

10L.  
COLL.  
0265  
/0063

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge, CB2 2RU, UK  
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA  
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia  
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain  
Dock House, The Waterfront, Cape Town 8001, South Africa

<http://www.cambridge.org>

© M. A. Claussen 2004

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without  
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2004

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeface Bembo 11/12 pt. System L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X 2<sub>ε</sub> [TB]

*A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library*

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data*  
Claussen, M. A. (Martin A.)

The reform of the Frankish church: Chrodegang of Metz and the *Regula canonicorum* in the eighth  
century / M. A. Claussen

p. cm. — (Cambridge studies in medieval life and thought; 4th ser., 61)  
Includes bibliographical references (p. ) and index.

ISBN 0 521 83931 9

1. Chrodegang, Saint, Bishop of Metz, ca. 712–766. *Regula canonicorum*. 2. Monasticism and  
religious order — Rules — History — To 1500. I. Title. II. Series.

BX2436.5.C53 2004

274.4'382302 — dc22 2004045631

ISBN 0 521 83931 9

## CONTENTS

|  |         |
|--|---------|
| <i>List of illustrations</i>   | page vi |
| <i>Acknowledgments</i>   | vii     |
| <i>Abbreviations</i>   | x       |
| Introduction   | I       |
| 1 Chrodegang in the Frankish church                                  | 19      |
| 2 The <i>Regula canonicorum</i>                                      | 58      |
| 3 Chrodegang and the <i>Rule</i> of St. Benedict                     | 114     |
| 4 Roman and Gallic sources for the <i>Regula canonicorum</i>         | 166     |
| 5 Individual, community, and ritual in the <i>Regula canonicorum</i> | 206     |
| 6 Hagiopolis   | 248     |
| <i>Bibliography</i>  | 290     |
| <i>Index</i>   | 334     |
| <i>Index of manuscripts</i>  | 339     |
| <i>Index locorum</i>   | 340     |

## ABBREVIATIONS

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| AASS                  | <i>Acta sanctorum quotquot toto orbe coluntur</i>   |
| ASHAL                 | <i>Annuaire de la Société d'Histoire et d'Archéologie de la Lorraine</i>  |
| CC                    | Corpus christianorum, series latina   |
| CSEL                  | Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum  |
| DACL                  | <i>Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie</i>   |
| DHGE                  | <i>Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques</i>   |
| DIP                   | <i>Dizionario degli istituti di perfezione</i>  |
| FmSt                  | <i>Frühmittelalterliche Studien</i>   |
| Gregory of Tours, HLX | Gregory of Tours, <i>Historia libri X</i> , ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison, <i>Gregorii episcopi Turonensis Historiarum libri X</i> , editio altera, MGH SRM I.1 (Hanover, 1937–51) |
| HJ                    | <i>Historisches Jahrbuch</i>  |
| JGLGA                 | <i>Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für lothringische Geschichte und Altertumskunde</i>  |
| Hauck, KD             | Albert Hauck, <i>Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands</i> (Leipzig, 1914)   |
| Karl Martell          | Jörg Jarnut, Ulrich Nonn, and Michael Richter, eds., <i>Karl Martell in seiner Zeit</i> , Beihefte der Francia 37 (Sigmaringen, 1994)   |
| Lowe, CLA             | E. A. Lowe, <i>Codices latini antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century</i> (Oxford, 1937–71)  |
| Mansi                 | Johannes Mansi, <i>Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio</i> (Graz)   |

## List of abbreviations

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| MGH                  | <i>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</i>   |
| AA                   | Auctores antiquissimi  |
| Cap.                 | Capitularia, Legum sectio II, ed. A. Boretius  |
| Conc.                | Concilia, Legum sectio III, ed. A. Werminghoff   |
| Dip. kar.            | Diplomata karolinorum I, ed. E. Mühlbacher   |
| Epp.                 | Epistolae  |
| SRG                  | Scriptores rerum germanicarum in usum scholarum  |
| SRL                  | Scriptores rerum langobardicarum et italicarum   |
| SRM                  | Scriptores rerum merovingicarum  |
| SS                   | Scriptores   |
| NCMH                 | <i>New Cambridge Medieval History 2: c. 700–c. 900</i> , ed. Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge, 1995)  |
| NPNF                 | Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church   |
| Paul the Deacon, GEM | Paul the Deacon, <i>Gesta episcoporum Mettensium</i> , ed. G. H. Pertz, MGH SS 2.260–70.   |
| PG                   | <i>Patrologia cursus completus series graeca</i> , ed. J.-P. Migne   |
| PL                   | <i>Patrologia cursus completus series latina</i> , ed. J.-P. Migne   |
| Prinz, FMiF          | Friedrich Prinz, <i>Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich: Kultur und Gesellschaft in Gallien, den Rheinlanden und Bayern am Beispiel der monastischen Entwicklung (4. bis 8. Jahrhundert)</i> , second edition (Munich, 1988) |
| RB                   | <i>Rule of Benedict</i>  |
| RCan                 | <i>S. Chrodegangi Mettensis episcopi Regula canonicorum</i> , ed. Wilhelm Schmitz (Hanover, 1889)  |
| Rev. Ben.            | <i>Revue Bénédictine</i>   |
| Saint Chrodegang     | <i>Saint Chrodegang: Communications présentées au colloque tenu à Metz</i> (Metz, 1967)  |
| SC                   | Sources chrétiennes  |
| Settimane            | Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo (Spoleto)  |

*List of abbreviations*

ZKG  
ZRG

germ. Abt.  
kan. Abt.

*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*  
*Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für*  
*Rechtsgeschichte*  
germanistische Abteilung  
kanonistische Abteilung



The Chancel of St-Pierre-aux-Nonnains, "Panel of the Consecration"

## INTRODUCTION

For most people today, to reform generally means to improve, to make better, or to ameliorate, but in at least some historical periods, reform has literally meant “re-form,” an attempt to make over or recapture something which has been lost.<sup>1</sup> In the European Middle Ages, reform almost always had the latter meaning. Movements of reform throughout the medieval period generally took as their model an image, a vision, an understanding of the past. These “imagined pasts” may not have been historically accurate, but their purpose was to provide an effective inspiration and a concrete legitimacy for action in the present.<sup>2</sup> A flexible attitude toward the past and an understanding of the dynamic relationship between tradition and reform best characterizes Carolingian ideas about and efforts toward reform. Yet for the men and women of the eighth and ninth centuries, the past did not always yield up material that was appropriate for the present, and so history had to be adapted or transformed in various ways. This adaptation was rarely done frivolously,

<sup>1</sup> None of the six definitions of “reform” as a noun in the *Oxford English Dictionary* (1933) implies a restoration to a lost ideal; neither do any of those found in the second College edition of *Webster’s New World Dictionary of the American Language* (1982).

<sup>2</sup> The literature on reform and its concepts is vast, but the best place to start is in the magisterial studies by Gerhart B. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers* (Cambridge, 1959); Ladner, “Gregory the Great and Gregory VII: A Comparison of Their Concepts of Renewal,” *Viator* 4 (1982), pp. 1–27; and Ladner, “Die mittelalterliche Reform-Idee und ihr Verhältnis zur Idee der Renaissance,” *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 60 (1952), pp. 31–59; see also Kenneth W. Jones, *Socio-religious Reform Movements in British India* (Cambridge, 1989); Tobin Siebers, ed., *Religion and the Authority of the Past* (Ann Arbor, 1993); and Ronald C. White, *The Social Gospel: Religion and Reform in Changing America* (Philadelphia, 1976). For the particulars of our period, see Giles Brown, “Introduction: The Carolingian Renaissance,” in Rosamond McKitterick, ed., *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 1–51; Hans Liebeschütz, “Wesen und Grenzen des karolingischen Rationalismus,” *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 33 (1950), pp. 17–44, esp. pp. 18–32; Karl F. Morrison, *The Mimetic Tradition of Reform in the West* (Princeton, 1982); Alan Thacker, “Bede’s Ideal of Reform,” in Patrick Wormald, ed., *Ideal and Reality in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society: Studies Presented to J. M. Wallace-Hadrill* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 130–53; Timothy Reuter, “‘Kirchenreform’ und ‘Kirchenpolitik’ im Zeitalter Karl Martells: Begriffe und Wirklichkeit,” in *Karl Martell*, pp. 35–59; and Walter Ullmann, *The Carolingian Renaissance and the Idea of Kingship* (London, 1969).

and was always accomplished with a great deal of study, thought, and scholarship. Above all, the Carolingian ideal of *utilitas* – usefulness, servableness, expediency – governed the use of history as the basis for reform.<sup>3</sup>

Reform movements needed a past to re-form to, and thus they had almost of necessity an intellectual side. The Carolingian kings patronized scholars whose tasks at least partly involved them in works of recovery: they sought to comprehend some normative period of the past, and to this end they spent much time and energy finding, editing, and commenting on a series of texts, often drawn from late antiquity. It was this period that at least some Carolingian thinkers deemed normative for their society: it was this period that they sought to recapture, to re-emulate, to reform to.<sup>4</sup> Thus, for instance, Charlemagne supported scholars such as Alcuin and Benedict of Aniane, not just because it was something that was expected – royal or imperial patronage being an attribute of a great or legitimate king – but because these and many others were involved in discovering the norms from a past that would help him guarantee a just and righteous society in the present.<sup>5</sup>

Sometimes, the chosen past turned out to be less than usable. An illustrative example of this is the sacramentary that Charlemagne requested

<sup>3</sup> See Réginald Grégoire, “L’Ordine ed il suo significato: ‘utilitas’ et ‘caritas,’” in *Segni e riti nella chiesa altomedievale occidentale*, Settimane 33 (Spoleto, 1987), pp. 639–97 at pp. 660–5; the essays edited by Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger in *The Invention of Tradition* (Cambridge, 1983); Matthew Innes and Rosamond McKitterick, “The Writing of History,” in McKitterick, *Carolingian Culture*, pp. 193–220; Natalia Lozovsky, “Carolingian Geography Tradition: Was It Geography?” *Early Medieval Europe* 5 (1996), pp. 25–43; Rosamond McKitterick, “Royal Patronage of Culture in the Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians: Motives and Consequences,” in *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell’alto medioevo occidentale*, Settimane 39 (Spoleto, 1992), pp. 93–129 at p. 117; and below.

<sup>4</sup> For the Carolingians and late antiquity, see most famously Richard Krautheimer, “The Carolingian Revival of Early Church Architecture,” in his *Studies in Early Christian, Medieval, and Renaissance Art* (New York, 1969), pp. 203–56 (but see also Robert Coates-Stephens, “Dark Age Architecture in Rome,” *Papers of the British School at Rome* 65 (1997), pp. 177–232 for important corrections to Krautheimer’s typology); Donald Bullough, “Roman Books and Carolingian *Renovatio*,” in his *Carolingian Renewal: Sources and Heritage* (Manchester, 1991), pp. 1–37; Josef Fleckenstein, *Die Bildungsreform Karls des Grossen als Verwirklichung der Norma rectitudinis* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1953); George Henderson, “Emulation and Invention in Carolingian Art,” in McKitterick, *Carolingian Culture*, pp. 248–73; and Armando Petrucci, “Symbolic Aspects of Written Evidence,” in his *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy: Studies in the History of Written Culture*, ed. and trans. Charles M. Radding (New Haven, 1995), pp. 103–31.

<sup>5</sup> Fr. Brunhölzl, “Die Bildungsauftrag der Hofschule,” in Bernhard Bischoff, ed., *Karl der Grosse: Lebenswerk und Nachleben 2: Das Geistige Leben* (Dusseldorf, 1965), pp. 28–41; Rosamond McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians* (New York, 1983), pp. 160–6; Innes and McKitterick, “The Writing of History,” in *Carolingian Culture*, pp. 193–220; and the essays in Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes, eds., *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), especially Mary Garrison, “The Franks as the New Israel? Education for an Identity from Pippin to Charlemagne,” pp. 114–61, and Matthew Innes, “Teutons or Trojans? The Carolingians and the Germanic Past,” pp. 227–49.

and received from Pope Hadrian at the end of the eighth century. This text, the so-called Gregorian sacramentary, although certainly hailing from Rome, did not fulfill the liturgical needs of the Franks, nor meet their expectations of what a Roman liturgical book should be. Benedict of Aniane, one of Charlemagne’s monastic advisors and perhaps the court’s liturgical expert, revised the sacramentary, adding, modifying, and deleting material to produce a book that could be promulgated throughout the empire. In other words, Benedict took a preexisting tradition – in this case, a Roman text – and changed it to produce a new text and a new kind of tradition.<sup>6</sup> At other times, a usable past simply did not exist. Occasionally, there was insufficient historical information available to reformers, so that they were forced to turn to their own devices, but, more often, men and women in the early Middle Ages could face problems and situations for which the past did not supply appropriate analogues. To deal with this sort of situation, a past had to be created, a history invented, a tradition assembled. This effort could not be undertaken lightly: it demanded all the scholarly resources, intellectual verve, and spiritual discretion that a reformer might possess. The act of creation itself would often involve a sort of cobbling together of bits of the past gathered here and there, a bundling of whatever information and knowledge might be available, and a fitting of this newly made historical bricolage into a framework that the writers of the original sources might not have recognized.

