church and consists of a decorated ogee headed niche. Above is a figure of Christ as St Salvator with an orb and his right hand raised in blessing, on either side of whom are wingless angels in albs and amices holding the cross and pillar of the scourging. On the cornice is the Annunciation. Eeles notes that the sill seems to have been designed for an inscription. |
| St Marnan’s Collegiate Church | Fowlis Easter, Angus. Archdiocese of St Andrews. Deanery of Gowrie. 1450s |
| 4. Tealing Parish Church, Angus. | Fragment of a fifteenth century sacrament house set in the south wall of the 1806 church. It is the lintel from above the aumbry and is similar in design to that at Fowlis Easter, ten kilometres away. Framed by pinnacles, a foliate cornice and an ogee arch are a pair of winged angels, holding scrolls with *Benedicimus te* and *Adoramus te* from the Gloria at mass, and the head and shoulders of Christ with a scroll inscribed *Hic est corpus m[eum]*. *TSES* 3 (1910), 95. |
| Diocese of Dunkeld, deanery of Angus. | Fifteenth century. |
| 5. Cortachy Parish Church, Angus. | Lintel of a sacrament house of the same design as that at Tealing, reset in the exterior north wall of the aisle. The inscription on the scrolls are difficult to decipher. Iain Fraser, ‘The Cortachy Sacrament House’, *Tayside and Fife Archaeological Journal* 9 (2003), 103-11. |
| Diocese of Brechin. | Fifteenth century. |
| 6. Collegiate Church of St Matthew, Rosslyn, Midlothian. | Rosslyn chapel was founded by the Sinclair family before 1456 and only the chancel was built. In the east wall of the unfinished south transept, to the north of an altar, there is a decorated aumbry that looks like a sacrament house. Fawcett (2002), 258, accepts it was a sacrament house but as the transepts were not built it was not used as such. |
| Archdiocese of St Andrews. c.1450. | |
| 7. Collegiate Church of SS Mary and Kentigern, Crichton, Midlothian. | The collegiate church was founded in 1449 by William Crichton. An ogee headed aumbry in the north wall of the chancel was probably a sacrament house. |
| Archdiocese of St Andrews. Deanery of Haddington. c.1450. | |
| 8. Delgaty Castle, Aberdeenshire. | Found at Delgaty castle, a niche carved with a draped curtain held each side by a fleur-de-lis. McRoberts (1965, p.45) notes that it was ‘securely concealed within a wall and carefully wrapped in moss’, and was probably from the sacrament house of the castle chapel. Described in *PSAS* 44 (1910), 256-7, as 3 feet 3 inches by 4 feet 1 inch. |
| Diocese of Aberdeen. c.1450. | |
| 9. St Fergus Church, Glamis, Perthshire. | The church, now a ruin, was built in memory of the first Lord Glamis, who died in 1459, by his widow, Isabella Ogilvy. The south transept remains roofed and in its east wall is a sacrament house with shields bearing the arms of the Lyon and Ogilvy families. |
| Archdiocese of St Andrews. Deanery of Angus. c.1450. | |
| **10. Chapel of St Mahew, Kilmahew,**  
**Dunbartonshire.**  
Archdiocese of Glasgow.  
Parish of Neveth (Rosneath), Deanery of Lennox.  
1467. | The medieval chapel of St Mahew is situated at Kirkton of Kilmahew, near Cardross. It was mentioned in two 14th century charters, largely rebuilt in 1467 and was restored in 1953-5. There are two recesses in the east wall, one of which is a decorated aumbry which was probably a sacrament house. |
| | |
| **11. Church of St Laurence, Lundie,**  
**Perthshire.**  
Archdiocese of St Andrews.  
Deanery of Angus.  
Late fifteenth century. | The church was appropriated to St Andrews cathedral priory and is near Fowlis Easter. A late 15th century fragment, 19x11 inches, with a flat ogee-headed arch surmounted by a finial and flanked by two coarse pinnacles was found built into a wall near the church. It may have been the head of a sacrament house. |
| | |
| **12. Newburn Old Parish Church, Fife.**  
Archdiocese of St Andrews.  
Deanery of Fife. | The church, now a ruin, was appropriated to Dunfermline abbey. The east end has two aumbries on the north side. The upper one is arched and framed by mouldings and was probably the sacrament niche, the lower was probably for the altar vessels. |
| | |
| **13. St Bean’s Church, Fowlis Wester,**  
**Perthshire.**  
Diocese of Dunblane. Deaneries of Strathearn and Menteith. | The church was appropriated to Inchaffray abbey. At the north end of the east wall is a rebated aumbry with the monograms of Jesus and Mary which probably served as a sacrament house. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The old kirk was pulled down in 1783. This sacrament house with images of the five wounds and a cross with crown of thorns is in the porch of the new church. The cornice is in the kirkyard with more instruments of the passion: column of flagellation, scourges, ladder, cross, crown of thorns, pincers, five wounds, spear seamless robe, dice, 30 pieces of silver. Macpherson (1891), 96-99.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. Church of St Maelrubha, Contin, Easter Ross.</th>
<th>Diocese of Ross. c.1500.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Parish church incorporates portions of its medieval predecessor and in 1908 a small aumbry with arch-pointed head was revealed at the east end of the north wall (84 x 81 x 46 cm). C. Maclean, ‘Notes on Contin Church, Ross-shire, with its Sacrament House, and Two Sepulchral Slabs in the Churchyard’, PSAS 49 (1915), 71-80.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The church was a mensal church of the bishop of St Andrews. It became disused in 1796 and only the east end remains rebuilt as a burial enclosure. Next to a large tomb recess is an ogee headed niche with a fleur-de-lis finial and on either side the royal arms and the arms of a branch of the Melville family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. Kings College Chapel, Aberdeen.</th>
<th>Diocese of Aberdeen. 1500. (not extant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Given by Alexander Galloway, this is lost but was described as ‘locus pro sacramento, figure pyramidalis’. As it was ‘above the altar’, McRoberts (1965), 46-47 suggested it was like an Italian Renaissance tabernacle.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Church of St Marnan, Benholm, Kincardineshire.</td>
<td>Built into the east wall of the 1832 (redundant) parish church is a small aumbrey with a thistle finial, flanked by two crude buttresses with crocketed pinnacles and surmounted by a plain coved cornice. Eeles dated it to the early 16th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early sixteenth century.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Meathie-Lour Church, Angus.</td>
<td>The church was appropriated to Coupar Angus abbey and was the parish church of the old parish of Meathie-Lour until 1667, after which it became ruinous. A decorated sacrament house, carved with a grapevine, pinnacles and stylised leaves, discovered during excavations in 1926, has been built into the modern north wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdiocese of St Andrews. Deanery of Angus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Avoch Parish Church, Easter Ross.</td>
<td>The parish was appropriated to the Cistercian abbey of Kinloss and was repaired under Abbot Thomas Crystall (1504-28) (Kinloss Recs, xlii, xlxi). The aumbry is in the vestry wall of the 1872 parish church which replaced one rebuilt in 1670. It may have come from the previous church or from the chapel of Ormonde castle, Avoch. The small ashlar niche is surrounded by a wide filleted roll and hollow moulded border, stepped at top centre to enclose a shallow, somewhat crudely carved chalice or ciborium. Elizabeth Beaton, ‘Sacrament House, Avoch’, PSAS 114 (1984), 581-3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocese of Ross. Early sixteenth century. (poor quality image in PSAS 114)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. St Meddan’s Church, Fintray, Aberdeenshire.</td>
<td>The medieval church, appropriated to the abbey of Lindores, was in use until 1703 and is now a ruin in a graveyard. The sacrament house is at the east end of the surviving portion of the north wall. It comprises a stone plaque with a low relief depiction of Christ crucified, flanked by two figures and enclosed within a simple roll-moulded frame, and a lower panel containing the aumbry with an object, perhaps a monstrance, carved on the lintel. The heads of the figures are all damaged and that of Christ has been obliterated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 22. Bendochy Church, Perthshire. | The church was appropriated to the abbey of Coupar Angus. The sacrament house was found beneath the floor and re-set in the east wall in 1885. It is badly worn but a monstrance and the initials of Abbot William Turnbull (1507-23) have been detected amidst the shattered carving. |
| Diocese of Dunkeld. Deanery of Atholl and Drumalban. c. 1520. | |