Chrodegang of Metz was an expert in all these various strategies of reform. When it was available, Chrodegang drew on material from the past as the direct model for his actions. But in many of the areas in which he worked, Chrodegang found no usable history, no workable past, and so he was forced to become more inventive. This book will examine how Chrodegang sought to originate traditions throughout his life. The traditions he created all revolve around his main concern, the one that runs like a red thread throughout his whole ecclesiastical career. This was christianization: that is, how to implement the ideas and the norms associated with Christian teachings and spirituality in the areas under his care. Chrodegang, it seems clear when looking at the totality of his actions, took very seriously his duties as bishop, and brought to them the

<sup>6</sup> Jean Deshusses, “Les Suppléments au sacramentaire grégorien: Alcuin ou S. Benoît d’Aniane?” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 9 (1965), pp. 48–71, and his “Les sacramentaires: état actuel de la recherche,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 24 (1984), pp. 19–46. For a more general history of the liturgical reforms of the Carolingians, almost all of which reveal this same pattern, see Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and rev. William Storey and Niels Rasmussen (Washington, DC, 1986), pp. 61–224, and the important revisions to some of Vogel’s key points by Yitzhak Hen, *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy in Frankish Gaul to the Death of Charles the Bald*, Henry Bradshaw Society Subsidia 3 (London, 2001).

sort of attention that Gregory the Great outlined in *The Pastoral Care*. He also brought to them the concern that we find characterizes the spiritual responsibilities of the abbot, at least as outlined in the second chapter of the *Rule of Benedict*.<sup>7</sup> Unfortunately we cannot examine all of his actions. Chrodegang has left us few written texts and therefore this study must concentrate on the longest monument he bequeathed the future: his *Regula canonicorum*, the *Rule for canons*. Along the way, we will examine what we can of his other works: his concern for the greater church in Francia, of which he was primate after 754, and his attempts to create a holy city in his see, which began, perhaps, with the *Regula canonicorum*, but extended far beyond that particular piece of legislation.

Chrodegang based his reforms on a vision and understanding of the Christian past of Metz, and more broadly, of that of Francia and of the whole of the Latin church. But as we shall see, Metz is not rich in its ancient Christian history. It had martyrs neither from the Roman period nor from the Frankish. Its own saints, such as its seventh-century bishop Arnulf – perhaps one of the Carolingian progenitors – seem not to have inspired a great deal of devotion. The town itself did not have much of a usable past, and so holes had to be filled in, gaps spanned, with new history, which in turn spawned new kinds of traditions. So too when it came to implementing his rule, in order that he might reform the canons of his cathedral: there was only limited precedent for such legislation, and so Chrodegang drew on pre-existing monastic rules as the basis for his own work. And the same is true for his liturgical innovations: where Metz was poor, where Francia as a whole might have been lacking, Jerusalem or Rome or Constantinople were rich, good measure and flowing over. Importing the traditions of other churches, appropriating their history, and thus making it part of his own, Chrodegang's work lay at the foundation of the Carolingian spiritual revival of the later eighth and ninth centuries.

One can argue that Chrodegang was the first to incorporate into his own work all the major aspects that characterized later Frankish reform. But unlike some other Merovingian and Carolingian reformers – Willibrord and Boniface before him, Alcuin, Benedict of Aniane, Theodulf of Orléans in the generations after him, and most of those who worked during the reigns of Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald, for instance – we can only know little about the man, for the main document we have regarding his reforms is his rule. Ostensibly it seeks only modest goals: to enable a cleric to “prune from himself the illicit, cast out

<sup>7</sup> T. F. X. Noble, “The Monastic Ideal as a Model for Empire: The Case of Louis the Pious,” *Rev. Ben.* 86 (1976), pp. 235–50.

the wicked, and abandon the unlawful long-held . . . [so that] things good and better might be grafted on.”<sup>8</sup> However, the rule essays to do much more than simply keep the canons from grievous sin. It seeks to create in the Metz cathedral close a new community, one based on ideas of hierarchy and equality, love and unanimity, where before there had only been a group of men beset with “strife, scandals, and hate.” This process of community creation was very similar to what he was doing at the same time within the larger Frankish church. In the regular meetings of bishops that convened during his primacy, Chrodegang sought to unite men, drawn from the various parts of the kingdom and belonging to various factions and parties, by giving them common spiritual tasks and common spiritual goals. Since these meetings were, while regular, nonetheless infrequent, we can better understand Chrodegang's ideas when we look to Metz. Here, in both the cathedral community and the town as a whole, Chrodegang deployed various strategies to break down structural divisions and to create something new, a town united under its bishop, where all the inhabitants shared the same goal of praising God. This work was the first comprehensive expression of a new “Carolingian” vision of reform. Chrodegang was, in the end, concerned not only with one or two groups in the church, but with the whole complex of society. He sought to separate and redefine the various orders in his town, giving each one its own unique task, but ordering them to a new and transcendent goal.

Chrodegang accomplished this not by breaking with the past, but by harnessing it, using the images and works of earlier periods in Christian and Frankish history to help him achieve his goals. The past, as he understood it, provided him with models, but they were not the sort of models that could be transplanted unchanged into his own environment. Instead, these were exemplars and norms, requiring adaptation and realignment if they were to fit into the world of mid-eighth-century Metz. Chrodegang, like a historian, understood the past through a series of texts; but unlike his modern counterparts, he felt free, and perhaps even compelled, not to stop with presenting the past as it was, but to determine its essential characteristics, the one or two things that made those earlier periods qualitatively different from his own. Once this quintessence had been discovered, Chrodegang systematically set about trying to re-create it in his contemporary context. This effort involved a manipulation of texts – most notably the *Rule of Benedict*, but also works by “Julianus” Pomerius, Caesarius of Arles, Gregory the Great, Isidore of Seville, various Roman and other conciliar decrees, and even Scripture itself. By mimetic and

<sup>8</sup> *RCan.* Prologue; Wilhelm Schmitz, ed., *S. Chrodegangi Mettensis episcopi (742–66) Regula canonicorum . . .* (Hanover, 1889), p. 1.

intertextual strategies, Chrodegang sought to bring to birth in Metz a new creation, a *hagiopolis*, a holy city.

In their constant quest for the antecedents of great movements, historians have generally overlooked Chrodegang's influence on later Carolingian reform; or perhaps he has been overshadowed by his more visible and heroic contemporary, the Anglo-Saxon Boniface, and by the great reformers of the succeeding generations, men such as Alcuin, Benedict of Aniane, Hrabanus Maurus, and Hincmar of Rheims. These men strove toward the same basic goals – the erection of a metropolitan church structure, the regularization of religious life, the proclamation of the basic duties of Christian women and men, the christianization of the Frankish aristocracy and especially the royal family, the reform of cult. All of them had their own successes and failures, but in general, judging from what he called for in his synods and in his rule, Chrodegang must be counted among the most successful reformers of the early Middle Ages. He completed and improved upon the work of other late Merovingian churchmen, including that of Boniface, and his success was due at least in part to his ability to compromise on unimportant issues (an ability that some ecclesiastical reformers simply did not have) and his willingness to work within the bounds of a church whose leadership was drawn from the Frankish aristocracy. Chrodegang smoothed over and sought to eliminate factions, while more fervent reformers, with that prophetic zeal which characterized certain men and women in the Hebrew Bible, instead fomented them. Mainly others have monopolized the attention of historians simply because we can see them as individuals. We can know Boniface, for instance, in a way that we can know few others from the first half of the eighth century. He left us, along with conciliar acts and synodal decrees, an extraordinary letter collection, one of the largest from the early Middle Ages. Such a preponderance of evidence has helped to make Boniface a leading man to Chrodegang's bit player.

A second reason why Chrodegang has generally languished in the shadows suggests itself: he appears to have done nothing new or innovative himself. His rule seems to hew so closely to that of Benedict that it has been called a plagiarism; the canons of the councils he directed often simply repeated those of the past; his romanizing attitudes in liturgy and cult in fact first appeared in England, with the peculiar Anglo-Saxon devotion to the papacy.<sup>9</sup> In fact, Chrodegang appears as a Boniface-*manqué*, without the fire, without the passion. And there is reason to

<sup>9</sup> Recently discussed in Alan Thacker, "In Search of the Saints: The English Church and the Cult of Roman Apostles and Martyrs in the Seventh and Eight Centuries," in Julia M. H. Smith, ed., *Early Medieval Rome and the West: Essays in Honour of Donald A. Bullough*, The Medieval Mediterranean: Peoples, Economies and Cultures, 400–1453 vol. 28 (Leiden, 2000), pp. 247–77.

this. Boniface does indeed seem to have been the first to undertake reforms that had the same characteristics as later efforts, especially those under Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. In his unswerving devotion to Rome, his obsession with promulgating certain aspects of canon law, and even his pastoral and missionary drive, Boniface appears to have prefigured what would come in later reform movements. This is, at least in part, an illusion. While many of Boniface's ideas appear the same as later Carolingian ones, they are similar exactly in appearance, not in substance. For instance, the Carolingian devotion to Rome was radically different from Boniface's, although they might at surface appear the same.<sup>10</sup> The Carolingians looked to Rome for norms and exemplars that would then be subject to modification and adjustment before they could usefully be implemented in Francia. That is, after all, just what the Carolingians did with the *Rule* of Benedict, and books of canon law, liturgy, and theology which at various times they requested from Rome.<sup>11</sup> Rome sometimes did not even supply the correct answers to difficult theological questions, and thus the true defense of the faith required the active intervention of the Franks themselves. We can see this attitude both in the preface to the Salic laws, which describes the Romans as slayers of saints and the Carolingians as preservers of relics, as well as in the controversies surrounding the *Opus Caroli regis*.<sup>12</sup> Chrodegang points to a more critical attitude toward Rome: things coming from Rome, whether they be liturgical habits, manuscripts, theological pronouncements, or political arrangements, needed, like the past itself, to be adapted to fit into Frankish ways of doing things, and to meet particularities of Frankish traditions.

The text with which we will be most concerned in this book is the *Regula canonicorum*, the *Rule for canons*.<sup>13</sup> Like many late antique and early

<sup>10</sup> Arnold Angenendt, *Das Frühmittelalter: Die abendländische Christenheit von 400 bis 900* (Stuttgart, 1990), pp. 275–6, argues that Boniface held that all *Heil* came from Rome, a belief very different from that of the typical religious Frank in the early or mid-eighth century.

<sup>11</sup> See Bullough, "Roman Books and Carolingian *Renovatio*."

<sup>12</sup> Sections D.4 and E.3 in Karl August Eckhardt, ed., *Lex Salica, MGH Legum 1, Legum nationum germanicarum 4.2* (Hanover, 1969), pp. 6–9; Ann Freeman, ed., *Opus Caroli Regis (Libri Carolini)*, *MGH Conc. 2, Supp. 1* (Hanover, 1998); Harald Willjung, *Das Konzil von Aachen, 809, MGH Conc. 2, Supp. 2* (Hanover, 1998); and the studies by Gary B. Blumenshine, "Alcuin's *Liber contra haeresim Felicis* and the Frankish Kingdom," *FmSt* 17 (1983), pp. 222–33; John C. Cavadini, *The Last Christology of the West: Adoptionism in Spain and Gaul* (Philadelphia, 1993); Ann Freeman, "Carolingian Orthodoxy and the Fate of the *Libri Carolini*," *Viator* 16 (1985), pp. 65–108; H. B. Swete, *History of the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Spirit* (Cambridge, 1976); and more generally, David Ganz, "Theology and the Organisation of Thought," in *NCMH*, pp. 758–85.

<sup>13</sup> The textual history of the rule is discussed by Gaston Hoquard, "La règle de Saint Chrodegang," in *Saint Chrodegang*, pp. 55–89; A. Werminghoff, "Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Konzils im Jahre 816," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde* 27 (1901–2), pp. 607–75; Otto Hanneman, "Die Kanonikerregeln Chrodegangs von Metz und der Aachener Synode von 816,

medieval works, its textual history is at times a little confusing.<sup>14</sup> We do not have Chrodegang's autograph of the rule, and so we are at some loss. Fortunately, we do have a slightly later copy of the text, which, since its discovery, has been given the siglum **B**.<sup>15</sup> This manuscript, written at Metz at the end of the eighth century, contains, along with most of the *Rule* (the preface and first eight chapters, and part of the final chapter, are missing), Isidore of Seville's *De viris inlustribus*, a Metz martyrology, one of the Roman *ordines*, and other material. It seems at least in part to be a theological and liturgical, or perhaps better an ascetic, compendium.<sup>16</sup> In the absence of a critical edition of the rule, it is the best witness we have to Chrodegang's original work. A slightly later manuscript, known as **L**<sup>1</sup>, also written at Metz but in Tironian notes, is the basis for Wilhelm Schmitz's edition of the rule, currently the best published one.<sup>17</sup> These manuscripts belong to the Metz version of the *Regula canonicorum*, but there are two other classes of texts: the generalized version and the Aachen version. The former has had specific references to the ecclesiastical geography of Metz removed, and also contains some additions written by Angilramn. The latter was the text that was promulgated throughout the empire as normative by the 816 synod of Aachen, and served as the main rule for

und das Verhältnis Gregors VII dazu" (PhD dissertation, Greifswald, 1914); Rudolf Scheiffer, *Die Entstehung von Domkapiteln in Deutschland*, Bonner Historische Forschungen 43 (Bonn, 1976), pp. 232–61; and Brigitte Langefeld, "Regula canonicorum or Regula monasterialis vitae? The Rule of Chrodegang and Archbishop Wulfred's Reforms at Canterbury," *Anglo-Saxon England* 25 (1996), pp. 21–36 at pp. 21–8.

<sup>14</sup> On the relationships between text and manuscript, see John Dagenais, *The Ethics of Reading in a Manuscript Culture: Glossing the Libro del buen amor* (Princeton, 1994), pp. xii–29.

<sup>15</sup> On **B** (Bern Burgerbibliothek lat. 289), see Adalbert Ebner, "Zur Regula canonicorum des hl. Chrodegang," *Römische Quartalschrift für Christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 5 (1891), pp. 82–8; and Lowe, *CLA* 7.861. Lowe describes the script as a "well-formed Caroline minuscule by many different hands, some manifestly representing an early stage," while others represent a more advanced development. He adds that the text of the rule is written in the earlier style script. Jean-Baptiste Pelt, *Études sur la cathédrale de Metz: la Liturgie I (Ve–XIIIe siècle)* (Metz, 1937), pp. 7–28, provides an edition, based on that of Wilhelm Schmitz (see above, note 6), but that takes account of the text of **B** and other manuscripts.

<sup>16</sup> See H. M. Rochais, "Contribution à l'histoire des florilèges ascétiques du haut moyen âge latin: le 'Liber scintillarum'," *Rev. Ben.* 63 (1963), pp. 246–91 at pp. 246–60.

<sup>17</sup> **L**<sup>1</sup> = Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Voss. lat. 94, written mainly in Tironian notes. See the introduction to Schmitz's edition, and Albert Werminghoff, "Die Beschlüsse des Aachener Konzils im Jahre 816," *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Ältere Deutsche Geschichtskunde* 27 (1901–2), pp. 605–75 at pp. 646–51. In this same class is **V** (Vatican City, Vat. pal. lat. 555). This text forms the basis of the *Regula canonicorum* that Migne published in *PL* 89.1097–1120. See Guiscardo Moschetti, "I frammenti veronesi del secolo IX delle Istituzione di Giustiniano," in Moschetti, ed., *Atti del congresso internazionale di diritto romano e di storia del diritto, 27–29 settembre, 1948* (Milan, 1953), 1.439–509 at pp. 462–4; and *Codices palatini latini bibliothecae Vaticanae* (Rome, 1886), p. 178. The main difference between **V** and **L**<sup>1</sup> is in the additions Chrodegang's successor Angilramn made to chapters 20, 33, and 34.

the canonical life until the eleventh century and beyond.<sup>18</sup> Finally, there is one last text that we can associate with Chrodegang's activities in Metz. It is a precious document that, since its discovery in the 1930s, has been much commented upon: a station list of churches that were to be the site of episcopal services during the weekdays and Sundays of Lent and Easter Week.<sup>19</sup>

The *Regula canonicorum* is the most significant work we have by Chrodegang. It was written for the canons of his cathedral in Metz, and it was around the canons of the cathedral of St Stephen that most of his reform efforts revolved. But who were they, and where did they come from?<sup>20</sup> *Canonicus* is based on the Latin word *canon*, which in turn is simply the

<sup>18</sup> The generalized text is represented by **L**<sup>2</sup> (Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek BPL 81), written in an unknown location in the tenth century. The Aachen text is reprinted in *PL* 89.1057–96, and served as the basis for other rules for canons, including the Anglo-Saxon one edited by Arthur S. Napier, *The Old English Version of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang together with the Latin Original* (London, 1916). See Werminghoff, "Beschlüsse," p. 646.

<sup>19</sup> The discovery was first made by Theodor Klauser, "Une document du IXe siècle: notes sur l'ancienne liturgie de Metz," *ASHAL* 38 (1929), pp. 497–510; and his "Eine Stationsliste der Metzter Kirche aus dem 8. Jahrhundert, wahrscheinlich ein Werk Chrodegangs," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 44 (1930), pp. 162–93. See below, chapter 6, for bibliography on this important find.

<sup>20</sup> Here I have relied on a number of secondary works: Jean Becquet, "Vingt-cinq ans d'études canonicales en France (1959–1984)," in *Liber amicorum: études historiques offertes à Pierre Bougard*, Revue du Nord, hors série, collection Histoire 3 (Arras, 1987), pp. 65–71; Jean Châtillon, "La spiritualité de l'ordre canonial (VIIIe–XIIIe siècle)" in his *Le Mouvement canonial au moyen-âge: réforme de l'église, spiritualité et culture*, Bibliotheca victorina 3 (Paris, 1992), pp. 131–49 at pp. 132–7; C. Dereine, "Chanoines," in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique* (Paris, 1953), 12.353–405; C. Egger, "Canonici regolari," in *Dizionario degli istituti di perfezione* (Rome, 1975), 2.46–63; William Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles: The Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 90–3; H. Leclercq, "Chanoines," in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* 3/1 (Paris, 1931), pp. 223–48; Ernst Mayer, "Der Ursprung der Domkapitel zugleich ein Wort zu den Urkunden Drogonis," *ZRG*, kan. Abt. 7 (1917), pp. 1–33; Ferminio Poggiaspalla, *La vita comune del clero dalle origini alla riforma gregoriana*, Uomini e dottrine 14 (Rome, 1968); Schieffer, *Die Entstehung von Domkapiteln in Deutschland*; Josef Semmler, "Mission und Pfarrorganisation in der rheinischen, mosel- und maasländischen Bistümern (5.–10. Jahrhundert)," in *Cristianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica delle campagne nell'alto medio-evo: espansione e resistenze*, Settimane 28 (Spoleto, 1982), pp. 813–88; Semmler, "Mönche und Kanoniker in Frankenreich Pepins III und Karls des Grossen," in *Untersuchungen zu Kloster und Stift*, Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte 68, Studien zur Germania Sacra 14 (Freiburg, 1980), pp. 78–111; Semmler, "Le monachisme occidental du VIIIe au Xe siècle: formation et réformation," *Rev. Ben.* 103 (1993), pp. 68–89 at pp. 69–74; Josef Siegwart, *Die Chorherren- und Chorfräulengemeinschaften in der deutschsprachigen Schweiz vom 6. Jahrhundert bis 1160*, Studia Freiburgensia, Neue Folge 30 (Freiburg, 1962); Siegwart, "Der gallo-fränkischen Kanonikerbegriff," *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte* 61 (1967), pp. 193–244; Leo Ueding, "Die Kanones von Chalkedon in ihrer Bedeutung für Mönchtum und Klerus," in Aloys Grillmeier and Heinrich Bacht, eds., *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Würzburg, 1953), 2.569–676; and M. Zacherl, "Die Vita communis als Lebensform des Klerus in der Zeit zwischen Augustinus und Karl dem Grossen," *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 92 (1970), pp. 385–424.



transliterated Greek κανών, a word that has a maddeningly wide range of meanings, from “rod” or “straight-edge,” to “model,” “standard,” or “prototype,” to “rule,” “table,” “paradigm,” and finally, “tax assessment.”<sup>21</sup> For our purposes in this study, κανών; means either list or rule. For instance, a κανών could be a list of the approved books of the Bible. It was this sense of κανών as list that allowed its meaning to be transferred from a list or table, to a tax assessment: the tax κανών listed the names and the amount owed from various individuals and groups. In Latin, this word could be rendered as both *canon* and *matricula*. κανών could also mean rule or standard. Hence the decisions of church councils were known as canons, because they presented the precepts and the dicta of the faith. In the west, κανών in this sense could be translated both as *canon* and as *regula*. This brief etymological journey brings us to the two possible meanings for the word *canonicus*: either a *canonicus* is one whose name is inscribed on a κανών/*canon*/list, or a *canonicus* is one who lives according to the κανόνες/*canones*/rules of the church.<sup>22</sup>

While religious reformers, beginning with Cassian and including Chrodegang, would try to link the basic organization of the canonical life to the early Christian community described in *Acts of the Apostles*, there are few actual historical ties between the religious life of the primitive church and the religious organizations that developed around the time of Constantine.<sup>23</sup> Whether his communities of friends could be better described as monastic or canonical, Augustine found nothing in recent history to justify his creation of a community of men living the common life.<sup>24</sup> The constitutions he wrote for these communities would in the eleventh and twelfth centuries become the most popular rule for canons in western Europe, and would eventually supplant the rule of Chrodegang,

<sup>21</sup> For these meanings, see Guy Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries: Notes for the History of Monasteries and Convents at Rome from the V through the X Centuries*, Studi di antichità cristiana 2 (Rome, 1957), pp. 381–5; G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961–68), s.v.; Liddell and Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford, 1968), s.v.

<sup>22</sup> Just which one it is is a matter of some debate: Poggiaspalla, *La vita comune del clero*, p. 26, and Siegwart, *Die Chorherren- und Chorfauengemeinschaften* and “Der gallo-fränkischen Kanonikerbegriff,” both argue that the κανών referred to is a list of clergy who have various privileges. DuCange, in his *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, s.v., and early medieval sources (see below for these), argue that the *canonicus* is one who follows the κανόνες, the teachings and laws, of the church. Dereine, in “Chanoines,” pp. 354–5, sensibly posits that these two derivations are not exclusive, and *canonicus* as a substantive probably drew upon both of them. For further Latin uses and derivations, see J. F. Niermeyer, *Mediae latinitatis lexicon minus*, s.v.

<sup>23</sup> Most famously done by Cassian in *Collationes* 18.7–8, in Dom E. Pichery, ed., *Jean Cassien: Conférences XVIII–XXIV*, Sources chrétiennes 64 (Paris, 1959), pp. 18–22. On the lack of continuity, see Leclercq, “Chanoines,” pp. 223–4.

<sup>24</sup> See Leclercq, “Chanoines,” p. 224; Possidius, *Vita Augustini*, cc. 5 and 25 (*PL* 32.36 and 32.54–5); Augustine, *De moribus ecclesiae* 1.33.70–1, in *PL* 32.1309–78 at 1339–40; more generally Adolar Zunkeller, *Augustine’s Ideal of the Religious Life* (New York, 1986), pp. 24–45; and George Lawless, *Augustine of Hippo and His Monastic Rule* (Oxford, 1987).

but there were certainly hiatuses in the use of Augustine’s rules between the fifth century and the eleventh. However, we know that some clerical communities existed in late antiquity. Perhaps the most famous of these was the one Eusebius founded in the Italian town of Vercelli. Ambrose, the bishop of Milan, describes this community in his Letter 63:

Eusebius of holy memory was the first in western lands to bring together these differing manners [that is, uniting episcopal and ascetic/monastic ways of life], both . . . living in the city observing the rules of monks, and ruling the church with fasting and temperance.<sup>25</sup>

Ambrose added that “the grace of the priesthood is much increased if the bishop constrains young men to the practice of abstinence and to the rule of purity; and forbids them . . . the manners and mode of life of the city.” Ambrose is praising Eusebius not so much for instituting the common life, as for having the wisdom to see that the practice of communal living was one way to ensure the purity – that is, the sexual continence – of the clergy. In a sermon for Eusebius’ feast day, Maximus of Turin was a little clearer about the reforms that bishop brought to the clergy in Vercelli:

in this holy church, he [Eusebius] established those who were clerics as monks, and had the priestly offices confined by the same interior disciplines by which matchless chastity is also preserved, so that there would be in these men both the contempt of material things and the exactitude of Levites. Thus, if you saw the monastery’s little beds you would think them the equal of oriental ones.<sup>26</sup>

It seems from both of these descriptions, but especially that of Maximus, that Eusebius was, as Peter Brown suggests, mainly monasticizing his clergy, and imposing on them the asceticism that was typical of the cenobitic life.<sup>27</sup> Again, as in Ambrose’s approbation, the point is not that Eusebius developed a novel form of life that led to a new kind of holiness, but rather that he imposed a traditional sort of control over the priests and clergy of his cathedral. This strikes me as something different from imposing on them the common life of canons. We can see the same thing in another source, describing an earlier period, on the other side of the empire. Sozomen, the church historian, mentions a semi-monasticized

<sup>25</sup> Ambrose, Ep. 63.66 = Michaela Zelzer, ed., *Sancti Ambrosii Opera*, “Epistolae extra collectionem,” CSEL 82/3 (Vienna, 1982), Ep. 14.66, p. 270. The translation is from H. de Romstin et al., *Some of the Principal Works of St. Ambrose*, NPNF second series 10.466.