<p>| 23. St Michael’s Church, Kinkell, Aberdeenshire. | Given by Alexander Galloway, canon of Aberdeen, to his prebendal church in 1524. It consists of four panels in a Greek cross. The aumbry has two pinnacles and the remains of a relief of two angels holding a monstrance. The sill is carved with ‘Ano Dni 1524’ ‘A.G.’ and Galloway’s motto ‘Memorare’. The top panel is blank and may have contained a painting, the side panels have scrolls with the text ‘Hic est servatum corpus de virgine natum’. |
| Diocese of Aberdeen. Deanery of Garioch. 1524. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24. St Mary’s Church, Kintore, Aberdeenshire.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diocese of Aberdeen. Deanery of Garioch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1525.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kintore was in the gift of the parson of Kinkell, who was Alexander Galloway when this sacrament house was installed. When the old church was destroyed in 1819 it was built into the staircase wall of present building. The upper panel has a fine relief of angels in albs, amices and crossed stoles bearing a large and elaborate monstrance surmounted by a crucifix. The upper panel and aumbry are surrounded by a renaissance baluster frame. On the lintel of the niche is inscribed ‘Jesus Maria’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25. St Mary’s Church, Auchindoir, Aberdeenshire.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diocese of Aberdeen. Deanery of Mar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1529-38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parish was a prebendal church of King’s College, Aberdeen. The sacrament house in the form of a monstrance was given between 1529 and 1538 by canon Alexander Spittal whose initials M.A.S. are on the sill. On the cover of the monstrance are the words ‘Hic est Corpus Dominicum’. McRoberts (1965), 49, claims that it was designed by Alexander Galloway. Another sacrament house in the form of a monstrance is at St James, Gernsbach (1470) in the Empire.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26. St Congan’s Church, Turriff, Aberdeenshire.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diocese of Aberdeen. Deanery of Boyne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1540.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The church was appropriated to the abbey of Arbroath. Only one side of the sacrament house is visible as a wall has been built against it. It has a clustered pillar with carved capital supporting a square headed lintel and was probably erected by Alexander Lyon, prebendary of Turriff (dd 1541) whose initials are on the sill.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. St Olaf’s Church, Kirkwall, Orkney.
Diocese of Orkney.
c. 1540.
Two stone aumbries are built into the south wall and vestry of St Olaf’s Scottish Episcopal Church in Kirkwall (1876). They were taken from the medieval St Olaf’s church in the town and one (in the upper picture) was probably a sacrament house. St Olaf’s was rebuilt by Bishop Robert Reid after he became bishop of Orkney in 1540 and they probably date from this time McRoberts (1965), 56.

28. St Fergus’s Church, Dyce, Aberdeenshire.
Diocese of Aberdeen. Deanery of Garioch.
1544.
The parish was a pendicle of Kinkell and a prebend of Aberdeen. The old church was replaced in 1872 but a fragment of the sill of a sacrament house has survived with the initials A.G., for Alexander Galloway parson of Kinkell, and the date 1544.

29. Orchardton Tower Chapel, Kirkcudbright.
Diocese of Galloway.
c. 1550.
Orchardton Tower, near Dalbeattie, was built for John Cairns in 1456. In what was probably the chapel is a sacrament house and decorated piscina which McRoberts (1965), 56, dated to c. 1550, although they may have been imported from another building. R.C. Reid, 'Note on a sacrament house at Orchardton', *Trans Dumfriesshire Galloway Natur Hist Antiq Soc*, 3rd series, 17 (1932), 33-5.
30. Church of St John, Deskford, Aberdeenshire.

Diocese of Aberdeen.
Deanery of Boyne.
1551.