<sup>26</sup> Maximus of Turin, s. 7.1 = Almut Mutzenbecher, ed., *Maximi episcopi Taurinensis Collectionem sermonum antiquam* . . . CC 23 (Turnhout, 1962), p. 25. The translation is from Boniface Ramsey, OP, *The Sermons of St. Maximus of Turin*, Ancient Christian Writers 50 (New York, 1989), pp. 243–5 at p. 244. This sermon also appears under Ambrose’s name as sermon 56 in *PL* 17.743–5.

<sup>27</sup> On the role of Ambrose in the asceticization of western holiness, see Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York, 1988), pp. 353–63.

clerical community at Rhinocoruna, in Egypt. After describing the life of the bishop, a certain Melas, and his habits of holiness, he writes that “the clergy of this church dwell in one house, sit at the same table, and have everything in common.”<sup>28</sup> A little closer to home, Caesarius of Arles also instituted a common life among his clergy, though it too seems to have had as its guiding principle monastic ideals of asceticism.<sup>29</sup>

We find anecdotal evidence about clergy living the common life in a number of sixth-century sources. Often, this evidence simply mentions the clergy dining at a common table.<sup>30</sup> For instance, in the middle of the sixth century, Gregory of Tours says that the archdeacon of Bourges chided the future saint Patroclus after he became a member of the clergy of that city.<sup>31</sup> In his ascetic zeal, Patroclus, the new convert, was so taken up with fasting, vigils, studies, and prayer, that he did not eat with the other clerics at their communal table. The archdeacon cried out to Patroclus in a rage, “Either you take your meals with the other brothers, or you leave us. It is not right that you neglect to eat with those whose ecclesiastical duties you share.”<sup>32</sup> Gregory, in his catalogue of his episcopal predecessors at Tours, says that Baudinus (+552) instituted a *mensa canonicorum* – a common table for his canons – during his reign.<sup>33</sup> A generation or so later, Gregory the Great gathered around himself “clerics of different sorts,” or so John the Deacon tells us, and that together they lived a common life.<sup>34</sup> Here, the pope seems to be making an important theological distinction between monks, who withdraw from society and live in a monastery, and clerics, who continue to lead the active life in the midst of the city. Gregory in his letters often stresses the need for the

<sup>28</sup> Sozomen, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6.31; PG 67.1389.

<sup>29</sup> Fulgentius of Ruspe and Hilary of Arles called for a similar life for their clergy. See in general Dorothee König, *Amt und Askese: Priesteramt und Mönchtum bei den lateinischen Kirchenvätern in vorbenediktinischer Zeit*, *Regulae Benedicti studia supplementum* 12 (St. Ottilien, 1985); and Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles*, pp. 91–3.

<sup>30</sup> For this, see Everett U. Crosby, *Bishop and Chapter in Twelfth-Century England: A Study of the Mensa episcopalis* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 10–12.

<sup>31</sup> The bishop of the city at the time was Arcadius, Gregory tells us, and he began his episcopate between 535 and 538, and ruled for twenty-nine years: see L. Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*<sup>2</sup> (Paris, 1910), 2.24.

<sup>32</sup> Gregory of Tours, *Liber vitae patrum* 9.1; MGH SRM 1/2, ed. Bruno Krusch (Hanover, 1885), p. 70. The translation is by Edward James, *Gregory of Tours: Life of the Fathers*, Translated Texts for Historians, Latin Series 1 (Liverpool, 1985), p. 79.

<sup>33</sup> Gregory of Tours, *HLX* 10.31; MGH SRM 1/1, ed. Bruno Krusch and Wilhelm Levison (Hanover, 1937–51), p. 533.

<sup>34</sup> “Videbantur passim cum eruditissimis clericis adhaerere pontifici religiosissimi monachi, et in diversis professionibus habebatur vita communis, ita ut talis esset tunc sub Gregorio penes urbem Romam ecclesia qualem hanc fuisse sub apostolis Lucas, et sub Marco evangelista penes Alexandriam Philo commemorat,” John the Deacon, *Vita Gregorii* 12, *PL* 75.92. On Gregory in particular, and the Italian situation in general, see Mayer, “Ursprung der Domkapitel,” pp. 20–30, and Poggiaspalla, *Vita commune del clero*, pp. 48–69.

separation from the world of those professing the monastic discipline.<sup>35</sup> In a letter to the bishop of Ravenna, shortly before Augustine and his companions were dispatched to Canterbury, Gregory wrote that “no one can serve in clerical orders and under the order of monastic rule at the same time, nor can one be held under the discipline of the monastery (*distinctionem monasterii*) who is forced to remain daily in the service of the church.”<sup>36</sup> Gregory evidently felt that the duties of each form of life were so overwhelming that no one individual could undertake both. But while Gregory’s goals included completely cloistering monks from public life, his actions, such as sending the brothers from his own monastery on the *Clivus Scauri* to England in 596 to serve as missionaries, seem to have undercut these ideals. Thus, while Gregory sought to make a distinction in both office and duties between monk and cleric, the practical needs that he faced apparently made this impossible.

There are other references, some few clear, others much less so, to the practice of the canonical life in the early Middle Ages. For instance, some commentators have seen the regime that Kentigern established in late sixth-century Glasgow for both clerics and populace to be canonical to some degree. His *vita* says that “he organized a large congregation who lived according to the norms of the primitive church” in his see.<sup>37</sup> Others see evidence for the common life in the laconic description Gregory of Tours provides in his story of the escape of Aetherius of Lisieux from a conspiracy by some clerics. Aetherius, Gregory says, “collected the boys of Lisieux together and handed them over to [a] priest, so that he could teach them. The townsfolk thought highly of his tuition which he gave. The bishop rewarded him with a plot of land and a vineyard, and he was often invited to their homes by the parents of his pupils.”<sup>38</sup> It seems unlikely that the unnamed priest was giving instruction in “secular” letters, and so some have argued that this is actually a sort of seminary for boys and young men that was instituted in Lisieux, whose inmates perhaps lived together and practiced the common life. Again here, we have little

<sup>35</sup> R. A. Markus, *Gregory the Great and his World* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 17–33.

<sup>36</sup> Gregory the Great, Ep. 5.1, *S. Gregorii Magni Registrum epistolarum libri i–vii*, CC 140, ed. Dag Norberg (Turnhout, 1982), p. 266. Gregory expressed the same sentiments in a letter to Maximilian bishop of Syracuse (Ep. 4.11). On this whole issue of Gregory and monasticism, see Dereine, “Chanoines,” p. 360; Kassius Hallinger, “Papst Gregor der Grosse und der hl. Benedict,” in Basilius Steidle, ed., *Commentationes in regulam S. Benedicti*, *Studia Anselmiana* 42 (Rome, 1957), pp. 231–319; and Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries*, pp. 379–407. On the more general issue of the Gregorian foundations in England, see Nicholas Brooks, *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066* (Leicester, 1984), pp. 3–7 and *passim*.

<sup>37</sup> “Cathedralem sedem in urbe Glasguensi constituit, et magnam congregationem secundum formam primitivae ecclesiae viventem ibidem ordinavit,” *AASS* Jan. 2.97–103 at p. 99.

<sup>38</sup> Gregory of Tours, *HLX* 6.36; Krusch, p. 307. The translation is by Lewis Thorpe, *Gregory of Tours: History of the Franks* (Harmondsworth, 1974), p. 367.

or no context to understand this off-hand remark by Gregory, but when taken all together, evidence such as this makes it seem likely that many of the cathedral churches in Gaul, and indeed throughout the western half of the old empire, were staffed by clerics who lived some sort of common life, and who performed the necessary liturgical offices required. In fact, whenever we have evidence, we can often see some sort of common life for clerics, and moreover, it seems this form of life was spread along with the internal christianization of northern and western Europe.<sup>39</sup> Josef Semmler, in an encyclopedic paper, has noted that with the expansion of Christianity into the Germanic areas of western Europe, new institutions and new forms of pastoral care had to be created. Among these were communities that observed the common life and yet were organized to serve parishes.<sup>40</sup> He found scores of churches served by men living the common life in dioceses along the Rhine, Maas, and Moselle. While this area was particularly well served by bishops (and nobles and kings as well, Semmler points out) zealous to spread the religion, it seems the form of the common life we find here is unusual only insofar as it is so well documented. It would be hard to argue that all these pieces of evidence, as fragmentary as they are, do not in some way sketch in a grander picture, a picture that would point to the commonness of the common life.

We also know that a clerical common life was familiar to the early medieval western church from a number of conciliar decrees. Our sources are particularly rich for Visigothic Spain, where regular church legislation dealt with clergy living the common life. The canons of these councils generally take it for granted that clerics are living in common, often with the bishop, and rarely address the issue of how their lives are ordered. Thus, while we are not explicitly told that an episcopal *familia* has clergymen in it, we are told how those who live with the bishop

<sup>39</sup> For instance, for Chur, see Siegwart, *Chorherren- und Chorfräugemeinschaften*, pp. 32–9; for Trier, see Wolf Heino Struck, *Quellen zur Geschichte der Kloster und Stifte im Gebiet der mittleren Lahn bis zum Ausgang des Mittelalters*, Veröffentlichungen der historischen Kommission für Nassau 12 (Wiesbaden, 1956–84), 12.19; Flodoard, 2.11, tells us that Rigobert of Reims (+733) instituted a common life for his clerics: “Sed et canonicam clericis religionem restituit, ac sufficientia victualia constituit, et praedia quaedam illis contulit, necnon aerarium commune usibus eorum instituit,” in M. Lejeune, ed., *Flodoardi historia Remensis ecclesiae* (Reims, 1854), p. 285. The choice of “restituit” implies that such a life had previously flourished at Reims, and Rigobert was merely reforming his canons to an older system.

<sup>40</sup> Semmler, “Mission und Pfarrorganisation,” pp. 841–3. See also Thomas L. Amos, “Monks and Pastoral Care in the Early Middle Ages,” in Thomas F. X. Noble and John J. Contreni, eds., *Religion and Society in the Early Middle Ages: Studies in Honor of Richard E. Sullivan*, SMC 23 (Kalamazoo, 1987), pp. 165–80; and Giles Constable, “Monasteries, Rural Churches, and the *cura animarum* in the Early Middle Ages,” in *Cristianizzazione ed organizzazione ecclesiastica della campagna nell’alto medioevo*, Settimane 28 (1982), pp. 349–89.

should act when he dies.<sup>41</sup> In the same way, we are not told who dines with the bishop: only that while at table, Scripture should be read.<sup>42</sup> Likewise, while there is no explicit description of a seminary in the episcopal palace, we are told that boys can be handed over to the bishop to be educated for the priesthood.<sup>43</sup> Nor are we told what *canonicus* means in Spain: rather, we have hints that bishops support the priests who are enrolled in their diocese, providing their *victum et vestum*, their food and clothing.<sup>44</sup> And as in the Gallic statutes, there is a clear sense that those bishops (or indeed any of those clerics who have attained higher orders) who continue to sleep with their wives, no matter how discreet they may be, will be caught. This at least implies that bishops, priests, and deacons do not live alone, but rather with a number of others in the religious life. We find similar, though fewer, provisions in Merovingian canon law. The Council of Clermont, in 535, distinguishes between a priest or a deacon who is a *canonicus* in the city or in a parish, and those who live *in villulis*.<sup>45</sup> A few years later, bishops meeting in Orléans described a banished priest as leaving from *inter reliquos canonicos clericus*.<sup>46</sup> A generation later, a council placed a group of wily clergy under interdict. These clerics had kept their local archpriest in the dark about their suspicious behaviour, since, whenever he visited, he was escorted around by “one of the lectors from their circle of canons, or even a cleric from their number.”<sup>47</sup> All of this provides tantalizing hints more than any sort of clarification, but I would suggest that the hints, simply because they are so tantalizing, tell us something: that communities of religious men, whose main task was either pastoral or liturgical, were commonplace in Germany, Gaul, and Spain, from the late antique period onwards. Chrodegang was working with an old institution, which, while its pedigree might not actually go back to the apostolic church, was nevertheless as venerable as the cenobitic monasteries that bishops and kings looked to as their exemplars of normative sanctity.