The sacrament house is in the ruined former parish church and is by the same sculptor as that at Cullen. It has vine-moulding and wheat ears with the inscription ‘Os meum es et caro mea’ over the aumbry. Two angels in embroidered albs, amices and crossed stoles hold a monstrance. Under the aumbry is inscribed: ‘Ego sum panis vivus qui de celo desendi: qui manducaverit ex hoc pane vivet in aeternum: Johans, sesto et cetera’. Below this are the arms of Alexander Ogilvie of Findlater and his wife Elizabeth Gordon, their mottoes ‘tout jour’ and ‘Laus Deo’, their initials AO and EG, and the inscription: ‘This present loveable work of Sacrament House maid to the honour and loving of God be ane noble man Alexander Ogilvie of that ilk, Elizabeth Gordon his spous. The year of God, 1551’.

31. Collegiate Church of St Mary, Cullen, Banffshire.

Diocese of Aberdeen.
Deanery of Boyne.
1550s

Rediscovered in 1863, it is by the tomb of Alexander Ogilvie of Findlater and his wife and was probably given by them and made by the same sculptor as the sacrament house at Deskford. It has 2 angels in albs, amices and crossed stoles with a monstrance, over a decorated aumbry and is inscribed at the top, ‘Caro mea vere est cibus et sanguis mea vere est potus qui manducat meam carnem et bibit meum sanguinem vivet in eternum’.
## Possible Sacrament Houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Tulliebardine Chapel, Perthshire. Diocese of Dunblane. c.1450.</td>
<td>Founded in 1446 and, apart from the chancel, largely rebuilt about 1500, there is no record of the chapel being a collegiate foundation. There is a small aumbry at the east end of the south wall of the chancel. It may have been a sacrament house although these were usually at the east end of the north wall or in the east wall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>St Ternan’s Church, Arbuthnott, Kincardineshire. Archdiocese of St Andrews. Deanery of Mearns. Late fifteenth century.</td>
<td>The Arbuthnott aisle was added to St Ternan’s church at the end of the fifteenth century. A small trefoil headed aumbry in the upper story of the aisle was believed by Bishop Forbes of Brechin to be a sacrament house but Eeles doubted this. There is also a larger aumbry in the lower chapel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>St Ethernan’s Church, Rathen, Aberdeenshire. Diocese of Aberdeen. Deanery of Buchan. ?</td>
<td>The remains of the old church are in the burial ground and include an aumbry in the east wall with an ogee arch which may possibly have been a sacrament house. By it is a piscina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>St Martin’s Church, Logie, Angus. Archdiocese of St Andrews. Deanery of Angus. c.1500.</td>
<td>The church continued in use until 1775. Eeles noted an early 16th century ogee headed niche with a fleur de lys finial high in north wall 4 feet from east end. It is like that at Monimail but possibly too high to be a sacrament house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Carmelite Priory Church, South Queensferry, West Lothian.</td>
<td>The Carmelite friary at South Queensferry was founded in 1330 and a donation was made for building work in 1457. At the north end of the east wall is a round headed aumbry, which may have been for altar vessels.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdiocese of St Andrews.</td>
<td>c.1500.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Church of St Katherine, Catterline, Kincardineshire.</td>
<td>Eeles notes that the only remains of the medieval church, appropriated to Arbroath Abbey, is ‘a plain coarse trefoil headed arch with roll mouldings’ built into the churchyard wall, probably of the sixteenth century and possibly not a sacrament house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocese of Brechin.</td>
<td>Sixteenth century.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. St Drostan’s Church, Old Deer, Aberdeenshire.</td>
<td>The ruined church was appropriated to Deer Abbey and funded a prebend of Aberdeen Cathedral. In the north side of the nave is a small pointed arch with a carved lintel and a cross in the spandrel. Eeles thought it doubtful it was a sacrament house but Fawcett (2002), 260, suggests that this part of the nave was originally the chancel.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diocese of Aberdeen.</td>
<td>Deanery of Buchan. ?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Holyrood Abbey, Edinburgh, Midlothian.</td>
<td>McRoberts (1965), 44, noted an aumbry which he thought may have been a sacrament house ‘from one of the medieval Chapels Royal’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdiocese of St Andrews.</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Paisley Museum and Art Galleries**
- N/A: Arbuthnott Book of Hours.
2. Printed Primary Sources

(See also Bibliography 3, Latin Liturgical Commentaries to 1591 etc.)


Adam of Dryburgh, *De tripartito tabernaculo*, PL 198.609-792.

Adamson, Patrick, *De Papistarum superstitionis ineptiis* (Edinburgh, 1564).

Adamson, Patrick, *Catechismus Latino carmine redditus...* (Edinburgh, 1581).

[Alan of Lille] *De sex aliis cherubim*, PL 210.269-80.


Albert the Great, *In tertium et quartum sententiarum* (Basle, 1506). EUL Dd.4.27.


Angelo, Bartolommeo d’, *Examen confessariorum ac ordinandorum* (Venice, 1583).
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Bible, Vulgate. (Lyons, 1514 x 1531), NLS BCL.A648 (ESL, 140), owned by Thomas Ross of Pluscarden (Ross Bible).


Book of Common Order. *The CL Psalmes of Dauid in English metre. With the forme of prayers, and ministration of the sacraments...* (Edinburgh, 1575).


Bruce, Robert, *Sermons vpon the Sacrament of the Lords Supper* (Edinburgh, 1590?).


Butrio, Antonius de, *Speculum de confessione* (Louvain 1483). SAUL TypGS.A88GR.


*Calendar of Scottish Supplications to Rome, 1418-22*, ed. E.R. Lindsay and A.I. Cameron (Edinburgh, 1934).


Eck, Johann, *Homiliarum doctissimi viri D. Iohannis Eckij* (Cologne, 1538).


*Fasti Aberdonenses: selections from the records of the University and King's College of Aberdeen, 1494-1854*, ed. Cosmo Innes, Spalding Club 26 (Aberdeen, 1854).


Gropper, Johann, *Canones Concilii Prouincialis Coloniensis* (Cologne, 1538).


Heidelberg Catechism. *Catechesis religionis christianae...in ecclesiis & scholis Palatinatus* (Edinburgh, 1591).


*Historie and Life of King James the Sext*, eds John Colville and Thomas Thomson, Bannatyne Club 13 (Edinburgh, 1825).

Holthusius, Johannes, *Modus examinandi sacrorum ordinum candidatos* (Dillinge, 1564).


Kennedy, Quintin, *Ane Compendius Tractiue Conforme to the Scripturis of Almychtie God* (Edinburgh, 1558).


Knox, John, *Heir Followeth the Coppie of the Ressoning which was betuix the Abbote of Crosraguell and John Knox, in Mayboill concerning the Masse* (Edinburgh, 1563).


Melanchthon, Philipp, *Der ordinanden examen* (Wittenberg, 1554).


Nausea, Frederick, *Isagogicon de clericis ordinandis* (Vienna, 1548).


*Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots*, ed. J.H. Pollen, Scottish History Society 1.37 (Edinburgh, 1901).


Peter de Palu, *In quartum Sententiarum* (Paris 1518). EUL Dd.5.21.

Pont, Robert, *Paruus catechismus quo examinari possunt iuniores qui ad sacram coenam admittuntur* (St Andrews, 1573).


*Register of the Privy Seal of Scotland (Registrum Secreti Sigilli Regum Scotorum)*, 8 vols, eds M. Livingstone *et al.* (Edinburgh, 1908-82).

*Registrum Domus de Soltre, necnon Ecclesiae Collegiate S. Trinitatis prope Edinburgh ... Charters of the Hospital of Soltre, of Trinity College, Edinburgh, and other collegiate churches in Mid-Lothian*, ed. David Laing, Bannatyne Club 109 (Edinburgh, 1861).


*Registrum Episcopatus Glasguensis, munimenta ecclesie metropolitane Glasguensis a sede restaurata seculo ineunte XII. ad reformatam religionem*, 2 vols, ed. Cosmo Innes, Bannatyne Club 75 and Maitland Club 61 (Edinburgh, 1843).


Reuchlin, Johannes, *De rudimentis hebraicis libri III* (Pforzheim, 1506; reprint: Hildesheim, 1974).


Rites of Durham. *A Description or Briefe Declaration of all the Ancient Monuments, Rites and Customs belonginge or beinge within the Monastical Church of Durham before the Suppression*, ed. J. Raine, Surtees Society 15 (London, 1842).


Suger of St Denis, *Libellus de consecratione ecclesiae S. Dionysii*, [http://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/Chronologia/Lspost12/Suger/sug_con0.html](http://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/Chronologia/Lspost12/Suger/sug_con0.html)


Thomas Aquinas, *Confessionale* (c.1500), owned by James Sutherland and bound with his *Tractatus sacerdotalis*.

Thomas Aquinas, *In Sententias* (c.1500), GUL Bm1.d3.


Watson, Thomas, *Holsome and Catholyke Doctryne Concernyng the Seven Sacraments of Chrystes Churche* (London, 1558).


William Durandus of Mende, *Speculum iudicale* (Basle, 1574).
William Durandus of Mende, *Repertorium aureum iuris canonici* (Frankfurt, 1592).

William Durandus of Mende, *In sacrosanctum Lugdunense concilium sub Gregorio X, Giulelmi duranti... Commentarius* (Fano, 1569).

William Durandus of Mende, *Instructions et constitutions de Guillaume Durand le Spéculateur, publiées d’après le manuscript de Cessenon*, eds J. Berthelé and M. Valmary (Montpellier, 1905).


Winzet, Ninian, *Flagellum Sectariorum...accessit Velitatio in Georgium Buchananum* (Ingolstadt, 1582).

3. Latin Liturgical Commentaries to 1591

This is an extensive but not exhaustive list arranged by author and date. Each entry is followed by an indication in square brackets of the parts of the liturgy interpreted in the commentary.

**Abbreviations:** The commentary covers: C = churches; O = holy orders; V = vestments; M = mass; D = divine office; I = sacraments of initiation, baptism & confirmation; P = penance; K = calendar and ceremonies of the Christian year; U = extreme unction; F = funerals and rites for the dead; S = sacramentals; N = marriage; OC = the order for a Council.

**AMBROSE OF MILAN** (c.339-97)
- *De sacramentis*. CSEL 73, 13-85. [I M]
- *De mysteriis*. CSEL 73, 87-116. [I M]

**EGERIA** (fl. c. 380)

**JOHN THE DEACON**
- *Ad Senarium*. PL 59: 399-408. [I]

**PSEUDO-MAXIMUS OF TURIN**
- *De baptismo*. PL 57: 771-782. [I]

**ISIDORE OF SEVILLE** (c.560-636)
- *Sancti Isidori Episcopi Hispalensis De ecclesiasticis officiis*, ed. C.M. Lawson, CCSL 113 (Turnhout, 1989). Books 6 and 7 are on the liturgy. [C M I D K O V]

**PSEUDO-GERMANUS**

**PSEUDO-BEDE**
- *De officiis (Collectaneum)*. PL 94:531-555. [K O V]

**MAGNUS OF SENS** (8th century)
- *Baptismus graece*. E. Martêne, *De antiquis Ecclesiae ritibus libri quatuor*, (Rouen, 1700), i, 158-161. [I]
- *Libellus de mysterio baptismatis*. PL 102 [I]

**ALCUIN** (d.804)
- *Primo paganus*. MGH Epist. 4, 202 sq. [I]
- *Officia per ferias*. PL 101: 509-612. [D]
- *Quia etiam prophetae*. PL 101: 465-468. [D]
- *Disputatio puerorum*. PL 101:1097-1144. [K O M]
- (Pseudo-Alcuin) *De psalorum usu*. PL 101: 468-508. [D]
ANGILBERT OF ST-RIQUIER (d.814)
*Institutio. Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum*, 1.283-303. [K]

CHARLEMAGNE (742-814)
*Saepius tecum. Amalarii opera* 3.235. [I]

LEIDRADE OF LYONS (Bishop 798-814)
*De significationibus. PL* 99:853-872. [I]

HILDEBALD OF COLOGNE (Bishop 794-819)
*Primitus enim. Amalarii opera* 3.269-71. [I]

THEODULF OF ORLEANS (d.821)
*Cur infans. PL* 105:223-240. [I]