This study can be roughly divided into three parts. The first two chapters examine Chrodegang’s life and work; the next two analyze the various

<sup>41</sup> Lerida (546), c. 16, in José Vives et al., ed., *Concilios visigóticos e hispano-romanos*, España cristiana 1 (Barcelona, 1963), pp. 59–60.

<sup>42</sup> 3 Toledo (589), c. 7, Vives, *Concilios visigóticos*, p. 127. It also says that in any “sacerdotali convivio,” Scripture should be read instead of “otiosae fabulae.”

<sup>43</sup> See 2 Toledo (531), c. 1, Vives, *Concilios visigóticos*, p. 42; 4 Toledo (633), c. 24, Vives, *Concilios visigóticos*, p. 201; etc.

<sup>44</sup> See Mérida (666), cc. 12 and 13, Vives, *Concilios visigóticos*, pp. 333–5.

<sup>45</sup> Clermont, c. 15, in Charles de Clercq, ed., *Concilia Galliae: A. 511–A. 695*, CC 148A (Turnhout, 1963), p. 109; cf. 2 Vaison (529), c. 1, p. 78.

<sup>46</sup> 3 Orléans (538), c. 12, de Clercq, *Concilia Galliae*, p. 119.

<sup>47</sup> 2 Tours (567), c. 20, de Clercq, *Concilia Galliae*, p. 180.

ways he used some older texts; while the final two discuss his larger efforts at reform. After a brief introduction to the historical environment in which he lived and worked in chapter 1, I attempt to place Chrodegang in various contexts, and thus allow us to evaluate his work by examining it against the same standards he himself knew. In chapter 2, then, I analyze the *Regula canonorum* against a background of earlier monastic rules, the sort of texts his own rule most resembles. In chapters 3 and 4, I try to place Chrodegang's work in the broader context of early medieval intellectual history, where the common heritage of the Fathers formed a basic intellectual framework which he shared with others. Finally, in chapters 5 and 6, I examine the place of his work as an effort of christianization, both to evaluate his achievements and to explore how his ideas differ from earlier ones. It is only in the first and the last chapter that we shall be concerned with work of Chrodegang's other than the *Regula canonorum*. But because that rule, the patterns it establishes, and the ideals it presents, seem to lie so close to the heart of his wider reform programme, we shall look at it in some detail. Thus, many parts of the rule will be examined and analyzed again and again, from different points of view. None of the various forms of analysis, which come from diverse disciplines and draw on a variety of methodologies, presents a complete picture of the meaning of the rule; but I hope that, when taken together, they allow us a fairly full understanding of it. The rule is a normative and not a mimetic text: its intent is to present a picture of the way the Metz chapter should be, not how it actually was. If we want a description of the day-to-day life in an early medieval religious house, we could turn to the pages of Gregory of Tours, to read of the goings on at Ste-Croix in Poitiers, or perhaps read the *Supplex libellus* from a Fulda riven by strife. We have no such evidence from Metz; but this privation brings a certain benefit. We are able to analyze what Chrodegang wanted to accomplish without having to judge its practicality or effectiveness.

In my attempts, then, to understand what Chrodegang actually sought to do by instituting a regular life among his canons, I have also tried to argue that we must take what he has written seriously. In fact, my analysis of the rule is based on the obvious, but often ignored, premise that Chrodegang wrote what he meant to write, that he, an early medieval writer, introduced as much intention and circumspection into his work as any author from any period. The dependence of Chrodegang's rule on Benedict, its most noted characteristic in the literature, needs to be explained as much as his departure from this and other sources. I suggest that Chrodegang's reliance on Benedict is far more complex than usually assumed, and that both the monastic text and the ideas behind it need to be examined if we are to see why the *Regula canonorum* is not simply a



Map 1 Early Carolingian Europe: places mentioned in the text

vulgar plagiarism. Likewise, Chrodegang's infrequent use of other texts demands explanation and clarification, precisely because of the rarity of such citations. I have used some aspects of modern critical theory to come to a fuller understanding of just how Chrodegang manipulated these older texts, and to what purpose.

Chrodegang was not a theorist, nor was he an ideologue: he was, like most other Carolingian reformers, a public official – in this case, a bishop – confronted with a series of problems which he attempted to solve. My final chapters therefore examine the consequences of the various textual strategies he deployed. These consequences I have examined under the rubric of christianization, since it seems to me that his own goal was

neither legal nor ethical reform, but rather reform of a transcendent and moral nature.

Chrodegang's reforms, although specifically designed for his own see, had other, longer ramifications. Though outside the bounds of this study, Chrodegang's rule was picked up and in the early ninth century was made the basis of the rule by which all canons in the empire had to live.<sup>48</sup> It retained this pre-eminence both on the continent and in England until the eleventh or twelfth century, when it was slowly replaced by Augustine's rule. Chrodegang's own textual predilections also outlived him. He was among the first Carolingians to accept the *Rule* of Benedict as the normative monastic text, with enormous consequences for the future development of monasticism, but it was his ideas on the essence of reform that were perhaps his greatest legacy. He believed that meaningful and at times fundamental structural change was necessary for true and lasting reform. His own attempts at creating new communities united in faith and love and prayer lay at the base of all his work, and the belief in the necessity of *concordia* and *unanimitas* would inform later Carolingian reform projects, those of Charlemagne and Benedict of Aniane and Louis the Pious. Thus, Chrodegang stands at the head of the long line of ecclesiastical and social reformers, and at the beginning of a period when Germanic kings, using these same principles, believed they could remake their world into a heavenly city.

<sup>48</sup> Brigitte Langefeld has explored the later influence of the *Regula canoniconum* in her article "Regula canoniconum or Regula monasterialis vitae? The Rule of Chrodegang and Archbishop Wulfred's Reforms at Canterbury," *Anglo-Saxon England* 25 (1996), pp. 21–36. Her forthcoming book on the Anglo-Saxon adaptations of Chrodegang's rule should offer the most detailed examination of how the rule was used since Hanneman, "Die Kanonikerregeln Chrodegangs von Metz" and Arthur S. Napier, *The Old English Version of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang together with the Latin Original* (London, 1916).

## CHRODEGANG IN THE FRANKISH CHURCH

As is so often the case in early medieval history, we know far less about Chrodegang than we would like, and our sources for his life and work are rather thin. There is a tenth-century life ascribed to John of Gorze, although when it was actually written remains a matter of some debate.<sup>1</sup> Its editor places it sometime after 907, and possibly between 965 and 973; others have argued for a ninth-century date.<sup>2</sup> Regardless of the dating, most scholars would agree that as a source of information for early and mid-eighth-century Metz, it is not very helpful.<sup>3</sup> It creates an initial but mistaken impression that it is a solid and reliable piece of historical biography, but whenever it can be corroborated with more contemporary sources, the *vita* is usually found wanting. More reliable is the *Gesta episcoporum Mettensium* (the *Deeds of the Bishops of Metz*) by Paul the Deacon, although like most literary works it too presents a number of problems.<sup>4</sup> It was commissioned by Angilramn, Chrodegang's successor at Metz, and

<sup>1</sup> John of Gorze, *Vita Chrodegangi episcopi Mettensis*, ed. G. H. Pertz, *MGH SS* (Hanover, 1852) 10.552–72.

<sup>2</sup> Heinrich Pertz, "Über die Vita Chrodegangi episcopi Mettensis," *Abhandlungen der königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (1852), pp. 507–17 at p. 507. Both Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (Munich, 1923), 2.196, and Max Buchner, in "Die Vita Chrodegangi – eine Kirchenpolitisch Tendenzschrift aus der Mitte des 9. Jahrhunderts, zugleich eine Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung der Primatial- und Vikariatsidee," *ZRG*, kan. Abt. 16 (1927), pp. 1–36, held for the earlier date. See also W. Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart, 1904), pp. 414–15. More recently, Peter Christian Jacobsen, "Die Vita des Johannes von Gorze und ihr literarisches Umfeld: Studien zur Gorze und Metzger Hagiographie des 10. Jahrhunderts," in Michel Parisse and Otto Gerhard Oexle, eds., *L'Abbaye de Gorze au Xe siècle* (Nancy, 1993), pp. 25–50, questions the attribution to John of Gorze, and offers a late tenth-century date. No one, however, has disputed Buchner's assessment regarding the value of the text for informing us about the eighth century.

<sup>3</sup> Buchner wrote that "für die Zeit Chrodegangs, wirft diese Quelle wenig aus . . ." (p. 36).

<sup>4</sup> Paul the Deacon, *Gesta episcoporum Mettensium*, ed. G. H. Pertz, *MGH SS* 2.260–70. See in general Reinhold Kaiser, "Die Gesta episcoporum als Genus der Geschichtsschreibung," in Anton Scharer and Georg Scheibelreiter, eds., *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung 32 (Munich and Vienna, 1994), pp. 459–80; and Michel Sot, *Gesta episcoporum, gesta abbatum*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 37 (Turnhout, 1981).

As I sketched a moment ago, the existence of links between Rome and the north is nothing extraordinary, and Chrodegang fits neatly into a tradition more than a century old in associating Benedict with Rome, and Rome with the source for normative texts.<sup>144</sup> Thus, in using *RB*, Chrodegang was doing something both quite Roman and quite Frankish: Frankish, in that for at least a century, some text or other of *RB* had stood behind new monastic rules such as the *Regula Donati*, and new monastic foundations, such as at St-Rebais-en-Brie.<sup>145</sup> It was Roman in that, as far as historians can tell, the very use of *RB* owed its popularity to its ties to Rome, to the fact that the life of Benedict, the *abbas romensis par excellence*, was written by Gregory, the *romanus antistites*.<sup>146</sup> But as well as belonging to this tradition, Chrodegang holds a place in another as well.

Joachim Wollasch has suggested that Gregory II (715–731) and his two successors, Gregory III (731–741) and Zacharius (741–752), consciously attempted to bring about a sort of renaissance of the late sixth- and early seventh-century papacy, a period seen by them as one of the high points of its history.<sup>147</sup> Gregory II himself, the first pope *natione romanus* for some time, laid out this programme even at his enthronement, by taking the same name as his last great Roman predecessor.<sup>148</sup> Just as Gregory the Great sent Augustine to the Anglo-Saxons, Gregory II sent Boniface to the Germans. Gregory the Great wrote the life of Benedict, and Gregory II sent Petronax *ad sacrum corpus beati Benedicti patris*.<sup>149</sup> Gregory III was a zealous restorer and embellisher of the old churches of Rome,

*deutsche Romidee des frühen Mittelalter*, Forschungen zur mittelalterlichen und neueren Geschichte 3 (Munich, 1929); and Gerd Tellenbach, *Römischer und christlicher Reichsgedanke in die Liturgie des frühen Mittelalter*, Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse Abhandlung 1 (Heidelberg, 1934). See also Kassius Hallinger, "Römische Voraussetzungen der bonifatianischen Wirksamkeit in Francia," in *Sankt Bonifatius: Gedankengabe zum zwölftehundertsten Todestag* (Fulda, 1954), pp. 320–61 at pp. 340–7.

<sup>144</sup> See Häussling, *Mönchskonvent*, pp. 148–9, 175–81, and 91–100.

<sup>145</sup> St-Rebais-en-Brie's privilege, from Burgundofaro bishop of Meaux, describes the monastery as governed "sub regula S. Benedicti et ad modum Luxoviensis monasterii" (Pardessus 2.275, pp. 39–41 at p. 40); see Eugen Ewig, "Das Formular von Rebais und die Bischofsprivilegien der Merowingerzeit," in his *Spätantikes und fränkisches Gallien*, Beihefte der Francia 3/2 (Munich, 1979), 2.456–85.

<sup>146</sup> The appellation for Gregory comes from Adrevald, *Historia translationis s. Benedicti* 3; de Certain, p. 4. As Engelbert, "Regeltext und Romverehrung," p. 39, has said about *RB*, "ihren Sieg verdankt sie mehr dem Zusammenspiel äusserer Faktoren als ihrer inneren Kraft."

<sup>147</sup> Wollasch, "Benedictus abbas romensis," pp. 126–36.

<sup>148</sup> *Liber pontificalis* 91, ed. L. Duchense, Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 2/3 (Paris, 1955), p. 396. Worth noting in this regard is Gregory's letter to the emperor Leo, where he claims that the whole of the west was under the sway of Petrine devotion: "totus occidentis sancto principe apostolorum fide fructus offert . . . [Peter] quem omnia occidentis regna velut deum terrestrem habent" (Ep. 12, PL 89.511–21 at p. 520).