ANGILMODUS OF SOISSONS
*Ea quae. F. Stegmüller, ‘Bischof Angilmodus über die Taufe’, Römische Quartalschrift* 52 (1957), 15-32. [I]

MAXENTIUS OF AQUILEIA (Bishop 811-33)
*De eo vero. J. M. Heer, Ein karolingischer Missionskatechismus* (Freiburg/Br, 1911), 90-95. [I]

JESSE OF AMIENS (d.836)
*De catechumen. PL* 105:781-791. [I]

AGOBARD OF LYONS (d.840)
*Contra Libros IV Amalarii. PL* 104:339-350. [K M D]
*Liber de correctione. PL* 104:329-340. [D]

WALAFRID STRABO (c.808-49)
*Liber de exordiis et incrementis quarumdam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum.* [C M V D I K O]

AMALARIUS OF METZ (c.770-850)
*Liber officialis* [K I O V M D F]
*De catechumen* [I]
*De ordine antiphonarii* [D]
*De iv temporum* [K]
*Eclogae* [M]

FLORUS OF LYONS (d.850)
*De expositione missae. PL* 119:15-70. [M]
*De divina psalmodia. PL* 104:325-350. [D]

PSEUDO-ILDEPHONSUS
*Revelatio quae ostensa est in spiritu sanctu mense septimo. PL* 106:881-90. [M]

RHABANUS MAURUS (776-856)
*Rabani Mauri De institutione clericorum libri tres*, ed. Aloisius Knöpfler (Munich, 1900) (original version) [C O V I M D K P]
*Liber de sacris ordinibus PL* 112:1165-1191 (a revision of *De institutione clericorum*). [C O I M]
**QUID SIGNIFICENT DUODECIM CANDELAE (mid-9th century)**


**MAGNUS LIBELLUS TURONENSIS**

Magnus libellus Turonensis. Wilmart, *Libelli precum quattuor aevi karolini*, 63-166. [D]

**PSEUDO-JEROME**

*De vii ordínibus Ecclesiae. Ps-Hieronymi De septem ordínibus ecclesiae*, ed. A.W. Kalff (Würzburg, 1935) [O]


**DOMINUS VOBISCUM**

Dominus vobiscum. Amalarii opera, i, 284-338. [M]

**QUOTIENS CONTRA SE**

Quotiens contra se. PL 96:1481-1502. [M]

**PRIMUM IN ORDINE**

Primum in ordine. PL 138:1173-1186. [M]

**MISSA PRO MULTIS**


**INDALTOIR FIUGOR INDINGRIMME**


**LOCA MONACHORUM**


**REMIGIUS OF AUXERRE (c.840-908)**

Liber de divinis officiis (expositio missae). PL 101:1248-71. [M]

**PSEUDO-ALCUIN (10th c.)**

Liber de divinis officiis. PL 101. 1231-33. Based on Isidore, Amalarius and Remigius. [K I O V M U F]

**ORDO QUOD SACERDOS DEBIT SACRIFICARE**


**BERNO OF REICHENAU (d. 1048)**

Liber de quibusdam rebus as missae officium pertinentibus. PL 142: 1055-80. [M K]

Dial. de jej. iv tp. PL 142:1087-98. [K]

**HUMBERT OF SILVA CANDIDA (1015-61)**

Adversus Graecorum calumnias. PL 143:929-74. [M]
PETER DAMIEN (1007-72)
  De horis canonici. PL 145:231-252. [D]

JOHN OF AVRANCHES (d.1079)
  De officiis ecclesiasticis (abbreviated as Quia quattuor elementis [D M O V]). R Delamere, Le De officiis ecclesiasticis de Jean d’Avranches, archévêque de Rouen (1067 – 1079) (Paris 1923), 1-53. [D M K I V]

BONIZIO OF SUTRI (d.1095)
  Sermo de penitentia. Berschin, Bonizo von Sutri, 161-5. [P]

FRUTOLPH OF MICHELSBERG

BERNOLD OF CONSTANCE (c.1050-1100) [non-allegorical]
  Micrologus de ecclesiasticis observationibus PL 151:974-1022. [M K D]

LIBER QUARE
  Liber quare (same period as Bernold). Liber quare, ed., G. P. Götz, CCCM 60 (Turnhout, 2003), 1-104. [K I D O V]

SIGEBERT OF GEMBLOUX (c.1030-1112)
  Epistola Duplex De Differentia Quatuor Temporum. PL 160:813-825. [K]

ODO OF CAMBRAI (1050-1113)
  Expositio in canone missae. PL 160:1053-1070. [M]

IVO OF CHARTRES (c.1040-1115)
  Sermons. PL 162:505-610. [I O V C M K]
  Sermo ad sac. ord. Reynolds, ‘Ivonian Opuscula’, 322. [V]

BRUNO OF SEGNI (d.1123)
  Tractatus de sacramentis ecclesiae mysteriis atque ecclesiasticis ritibus. PL 165:1089-1110. [C I V]

RUPERT OF DEUTZ (c.1075-1129)
  De divinis officiis, ed. H Haacke, CCCM 7 (Turnhout, 1967).

ALGER OF LIEGE (1055-1131)
  De sacramentis. PL 180:739-754. [M I]

HILDEBERT OF LE MANS/TOURS/LAVARDIN (d.1133)
  Liber de expositione missae (inauthentic) PL 171:1057-1134 [M]

DROGO OF LAON (d.1135)
  De divinis officiis. PL 166:1557-1564. [D]
HUGH OF ST VICTOR (d.1142)
   *De sacramentis Christianae fidei* PL 176:173-617. Hugh uses ‘sacramentum’ in the broad sense of the mysteries of creation and redemption, but Book 1 part 9 and Book 2 parts 3 to 11 are on the liturgy. [O V C I M S M P U]

WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY (c.1090-1143)

OTTO OF LUCCA (d.1146)
   *Summa Sententiarum.* PL 176:41-174. [I M P N]

GILBERT OF LIMERICK (1070-1147)
   *De statu ecclesiae.* PL 159:997-1004. [O]

Petrus Pictor (first half of 12th c.)
   *De sacra eucharistia.* PL 171:1198-1212, and PL 207:1135-1154. [M]

HONORIUS AUGUSTODUNENSIS (first half of 12th c.)
   *Eucharistion.* PL 172:1249-58. [M]
   *Gemma animae.* PL 172:541-738. [M C O V D K B]
   *Sacramentarium seu de causis et significatu mystico rituum divini in Ecclesia officii liber.* PL 172:813-1108. [K O V C M D]

SUGER OF ST DENIS (c.1081-1151)
   *Liber de rebus in administratione sua gestis,* and its supplement *Libellus de consecratione ecclesiae S. Dionysii.* [C]

HERVÉ DE BOURG-DIEU (fl. ante 1153)

GILBERT OF LA PORRÉE (1070-1154)

PETER LOMBARD (c.1100-1160)
   *Sententiarum libri IV.* Book 4. And thus commentaries on this book. [I M P U O N]

PSEUDO-HUGH OF ST VICTOR (c.1160)
   *Speculum de mysteriis ecclesiae.* PL 177:335-80. [C D K O V M]

HUGH OF AMIENS (Bishop 1130-64)
   *Contra haereticos.* PL 192:1111. [I M O]

GERHOH OF REICHERSBERG (1093-1169)

ISAAC OF STELLA (c.1100-69)
RICHARD THE PREMONSTRATENSIAN (late 12th century)
Sermo in canone misse/De canone missae/ de canone mystico. PL 177:455-70. [M]

JOHN BELETH (d.1182)

STEPHEN II OF AUTUN (STEPHEN OF BAUGÉ)

ROBERT PAULULUS OF AMIENS (d.1184)
De caeremoniis, sacramentis, officiis et observationibus. PL 177:381-456. [C I P U N O V]

PETER THE CHANCELLOR/ OF ROISSY (fl. early 13th century)

PREVOSTINE OF CREMONA OP (1150-1210)

SICARDUS OF CREMONA (c.1150-1215)
Sicardi Cremonensis Episcopi Mitralis de Officiis, eds Gábor Sarbak and Lorenz Weinrich, CCCM 228 (Turnhout, 2008). [C O V M D K I S]

POPE INNOCENT III [LOTHARIO DEI SEGNI] (c.1160-1216)

WILLIAM OF AUXERRE (c.1150-1231)
Summa de officiis ecclesiasticis. J. Ribaillier, Magistri Guillelmi Altissiodorensis Summa Aurea Lib. IV. (Grottaferrata, 1985). [I M P V O N]

GUY OF ORCHELLES

ALEXANDER OF HALES OFM (1183-1245)

HUGH OF ST CHER OP (d.1263)
Speculum ecclesiae. O. Solch, Hugonis a S. Charo Tractatus super missam seu Speculum ecclesiae, (Münster 1940). [V M D]

THOMAS AQUINAS OP (1225-74)
Summa Theologiae, Tertia Pars, q.83. [M]
ALBERT THE GREAT OP (1206-80)

GILBERT OF TOURNAI OFM (1200-84)

WILLIAM DURANDUS OF MENDE (c.1230-96)

Old French: Le Racional des divins offices de Guillaume Durand : liturgie, spiritualité et royauté : une exégèse allégorique / Jean Golein (1320-1403); v. 4. La messe, les Prologues et le Traité du sacre. édition critique et commentée par Charles Brucker et Pierre Demarolle (Genève, 2010-)

Manuel pour comprendre la signification symbolique des cathédrales et des églises / Guillaume Durand de Mende, évêque du treizième siècle, collection Le message initiatique des cathédrales (Fuveau, 1996).


[French translation: Du symbolisme dans les églises du Moyen Age, par Johan Mason Neale and Benj. Webb Traduit del an glais par M. V. O. avec une introduction et notes par m. l’abbé J. J Bourassé (Tours, 1847)]


**DENYS THE CARTHUSIAN (1402-71)**

*Expositio missae.* [M]

**ALBERTUS DE FERRARIIS DE PLACENTIA**

*De horis canonici.* [1] [D]. Editions: Rome, c.1475; Rome, 1477; Cologne, 1478; Louvain, 1485; Antwerp, 1487; Rome, c.1490; Venice, 1506; Nuremberg, 1507.

**GABRIEL BIEL (d.1495)**


**JOHANNES BECHOFFEN**


**FRANZ TITELMANS (d. 1537)**


**BARTOLOMÉ CARRANZA DE MIRANDA**

Carranza, *Instruction y dotrina de como todo Christiano deue oyr Missa y assistir a la celebración y Santo Sacrificio...* (Salamanca, Andrea de Portunaris; Antwerp, Christophe Plantin, 1555). [M]


**JEAN ETIENNE DURANTI (1534-1589)**

*De ritibus ecclesiae catholicae.* In the 18th century attributed to Pierre Danès. Rome 1591 fo; Rome 1591 8°; Cologne 1592 8°; Lyons 1594; Lyons 1596 4°; Lyons 1606 8°; Paris 1624 8°; ?; Paris 1631 8°; Paris 1632 8°; Lyons 1675 4°; Lyons 1715 (attributed to Danès). [C M D]

---

1 Albertus de Ferrariis is also said by PM Campi to be the author of a treatise *De celebratione missarum*, LS Sheppard, ‘Albertus Trotts and Albertus de Ferrariis’, *The Library* 5 (1947), 158-159.
4. Scottish Liturgical Commentaries and Quiñonian Liturgical Books

Liturgical commentaries and Quiñonian Roman Liturgical Books in (or probably in) Scotland before 1560. The references to Holmes, ‘Catalogue’, are to the item not the page number.

I: LITURGICAL COMMENTARIES

A. William Durandus, *Rationale divinorum officiorum*

OBL Laud Misc. 100.

SHL Incunabula 88.

3) William Durandus, *Rationale divinorum officiorum* (Basle, 1488). Owned by John Forbes of Ladysford (1710/1715). It was thus in North-East Scotland at this time and may have been in Scotland before 1560.
AUL Inc 176a.