<sup>149</sup> Paul the Deacon, *Historia langobardorum* 6.40, *MGH Scriptores rerum langobardicarum et italicarum*, ed. Georg Waitz (Hanover, 1878), p. 178.

seeking in this most physical of ways the renewal of Gregorian Rome.<sup>150</sup> Zacharius continued Gregory II's work in promoting the monasticism of Monte Cassino, translating book two of the *Dialogues* into Greek, sending Petronax the autograph rule and the measures from the original foundation that had been housed at the Lateran, and aiding the Cassinese monks in reclaiming the alienated lands of the *terra sancti Benedicti*.<sup>151</sup> This Roman revival took other forms as well, best seen in the renewed regular gatherings of bishops from the urban and suburbicarian dioceses, to rule on matters pertaining to faith and morals.<sup>152</sup> Wollasch argues that another aspect of this legal revival was the effort of the popes to establish *RB*, and the way it was observed at Monte Cassino, as not only a monastic, but also the Roman norm.<sup>153</sup> Thus it is that an idea that began in the provinces – of Benedict as a Roman abbot – was returned and enshrined at Rome, and then re-exported, to great effect. The Romans, in other words, were not in any way imposing a sort of cultural or theological or spiritual hegemony over the Franks: rather, the very idea of *RB* as a specifically Roman norm was a creation by northern Europeans, both Anglo-Saxons and Franks.<sup>154</sup>

We need to ask ourselves why the leading Frankish churchmen so willingly gave up an indigenous and flourishing religious tradition of local practices and observances, and eagerly embraced norms which emanated from Rome, one of which was *RB*. The answer is in fact simple. The Frankish church believed itself to be founded from Rome.<sup>155</sup> Kassius Hallinger has argued convincingly that this belief was not limited simply to the court circle, nor was it imported by the Anglo-Saxons at the end of the seventh century, and Eugen Ewig has found significant evidence to corroborate this position. But if the Frankish church in general was

<sup>150</sup> LP 92.6–12, Duchesne, pp. 417–20. Krautheimer, "The Carolingian Revival," pp. 215–23, argues that these popes continued to build churches in the then-traditional style, one based on Near Eastern models, not only in design, but even in fabric; but see Robert Coates-Stephens, "Dark Age Architecture in Rome," *Papers of the British School at Rome* 65 (1997), pp. 177–232, for important corrections to Krautheimer's typology.

<sup>151</sup> Wollasch, "Benedictus abbas romensis," p. 129.

<sup>152</sup> Mansi, v. 12, has four councils held in Rome under Gregory II two, both in 731, under Gregory III; and two under Zacharius; this after a hiatus of almost thirty-five years, the last council being held in 680 (Mansi 11.179).

<sup>153</sup> Wollasch, "Benedictus abbas romensis," p. 130.

<sup>154</sup> Häussling, *Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeyer*, pp. 166–7. Philippe Bernard, *Du Chant romain au chant grégorien (IVe–XIIIe siècle)*, Patrimoines christianisme (Paris, 1996), esp. pp. 655–709, strenuously argues against this, seeing in the romanization of Frankish cult the coming to fruition of a long-term papal policy, which sought "to impose its discipline and its rite in Gaul" (p. 697). Yitzhak Hen, *The Royal Patronage of the Liturgy in Frankish Gaul, to the Death of Charles the Bald (877)*, Henry Bradshaw Society Subsidia III (London, 2001), contests this interpretation. See chapter 6 below for a further discussion.

<sup>155</sup> See Hallinger, "Römische Voraussetzungen," pp. 324–7; Häussling, *Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeyer*, pp. 93–5; and Ewig, "Der Petrus- und Apostelkult," pp. 318–54.

founded from Rome, Metz in particular had close ties to that city. At the beginning of the *Gesta episcoporum Mettensium*, Paul the Deacon gives us a brief history of the Christian community in Metz, and he places its history in a broadly universal context. After the Ascension and the descent of the Holy Spirit, the Apostles went out to various regions to preach. Peter, their leader, hurried to Rome, “which was then the head of the whole world,” and once established there, sent out various others to evangelize other sections of the west.<sup>156</sup> The first group of cities that received these missionaries were Brindisi, Ravenna, Milan, and Aquileia; in other words, excluding Brindisi, the three patriarchates of Italy.<sup>157</sup> Peter then dispatched a second wave of missionaries to evangelize the cities of Gaul, and Metz received from this group its first bishop, Clemens.<sup>158</sup> This Roman foundation did more than link Metz and her bishops to the Apostles, and ultimately to Christ. It provided the city with a model by which its conduct, liturgy, canon law, and faith could be judged.<sup>159</sup>

Paul’s *Gesta* was written in the early 780s – a time of fervid religious, political, and ideological change in Francia – at the request of Angilramn, Chrodegang’s successor.<sup>160</sup> In Paul’s narrative, the Christian community of Metz was founded from Rome, but early in its history, in the reign of its thirteenth bishop, the city was destroyed by the Huns.<sup>161</sup> Walter Goffart sees this as the second of four milestones in the episcopal history of the city (the first was the foundation, the third was the episcopacy of Arnulf, the Carolingian progenitor). But it is through the final and important episode that the narrative is given its unity and coherence. Paul’s discussion of Chrodegang’s episcopate, given in the “unmistakable literary formulas of the *Liber pontificalis*,” tells of his introduction of Roman chant, liturgy,

<sup>156</sup> Paul the Deacon, *GEM*; ed. G. Pertz (Hanover, 1839), pp. 260–70 at p. 261.

<sup>157</sup> Walter Goffart, “Paul the Deacon’s *Gesta episcoporum Mettensium* and the Early Designs of Charlemagne’s Succession,” *Traditio* 42 (1986), pp. 59–93 at p. 71.

<sup>158</sup> Teachers were sent to Metz and “ad eas quae praecipuae erant Galliarum urbes,” *MGHSS* 2.261. The devotion to Clemens was certainly alive and well in Metz during the eighth century: there was a church dedicated to him, and he was remembered as well in the church built in the old Roman arena. The Bern martyrology records both his transitus and his translation as feast days.

<sup>159</sup> For the normative nature of Rome for the Frankish church in general, see Häussling, *Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeier*, pp. 97–107.

<sup>160</sup> For the dating of the *Gesta*, see above, chapter 1; and on Angilramn’s commissioning of the text, see Barbara Rosenwein, “Association through Exemption: Saint-Denis, Salornnes, and Metz,” in Hagen Keller and Franz Neiske, eds., *Vom Kloster zum Klosterverband: Das Werkzeug der Schriftlichkeit*, Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 74 (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1997), pp. 68–87 at pp. 74–80.

<sup>161</sup> Goffart, “Paul the Deacon’s *Gesta*,” and his *Narrators of Barbarian History: Jordanes, Gregory of Tours, Bede, and Paul the Deacon* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), pp. 329–431, esp. pp. 370–424, has explored the formal structures in some of the works by Paul.

customs, and cult into Metz.<sup>162</sup> Rather, I suppose one should say, it speaks of their reintroduction, for the deeds of Chrodegang returned Metz to its original, Roman, observance: what was begun by Clemens was restored by Chrodegang. While there is no doubt that between the time of the Huns and that of Chrodegang, there were good bishops in the city who accomplished godly deeds and undertook holy work, only with Chrodegang was the observance of Metz brought back to its own *priscorum norma patris*, that is, to the way which it was originally instituted. Along with Roman liturgy and Roman chant, we must place Chrodegang’s appropriation of Benedict in this same category of strategies used to restore the Metz church to its original observance.

Chrodegang was, however, no zealous romanizer, intent on abandoning the traditional forms of Gallo-Frankish Christianity, in an effort to achieve the political integration of his country by uniting it under the aegis of Roman liturgical practices. We have no evidence that any of the changes he brought to Metz in liturgy, in cult, in organization, he sought to export elsewhere. Even the canon law produced by the councils and synods which he chaired was not concerned with imposing a unity of liturgical observance where there had been none before. The canons of Compiègne, which promulgated Roman-style marriage law and indeed reflected the marriage customs of the distant Mediterranean world, are best seen in the context of a universally applicable *disciplina christiana*, not a specifically Roman one.<sup>163</sup> But Chrodegang was concerned, deeply and zealously, with restoring a lost past. This is the theme we have seen again and again, not only in the prologues from the synod of Ver and the *Regula canonicorum*, but throughout that rule as well, and Paul the Deacon, in the *Gesta*, tells us what this lost past was. Chrodegang’s “romanization” was in fact not an effort to romanize Metz, but rather to restore to it its heritage lost in the Hunnic invasions and not regained since. As part of this effort, not to romanize, but to re-Mediometricize Metz, he turned to *RB*.

This again should not surprise us. One may wonder why, if Chrodegang really sought to restore Metz to its Clementine glory, he relied on usages and customs clearly of a much later date. The answer again lay in the two prologues, read in the context of Paul’s history. In both of them, Chrodegang shows a keen awareness of the fact of historical change: “if the canons of the 318 fathers [of Nicaea] had perdured,” he says in the Prologue to the *Regula canonicorum*, such changes as he is about to propose would not be necessary. Alas, but they have not and his are. To restore

<sup>162</sup> Goffart, “Paul the Deacon’s *Gesta*,” p. 67.

<sup>163</sup> Peter Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, AD 200–1000*, The Making of Europe (Oxford, 1996), p. 269.

Metz then, he must do two things – look to the source and origin of the Metz church, and then extrapolate, not slavishly copying Roman usages, but rather adapting them to fit the peculiar needs at Metz. After all, he might have argued, if Peter wanted Metz to be nothing more than a perfect copy of his own church at Rome, he would not have given the city its own bishop, but rather sent it some sort of vicar. However, like Chrodegang, Clemens was a bishop, and while remaining faithful to Peter's teaching, going so far as to consecrate churches in Peter's honor, he did not plagiarize from the Apostle. In the same way, Chrodegang took the rule of the Roman abbot, Benedict, and adapted it to fit the circumstances at Metz, nor did he try to impose it on any other bishop or Chapter of canons (that happened after his death). Had Chrodegang been intent on "romanizing," he certainly could have done better: he could have obtained *ordines*, rules, and customs from the Roman basilical clergy and imposed them on his own canons. But he did not. Rather, he took a "Roman" rule – not a Roman institution – and he used it as the basis for his own creation.

Religious rules in Francia had come to have a definite form and structure by the mid-eighth century. By appropriating the *Rule* of Benedict for a portion of his text, Chrodegang legitimated his own novel efforts and for future generations he gave Benedict's *Rule* a privileged position among the dozens of rules circulating in Francia. But this mimesis has a number of components other than a textual one: ethically, by using Benedict, Chrodegang sought to produce men who had the virtue of monks, but who were not monks themselves, just as the *Regula canonicorum* had the virtues of *RB*, but was not *RB* itself. His mimesis has a historical component as well. He took the *Rule* of Benedict as a Roman rule, and altered it to make it applicable to Metz. But in doing so, it is hard to argue that he worked in harmony with the spirit of the Benedictine text. Chrodegang's canons are neither monks nor failed monks. Rather, he used *RB* to create something entirely new, and by careful and consistent revising, editing, and manipulating, he spoke through the words of others.<sup>164</sup>

There is a certain kind of harmony in this, for his textual manipulations of *RB* – "arranging, modifying, and adapting it" – are a synecdoche for his whole romanization process. He did not take from Rome and impose on Metz. Rather, he took Roman rules, customs, canons, and relics, and arranging them, as Hocquard has it, into a new *ensemble*, he created something entirely different, yet recognizable. His romanization was not a

<sup>164</sup> Michael Holquist, "The Politics of Representation," following Bakhtin's idea of dialogism, notes that we can appropriate meaning for our own purposes only by "ventriloquating others" (p. 169).

failed attempt (one to be done again, successfully, in the next generation) because it was not Roman enough. Rather, it was an attempt at the restoration of a lost past, one where ties to Rome were of great import, where Roman ideas and practices and teachings provided the norm, but the norm as the model and exemplar, not as the thing itself. Thus, while later generations may have felt the need to revise Chrodegang's work, to formulate a new liturgy based more on authentic Roman books and authentic Roman practices, Chrodegang's goal was different. His work was based on Roman models and drawn from them, but ultimately differed from them as Metz and eighth-century Francia differed from Rome and late antique Italy.



## HAGIOPOLIS

Throughout his life, many of Chrodegang's efforts were marked by an attempt to create communities which were characterized by unanimity and charity. His conciliar work, for instance, sought to promulgate a *disciplina christiana* and at the same time attempted to weld the fissiparous Frankish episcopate into a loving union, bound by ties of *amicitia* and mutual obligation, seeking the good of their national church and the salvation of their fellow bishops. In promoting a *disciplina christiana*, Chrodegang outlined the boundaries of proper Christian behavior and made clear what those living in the Frankish kingdoms had to do to be part of this Christian community; but he did this in such a way that bishops, abbots, and other church leaders from various parts of the kingdom and belonging to various ecclesiastical factions were brought to a common and consensual understanding and vision of Christian life. This overture toward ecclesiastical integration was complemented by the implementation of more formal ties, such as the *Totenbund* of Attigny. He had similar goals in the *Regula canonicorum*. If his description of the state of the Metz cathedral clergy can be believed, when he became bishop he found the canons involved in "quarrels, scandals, and hate."<sup>1</sup> In the rule, he tried to eliminate these most obvious symptoms of discord, and to form instead a style of life where the canons would "prune from themselves the illicit, cast out wickedness, and abandon the unlawful," and then "graft on to themselves things good and better."<sup>2</sup> Among these "things good and better," one surely must place his desire to create a community that took as its model the early church described in Acts of the Apostles, a community that was characterized by unanimity and concord, a community where mutual self-sacrifice was the norm, a community where the sick, the poor, and the outcast would find shelter and aid.

The Prologue of the *Regula canonicorum* tells us that when he became bishop and took over the pastoral care of Metz, Chrodegang was saddened

<sup>1</sup> *RCan*, Prol.; Schmitz, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> *RCan*, Prol.; Schmitz, p. 1, though I have changed the number of the nouns from the singular to the plural.

to see "into what neglect the clerics and the people had fallen," and that he wrote the rule as a response to this perfidious state.<sup>3</sup> It thus informs us that his ultimate concern is with the salvation of his charges – all of them, clerical and lay. The reform of the canons was a step, for Chrodegang, toward the salvation of the laity. This of course is fitting, and is of a piece with his legislative work, for the conciliar canons that were promulgated during his reign show as great a regard for the laity of Francia as they do its religious. And if he were to act true to form, the salvation of all the people of his diocese should equally be a concern, and this interest could involve forming them into a charitable and unanimous community, one that was, like the canons' own, a copy of the apostolic church. Paul the Deacon sketches out for us how Chrodegang sought to convert Metz and its people into a place where the Petrine admonition to be a "chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people set apart," was realized, and how Metz was transformed into a hagiopolis.<sup>4</sup> Paul writes that Chrodegang was

most eloquent in speech, steeped as much in his native tongue as in Latin, the *nutritor* of the servants of God, not only a foster-father but a most caring guardian of widows and orphans . . . He ordered his clergy, abundantly imbued with divine law and the Roman way of liturgy (*romana . . . cantilena*) to observe the customs and arrangements of the Roman church, which up to that time had hardly been done in the Metz church. With the material assistance of King Pippin, he ordered a baldaquin to be made for [the cathedral of] the holy protomartyr saint Stephen, and an altar for the same saint, and a chancel and an arch for the chancel. Likewise, in the church of St. Peter Major, he ordered a chancel to be made. He then built there an ambo decorated with gold and silver, and before the altar itself, a circuit of arches for the throne<sup>5</sup>. . . Then he sought from Paul, the Roman pontiff, the bodies of three holy martyrs – that is, the blessed Gorgonius, who rests at Gorze; and blessed Nabor, who remains at the monastery of Hilariacum [St-Avold]; and the blessed Nazarius, whom he lay in a basilica he built with extraordinary decoration in honor of these same martyrs at the monastery of Lorsch, across the Rhine.<sup>6</sup>

Laying aside for the moment his work with the canons, according to Paul, we can roughly divide Chrodegang's activities in Metz into three areas: preaching; building and *kosmesis*; and liturgical renewal and romanization. In this chapter, we will examine Chrodegang's accomplishments in each

<sup>3</sup> *RCan*, Prol.; Schmitz, p. 1.      <sup>4</sup> 1 Peter 2:9.

<sup>5</sup> This problematic passage says that Chrodegang "construxit . . . arcus per girum throni" before the altar of St Peter Major: Paul the Deacon, *Gesta episcoporum Mettensium*; MGH SS 2, ed. G. Pertz (Hanover, 1839), p. 268

<sup>6</sup> Paul the Deacon, *GEM*; MGH SS 2.267–8.

of these three areas as far as our extant evidence admits, in order to see how they contributed to his goal of community building.

BUILDING AND PREACHING

Scholarly debate on the exact nature of Chrodegang's building campaigns has gone on for over a century, and continues unabated.<sup>7</sup> It appears fairly certain that the old oratory of St. Stephen, which Gregory of Tours tells us was the only church to survive the attack of the Huns in 451, was rebuilt before Chrodegang's time, perhaps by the two late sixth-century bishops Villicus and Peter.<sup>8</sup> Although Paul offers some information regarding the restorations and rebuilding that Chrodegang undertook in Metz, most of the physical remains of these efforts have disappeared over the centuries. A few things have survived: among these remains, which include some

<sup>7</sup> Joseph Foedit, "La cathédrale de Metz, depuis ses origines jusqu'à Xme siècle," *ASHAL* 34 (1925), pp. 1-87, offers a summary of the debate from its apparent origins in the 1840s, until the mid-1920s. More recent scholarship is dominated by Carol Heitz; see his *Recherches sur les rapports entre architecture et liturgie à l'époque carolingienne* (Paris, 1963), pp. 82-6; "La Metz cathédrale de Metz au temps de Saint Chrodegang," in *Saint Chrodegang*, pp. 123-32; "More romano. Problèmes d'architecture et liturgie carolingiennes," in *Roma e l'età carolingia. Atti delle giornate di studio 3-8 maggio 1976*, Istituto nazionale di archeologia e storia dell'arte (Rome, 1976), pp. 27-37; "L'Architettura dell'età carolingia in relazione alla liturgia sacra," in *Culto cristiano politica imperiale carolingia*, Convegni del Centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale 18 (Rimini, 1978), pp. 339-62; "Metz et son groupe épiscopale à l'époque pré-carolingienne et carolingienne," in Carol Heitz and François Héber-Suffrin, eds., *Eglises de Metz dans le haut moyen-âge*, (Paris, 1982), pp. 5-14. See also R. S. Bour, "Notes sur . . . les églises antérieurs à l'an mil," *ASHAL* 38 (1929), pp. 51-639; Gérard Collot, "Introduction," in *Les Origines du christianisme dans l'ancien évêché de Metz du IVe au XIIe siècle* (Metz, 1966), pp. 3-22; Nancy Gauthier, *L'Évangélisation des pays de la Moselle: la province romaine de Première Belgique entre Antiquité et Moyen-Âge (IIIe-VIIIe siècles)*, (Paris, 1980); *eadem*, *Province ecclésiastique de Trèves*, Topographie chrétienne des cités de la Gaule des origines au milieu du VIIIe siècle I, (Paris, 1986); *eadem*, "Les Origines chrétiennes de la Lorraine: Histoire et archéologie," in *Actes des Xe journées internationales d'archéologie mérovingienne, Metz 20-30 octobre 1988* (Sarreguemines, 1989), pp. 65-75; François Héber-Suffrin, "La Cathédrale de Metz vue par Paul Diacre et les témoignages archéologiques," in eds., Pierre Riché, Carol Heitz, and François Héber-Suffrin, *Actes du colloque "Autour d'Hildegard"*, Cahier 5, Centre de recherches sur l'antiquité tardive et le haut moyen-âge and Centre de recherches d'histoire et civilisations de l'Université de Metz (Paris, 1987), pp. 73-83; Jean Humbert, "Rome et la renaissance carolingienne," in *Roma e l'età carolingia. Atti delle giornate di studio 3-8 maggio 1976*, Istituto nazionale di archeologia e storia dell'arte (Rome, 1976), pp. 7-14; Henri Tribout de Morembert, "A propos d'une pseudo-concélébration: la cathédrale de Metz et la liturgie au temps de Saint Chrodegang," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 56 (1968), pp. 96-109; and Pierre-Edouard Wagner and Jean-Louis Jolin, *15 siècles d'architecture et d'urbanisme autour la cathédrale de Metz* (Metz, nd [1987?]), pp. 53-67.

<sup>8</sup> Gregory of Tours, *HLX* 2.6; *MGH SRM* 1/1, ed. B. Krusch and W. Levison (Hanover, 1937-51), pp. 47-8; the evidence for the possible rebuilding in the sixth century is in the letter of Gogus to Peter, *Epistolae Austrasiae* 22; *MGH Epp.* 3, Epp. mero. et karol. aevi 1, ed. W. Gundlach (Berlin, 1892), pp. 134-5; Carlrichard Brühl, *Palatium und Civitas: Studien zur Profanotopographie spätantiker Civitates vom 3. bis zum 13. Jahrhundert. Band II: Belgica I, beide Germanien und Rhaetia II* (Cologne, 1990), pp. 51-5.

fragments from his renovations in the cathedral, the chancel from St-Pierre-aux-Nonnains must take precedence. In addition, in the ivories of the Drogo Sacramentary and the well-known Cambridge Fitzwilliam and Frankfurt diptych (see cover illustration) we have what scholars generally agree are depictions of some of the improvements done in the Metz cathedral and its allied churches during his episcopate.<sup>9</sup> To judge from Paul's testimony, while Chrodegang did not reconstruct the cathedral entirely, he did indeed sponsor some major renovations there. The exact nature of these need not concern us, but we should note a few things regarding the evidence from the *Gesta episcoporum Mettensium*. First of all, other than the basilica at Lorsch, Paul only describes the improvements Chrodegang undertook in the Metz cathedral complex, and even there, he limits himself to mentioning just the major changes in St. Stephen and St. Peter Major.<sup>10</sup> Second, the renovations that Paul describes for these two churches exclusively concern the space in and around the choir and altar areas: he tells us only of baldaquins, chancels, and ambos. These refurbishments all point to the physical and architectural changes that were necessary for the more formalized liturgies that Chrodegang introduced. The baldaquin, a stylized canopy over the main altar and tabernacle, was a piece of liturgical furniture found in many of the churches of Rome. Chancels were used to separate the parts of a church reserved for various clerical uses from those parts to which the laity had access. The ambo or pulpit was likewise used exclusively by the clergy. There can be little doubt that these changes were felt necessary or at least desirable because of the new responsibilities the canons were given in Metz, and the new liturgical regime Chrodegang instituted. In other words, Paul privileges only the renovations and improvements which had

<sup>9</sup> Jean Chélini, *L'Aube du moyen âge: naissance de la chrétienté occidentale - La vie religieuse des laïcs dans l'Europe carolingienne (750-900)*<sup>2</sup> (Paris, 1997), reproduces most of the carvings from the Drogo Sacramentary (Paris, BN lat. 9428) on pp. 17-31; on them, see François Héber-Suffrin, "La Cathédrale de Metz," in *Actes du colloque "Autour d'Hildegard"*, p. 74; Carol Heitz, "The Iconography of Architectural Form," in L. A. S. Butler and R. K. Morris, eds., *The Anglo-Saxon Church: Papers in History, Architecture and Archaeology in Honor of Dr. H. M. Taylor*, Research Reports 60 (London, 1986), pp. 90-100; Heitz, "Metz et son groupe épiscopal," p. 9; Roger E. Reynolds, "A Visual Epitome of the Eucharistic Ordo from the Era of Charles the Bald: The Ivory Mass Cover of the Drogo Sacramentary," in Margaret Gibson and Janet Nelson, eds., *Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom*<sup>2</sup> (Aldershot, 1990), pp. 241-60. On the diptychs, see Jean Michel Hanssens, "Une pseudo-concélébration presbytérale de la messe," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 55 (1967), pp. 393-412; Eva-Marie Knop, "Der Liturgiker als Liturge: Zu den Elfenbeintafeln mit Darstellungen der Messfeier in Cambridge und Frankfurt," *Ecclesia Orans* 7 (1990), pp. 23-42; and de Morembert, "A propos d'une pseudo-concélébration."

<sup>10</sup> Michel Fixot, "Une image idéale, une réalité difficile: les villes du VIIIe aux IXe siècle," in Georges Duby, ed., *Histoire de la France urbaine I: la ville antique des origines au IXe siècle* (Paris, 1980), pp. 495-563 at pp. 541-2.

liturgical implications for the lives of the canons.<sup>11</sup> By no means, then, is his necessarily a complete list of Chrodegang's activities.