4) William Durandus, *Rationale divinorum officiorum*. In the c.1500 chapel inventory of St Salvator’s College, St Andrews: ‘item an Rationale divinorum before ye provest chenzeit’. All the books in this inventory are service books except this *Rationale* and two grammars.
SL. S26.7.

5) William Durandus, *Rationale divinorum officiorum*. A payment by the King is recorded on 20 February 1503 to William Foular for books for the Observant Franciscan friars of Stirling including, a ‘racionale divinorum officiorum’.
SL S31.4.

6) William Durandus, *Rationale divinorum officiorum* (Lyons, 1506). This book was part of the library of the Edinburgh lawyer Clement Litill which was given to the collection that became Edinburgh University Library in (1581). The 1695 EUL catalogue notes that it was the 1506 Lyons edition but it is absent from later catalogues and is now missing. It was probably in Scotland before 1560.
Finlayson, *Clement Litill and his Library*, 58.
7) William Durandus, *Rationale divinorum officiorum*. In the 1530/40 inventory of St Mary’s Collegiate Church, Crail: ‘item ane buk in prent callit *Ordinarium divinorum chenzed at the desk at the hye alter*. A note by John Higgitt says that this is possibly the *Rationale* of Durandus.
SL. S10.10.

8) William Durandus, *Rationale divinorum officiorum*. In the 1542 inventory of King’s College, Aberdeen (AUL MS K 200). On a blank space at the end of the manuscript are listed: a processional, John of Genoa’s *Catholicon* and the ‘*racionale divinorum bene ligatum*’. These books are said to be kept with the choir books (*libri chori et templi collegii*).
SL. S3.36.

AUL pi 264 Dur 1.


EUL spec. coll. B*27.11.

12) William Durandus, *Rationale divinorum officiorum*. In the 1597 library catalogue of St Leonard’s College, St Andrews is a book called ‘rationale divinori’, which a note by John Higgitt suggests is the *Rationale* of Durandus. It was probably in the college library before 1560.

B) John Beleth, *Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis*

13) John Beleth, *Summa de ecclesiasticis officiis*. In the 1436 and 1465 library catalogues of Aberdeen cathedral: ‘*bestiale et liber de ecclesiasticis officiis in uno volumine in arseribus – secundo folio tendit*’.
SL. S1.80 and S2.63.

C) Alberto di Ferrari, *De horis canonicis*

SAUL, TypNL.A85JT.
D) Hugh of St Cher, *Speculum ecclesiae*

15) Hugh of St Cher’s commentary on the Mass, *Speculum Ecclesiae* (Louvain, c.1485). Bound with other incunables of pastoral interest, formerly in St Leonard’s college library, St Andrews, and recorded in the 1597 library list, S21.175. Holmes ‘Catalogue’, 1.3. SAUL, TypGS.A88GR.

E) Gabriel Biel, *Sacri canonis missae expositio*


19) Gabriel Biel, *Canonis missae exposito* (or *epithema expos.*). Among the books in the possession of John Grierson of the Dominican Priory at St Andrews in 1522. SL S20.78.

20) ‘Gabriel Biel in canonem missae’, is in the 1597 library catalogue of St Leonard’s College, St Andrews. It was probably in the college library before 1560. SL. S21.51.

F) Rupert of Deutz, *De diviniis officiis*

21) Rupert Of Deutz, *De diviniis officiis* (Cologne, 1526). Owned by Thomas Methven of Craighton, prebendary of the Chapel Royal, St Andrews, who was at St Salvator’s college in 1539. Holmes ‘Catalogue’, 1.10. SAUL, Mor.BX.890.R8.


G) Rabanus Maurus, *De clericorum institutione et ceremoniis ecclesiae*

23) Rabanus Maurus, *De clericorum institutione et ceremoniis ecclesiae* (Cologne, 1532). Owned by: John Stevenson (d. c.1564), precentor of Glasgow & provost of Biggar, Rector of Glasgow Univ and Senator of the College of Justice; Archibald Beaton, precentor of Aberdeen (d.1582); Andrew Lockhart, relative of George Lockhart (Glasgow). Holmes ‘Catalogue’, 1.13. ESL 146. EUL, D*.32.1.
H) Innocent III, De sacro altaris mysterio
EUL, *D.33.72.

25) The 1597 library catalogue of St Leonard’s College, St Andrews includes Innocent III, de contemptu mundi, which was sometimes printed with his, De sacro altaris mysterio. This volume was probably in the college library before 1560.
SL. S21.117.

I) Amalarius of Metz
EUL, C*.21.32.3.

GUL, spec. coll. Bi10-d.18.

J) Odo of Cambrai, canonis missae expositio
28) Pia atque sucincta canonis missae expositio, vetustate, religione & eruditione commendabilis, Venerabilis D. Odonis quondam Ecclesiae Cameracensis Episcopi (Antwerp, 1554). Bound with: Johann Wild OFM, Examen ordinandorum (Antwerp, 1554); Jacob Schöpper, Catechismus brevis et Catholicus; and the Pium diurnarum precum Enchiridion (Antwerp, 1555). This book was part of the library of Clement Litill which was given to the collection that became Edinburgh University Library in 1581. It was probably in Scotland before 1560. Finlayson, Clement Litill and his Library, 56. Holmes ‘Catalogue’, 1.20.
EUL, Dd.6.4.

K) Expositio hymnorum
ENCL, tVK 74 EXP.

L) Myllar’s Expositio sequentiarum
BL, C.35.c.6.
II: QUINONIAN LITURGICAL BOOKS

A) Quiñones breviary
EUL, Df.8.41.

NLS, BCL.S11.

3) Quiñones breviary (Lyons, 1544). Inscription of Ninian Roul (Ringand Rule), canon regular of St Andrews from before 1560 to 1597 who served as a precentor in the Reformed Church. Related to John Rule. Corrections to text and underlinings. Holmes ‘Catalogue’, 168.
NLS, BCL.S31.

NLS, PCL S.2.

6) Quiñones breviary (Lyons, 1546). The name ‘Joannes Roui’ is stamped on the binding, the brother of Ninian Rule who was also a Canon Regular of St Andrews from before 1560 to 1597. Holmes ‘Catalogue’, 171. AUL, Pi 2642 BRE.


10) Quiñones breviary (1551?). Lacking title page and without marks of ownership. Possibly of Scottish provenance as it is in the Blairs collection. Holmes ‘Catalogue’, 186. NLS, BCL.AA201.

B) Quiñonian missal


2) Quiñonian Missale Romanum (Venice and Lyons, 1550). Belonged to Andrew Durie, bishop of Galloway, early Lyonese binding with episcopal arms and ‘adveniat’. Holmes ‘Catalogue’, 180. ESL 141. AUL, pi 2642 Mis (4458) 2.

3) Quiñonian Missale Romanum (Venice and Lyons, 1550). Inscribed ‘Ex Libris Collegii Sti Salvatoris’. It belonged to Alexander Scot, Chancellor of Orkney (1544-54), the binding has ‘M.A.S. cancellarius’ on the front and ‘Orcadensis’ on back. Holmes ‘Catalogue’, 181. SAUL, TypFL.B50RM.
III: LITURGICAL COMMENTARIES IN SCOTTISH HANDS 1560-1600.

A. William Durandus, *Rationale divinorum officiorum*
1) *Rationale divinorum officiorum* (Lyon, 1560).
Salamanca, Royal Scots College Library, AN.4.1.

2) *Rationale divinorum officiorum*, incomplete (fols 20-519). Stamped ‘Colleg. Scotor. in Acad. Paris’ (Scots College, Paris). It includes the commentary of Beleth and was thus published after 1560.

B. Jean Etienne Duranti, *De ritibus ecclesiae catholicae*
3) Duranti, *De ritibus ecclesiae catholicae* (Cologne, 1592). From St Leonard’s College Library, St Andrews.
SAUL, TypGC.B92GD.
5. Editions of the *Rationale* of Durandus to 1775

The first number after the year refers to Michel Albaric’s list of editions: ‘Les Editions imprimees du *Rationale divinorum officiorum* de Guillaume Durand de Mende’, in Gy, *Guillaume Durand*, 183-200. Where editions are added to this list the location of the volume is noted. It is also noted whether the edition is folio, quarto or octavo and whether they are published with the *Summa/Rationale* of John Beleth, which was itself first published at Anvers 1553.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1480?</td>
<td>20. [Basle, 1480?] fo. (copy, BL IC.37101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1481</td>
<td>23. Lyon: M. Huss. fo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td>27. Strassburg: G. Husner. fo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1487</td>
<td>33. Venice: G. de Cereto 4°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35) 1488 34. Basle: N. Kessler. fo.
38) 1493 37. Strasburg: G. Husner. fo.
40) 1494 39. Lyon: P. le Masson, B.J.J. de Vieilleville. 4°
41) 1494 40. Nuremberg: A. Koberger. 4°
42) 1497 41. Lyon: J. Maillet. 4°
43) 1499 42. Venice: J. and A. Rubeus. fo.
44) 1494 43. Venice: [Stagninus?] fo.
45) 1499 44. Lyon: J. Sacon, Jq. Huguetan. fo.
46) 1500 45. Strasburg. fo.
48) 1503 47. Lyon: P. de Quarengiis. 4°.
50) 1504 49. Salamanca: J. Varela. fo. Spanish translation
51) 1506 50. Lyon: N. Abraham, Jq. Huguetan. 4°
53) 1509 52. Huguenau: J. Rynman, H. Gran. fo.
54) 1509 53. Venice: [Stagninus?] fo.
55) 1510 54. Lyon: J. Sacon, Jq. Huguetan. 4°
56) 1512 55. Lyon: J. Sacon, Jq. Huguetan. 4°
58) 1516 57. Lyon: L. Hillaire, Jq. Huguetan. 4°
59) 1518 58. Lyon: J. Myt, Jq. Huguetan. 4°
60) 1518 59. Caen/Paris: M. Angier, L. Hostingue. 4°
61) 1519 60. Huguenau: H. Gran, J. Rynman. fo.
62) 1519 61. Venice: B. de Vitalibus. 4°
63) 1521 62. Lyon: C. Fradin. 4°
64) 1525 63. Lyon: C. Fradin, A. Blanchard. 4°
65) 1528 64. Lyon: C. Fradin, J. Myt. 4°
66) 1531 65. Lyon: B. Bonin. 4°.
67) 1533 66. place not known. 4°.
69) 1536 68. *4° (imperfect and mutilated copy, NLS Dowd.579) Italian translation
72) 1540 70. Lyon: N. Petit. 4°.
73) 1540 71. Venice. 8°.
74) 1540 72. Lyon: S. Rousin, J. Ausolt. 4°.
76) 1552 74. Lyon: Th Payen, Jq. Junte. 4°.
77) 1553 75. Lyon: Jq. II Huguetan. 4°.
79) 1560 77. Lyon: Th. Payen, Jq. Junte. 4°. (Beleth)
80) 1562 *Antwerp (Copy at CUL A*.7.7.)
81) 1565 78. Lyon: Jq. Junte. 8°.  
85) 1572 82. Venice: C. de Tridino. 4°.  
86) 1572 83. ?  
87) 1574 84. Lyon: P. Roussin, Ph. Tinghi. 8°.  
88) 1577 85. Lyon: P. Roussin, Ph. Tinghi. 8°.  
89) 1577 86. Venice: G. Perchacinum. 8°.  
91) 1583 88. Lyon: S. Beraud, Q. Tinghi. 8°.  
92) 1584 89. Lyon: P. Roussin, Ph. Tinghi. 8°.  
95) 1591 92. Rome. fo.  
96) 1592 93. Lyon: J.B. Buysson. 8°.  
97) 1592 94. Cologne. 8°.  
98) 1599 95. Venice: M.A. Zalteri. 4°.  
101) 1609 98. Venice: D. de Imbertis. 4°.  
103) 1612 100. Lyon: G. Rouillé, P. Rousselot 8°.  
107) 1672 104. Lyons: A. Cellier. 4°.  
108) 1775 * Madrid: Roman Blas. 4°.
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