Another church improvement that has generally been associated with Chrodegang is the still extant chancel from the church at St-Pierre-aux-Nonnains (see Frontispiece).<sup>12</sup> This chancel had been thought to date to the seventh century, when the nunnery is believed to have been established in the old Roman basilica. In 1952, however, excavations unearthed a heretofore unknown chancel at the monastic church at Cheminot, a small house donated to the monks of St-Arnulf's in Metz in 783, though probably founded earlier.<sup>13</sup> The fragments of this chancel clearly came from the same workshop that produced the one from St-Pierre-aux-Nonnains, and now Chrodegang is generally credited with inspiring, if not actually sponsoring, the improvements at the Metz nunnery.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, the models for much of this work are Italian. Although, for instance, there are motifs in the St-Pierre chancel that indicate Germanic and insular influences, the main inspiration of this monument appears to be Lombardic. François Héber-Suffrin has convincingly argued that the central Christ figure in the St-Pierre chancel bears much in common with the figures from the altar of Duke Ratchis at the church of St Martin in Cividale.<sup>15</sup> That altar was completed around 740 or so, in time for Chrodegang to have seen it during one of his trips to Italy, perhaps the first one in 752. Thus, good art historical precedents link the chancel at St-Pierre-aux-Nonnains to Italian models. What prototypes may have inspired the work done in the churches of the Metz *episcopium* we do not know, for we lack both much of the physical evidence from the cathedral complex and the cloister, and a really detailed depiction or description of the work undertaken there. Nevertheless, scholars mainly agree that the work drew upon Italian, and most likely Roman, models.<sup>16</sup>

There are other buildings which have often been linked to Chrodegang's patronage. The cathedral group in Metz consisted of five churches: the cathedral of St Stephen; St Peter Major; St Paul; St-Pierre-le-Vieux; and Ste-Marie-la-Rotonde. Of these churches, the first three

<sup>11</sup> Fixot, "Une image," p. 541, believes that St Peter Major was the concrete and monumental representation of the new consecration of the lives of the canons.

<sup>12</sup> See Xavier Delestre, *Saint-Pierre-aux-Nonnains (Metz - Moselle) de l'époque romaine à l'époque gothique*, Guides archéologiques de la France (Paris?, 1992).

<sup>13</sup> Emile Morhain, "Découvertes archéologiques dans l'église de Cheminot," *ASHAL* 53 (1954), pp. 87-101.

<sup>14</sup> François Héber-Suffrin, "La chancel de Saint-Pierre-aux-Nonnains à Metz," in François Héber-Suffrin and Carol Heitz, eds., *Du VIIIe au XIe siècle: édifices monastiques et culte en Lorraine et en Bourgogne* (Paris, 1977), pp. 3-30.

<sup>15</sup> Héber-Suffrin, "La chancel," p. 13. See also Heitz, *L'Architecture religieuse carolingienne*, pp. 16-17.

<sup>16</sup> See, for instance, Héber-Suffrin, "La cathédrale," pp. 73-4; and Heitz, "More romano," p. 356.

are mentioned in the *Regula canonicorum*, and it is generally agreed that Chrodegang built St. Paul's.<sup>17</sup> These five churches, and the later addition, at the end of the century, of the church of St Gorgonius, made up the Metz *Kirchenfamilie*.<sup>18</sup> They would become the liturgical heart of a spiritually revitalized Metz, a revitalization which would be linked to the reform of the lives of the canons.<sup>19</sup> Other buildings – the cloister and its gates and walls, the Chapter room or house, the refectory, a *caminata* or warming room, dormitories and *mansiones* – are all mentioned in the rule as well, and were equally necessary to create a functioning community within the cathedral close. It seems likely that Chrodegang had a hand in building at least some of these as well.<sup>20</sup> All of this building and construction activity must have created in Metz in the middle years of the eighth century something of an economic boom, one which added significantly to the city's long-term commercial prosperity.<sup>21</sup> It has been suggested that some of the most important architectural achievements from the reign of Charlemagne, such as the building of the palatine chapel in Aachen, drew on men who were originally trained, or whose skills were honed, in mid-century Metz.<sup>22</sup>

Behind all of these activities, as Paul tells us explicitly, is Pippin the Short, whose generally tacit support of Chrodegang here received a voice. Frankish monarchs and aristocrats had long supported the establishment and work of churches and monasteries for a variety of reasons, and as we have seen, Chrodegang's family had a relationship with the king's going back to the early decades of the eighth century.<sup>23</sup> Chrodegang had

<sup>17</sup> Heitz, *L'Architecture religieuse carolingienne*, p. 20.

<sup>18</sup> Angelus Albert Häussling, *Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeyer: Eine Studie über die Messe in der abendländischen Klosterliturgie des frühen Mittelalters und zur Geschichte der Masshäufigkeit*, Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 58 (Münster, 1973), pp. 201-12; and Heitz, "L'Architettura dell'età carolingia," p. 342.

<sup>19</sup> Fixot, "Une image," p. 541, argues that "l'organisation canoniale en fut l'un des éléments essentiels dans la mesure où elle dota la ville d'un complexe religieux *intra muros* capable de rivaliser avec les grands ensembles monastiques suburbains (ou même ruraux) et où elle donna à l'ancien groupe épiscopale une valeur spirituelle et représentative nouvelle."

<sup>20</sup> Donald Bullough, "Social and Economic Structure and Topography in the Early Medieval City," in *Topografia urbana e vita cittadina nell'alto medioevo in Occidente*, Settimane 21 (Spoleto, 1974), pp. 351-99 at pp. 360-2, notes that this construction of a *Domhof* became a typical development of many German towns east of the Rhine in the period between the eighth and the tenth centuries.

<sup>21</sup> See Alan M. Stahl, *The Merovingian Coinage of the Region of Metz*, Numismatica Lovaniensia 5 (Louvain, 1982), pp. 135-7.

<sup>22</sup> See Humbert, "Rome et la renaissance carolingienne," p. 13, where he offers this interpretation of an inscription found in the Aachen church.

<sup>23</sup> For some of these, see Mayke de Jong, "Carolingian Monasticism: The Power of Prayer," in *NCMH*, pp. 622-53; de Jong, *In Samuel's Image: Child Oblation in the Early Medieval West* (Leiden, 1996); Barbara H. Rosenwein, *To Be a Neighbour of Saint Peter: The Social Meaning of Cluny's Property, 909-1049* (Ithaca, 1989); and Cassandra Potts, *Monastic Revival and Regional Identity in Early Normandy* (Woodbridge, 1997).

close personal ties to both Pippin and his father, and so royal support for Chrodegang's ventures in Metz should not surprise us. Certainly in exchange for providing *adiutorium* the king would expect the Metz canons to offer intercessory prayers on his behalf and that of his family; he would also strengthen the bonds between himself and his bishop, and perhaps reinforce claims the family had been making that Arnulf, the earlier bishop of Metz, was an ancestor;<sup>24</sup> and he would make known in a very public and concrete fashion his support for Chrodegang's activities and programme. Matthew Innes has pointed out that there were several other benefits to be had for the king.<sup>25</sup> Patronage of local churches and monasteries, in a world where kings had only limited possibilities to interact with specific regions in their territories, presented opportunities to "enter the 'small worlds' of the localities. But they were not just points of entry. They were points of articulation: places where resources and skills were concentrated to such a degree that political ideas could be given lasting form, and disseminated."<sup>26</sup> Through his support for Chrodegang's reforms and their underlying ideology, Pippin's entry into the small world of Metz could have laid the foundation for the development of a new kind of royal ideology, one that would eventually bear fruit in the Metz series of *laudes* written during the reign of Charlemagne.<sup>27</sup>

As important as the details of what Chrodegang built and had built are the ideas that underlie his architectural *renovatio* in Metz. Clearly, he was inspired in large parts of his building programme by Roman models: that much goes almost without saying.<sup>28</sup> In this as in so much else he was anticipating the work of many later Carolingian kings, bishops, and abbots.<sup>29</sup> He was likewise working in an old tradition of elite *kosmesis*. Building, rebuilding, and beautifying one's city had a long and respectable pedigree throughout classical and late antiquity, and it was undertaken

<sup>24</sup> Ian Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms, 450–751* (London, 1994), p. 259, and more generally, in his, "Forgery in Merovingian Hagiography," in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter, MGH Schriften* 33 (Hanover, 1988), 5:369–85, has questioned the truth of the Carolingian claim that Arnulf was an ancestor.

<sup>25</sup> Matthew Innes, "Kings, Monks and Patrons: Political Identities and the Abbey of Lorsch," in Régine Le Jan, ed., *La Royauté et les élites dans l'Europe carolingienne (début IX siècle aux environs de 920)* (Lille, 1998), pp. 301–24 at pp. 302–3.

<sup>26</sup> Innes, "Kings, Monks and Patrons," p. 303.

<sup>27</sup> August Prost, "Caractère et signification de quatre pièces liturgiques composées à Metz en Latin et en Grec au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle," *Mémoires de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France* 7 (1876), pp. 149–320.

<sup>28</sup> See Richard Krautheimer, "The Carolingian Revival of Early Church Architecture," in his *Studies in Early Christian, Medieval, and Renaissance Art* (New York, 1969), pp. 203–56; Robert Coates-Stephens, "Dark Age Architecture in Rome," *Papers of the British School at Rome* 65 (1997), pp. 177–232.

<sup>29</sup> Jean Hubert, "Les prémisses de la renaissance carolingienne au temps de Pépin III," *Francia* 2 (1974), pp. 49–58.

by emperors, kings, aristocrats, and bishops.<sup>30</sup> Chrodegang's inspiration, however, may well have been more immediate. In the *Liber pontificalis*, the power, prestige, and sanctity of popes "was shown in their ability to bequeath to Rome an impressive series of churches and monasteries filled with treasure."<sup>31</sup> However, the popes of the late seventh and early eighth centuries replaced this traditional ideal of construction with what amounted to a massive programme of restoration, meant to preserve Rome's early Christian heritage from decay and destruction.<sup>32</sup> Beginning with the reign of Sergius I (687–701), we find a new attitude about building reported in the *Liber pontificalis*.<sup>33</sup> The compilers of the papal biographies in the eighth century describe the efforts of the popes in terms of *renovare* and *restaurare* instead of the more straightforward *facere*.<sup>34</sup> This may be at least partially due to the fact that, after the "benign neglect" of much of the seventh century, the material fabric of the city was beginning to deteriorate, and the popes reacted by showing a mounting concern with the increasing dilapidation of their see.<sup>35</sup> At the same time, we witness a growing desire on the part of these popes and their courts to bring to rebirth the greatness that they perceived had characterized an earlier century of the papacy.<sup>36</sup> Thus, for instance, Gregory II (715–31)

<sup>30</sup> See for instance Paul Zanker, *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Jerome Lectures, Sixteenth Series (Ann Arbor, 1990); Peter Brown, *Power and Persuasion in late antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison, 1992), pp. 120–1 and 151–2; Neil B. McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital*, Transformation of the Classical Heritage 22 (Berkeley, 1994), pp. 226–37; Alba Maria Orselli, "L'Idée chrétienne de la ville: quelques suggestions pour l'antiquité tardive et le haut moyen âge," in G. P. Broglio and Bryan Ward-Perkins, eds., *The Idea and Ideal of the Town between late antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, The Transformation of the Roman World 4 (Leiden, 1999), pp. 181–93 at pp. 188–9; Ian Wood, "The Audience for Architecture in Post-Roman Gaul," in L. A. S. Butler and R. K. Morris, eds., *The Anglo-Saxon Church*, Research Report 60 (London, 1986), pp. 74–9; and more generally, Richard Krautheimer, *Three Christian Capitals: Topography and Politics – Rome, Constantinople, Milan* (Berkeley, 1983), esp. pp. 96–118.

<sup>31</sup> Simon Coates, "The Bishop as Benefactor and Civic Patron: Alcuin, York, and Episcopal Authority in Anglo-Saxon England," *Speculum* 71 (1996), pp. 529–58 at p. 550.

<sup>32</sup> See Gabriella Delfini, "Contributo alla storia del Laterano," in *Roma e l'età carolingia*, pp. 223–7; Paolo Delogu, "The Rebirth of Rome in the 8th and 9th Centuries," in Richard Hodges and Brian Hobbey, eds., *The Rebirth of Towns in the West, AD 700–1050*, CBA Research Reports 68 (London, 1988), pp. 32–42; and Louis Reekmans, "L'implantation monumentale chrétienne dans le paysage urbain de Rome de 300 à 850," *Actes du XI<sup>e</sup> Congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne: Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève et Aoste*, Collection de l'École Française de Rome 123 (Rome, 1989), 2:861–915 at pp. 874–902.

<sup>33</sup> Thomas F. X. Noble, "Paradoxes and Possibilities in the Sources for Roman Society in the Early Middle Ages," in Julia M. H. Smith, ed., *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West: Essays in Honor of Donald A. Bullough*, The Medieval Mediterranean: Peoples, Economies and Cultures, 400–1453, 28 (Leiden, 2000), pp. 55–83.

<sup>34</sup> On the building terminology in the *Liber pontificalis*, see Robert Coates-Stephens, "Dark Age Architecture in Rome," *Papers of the British School at Rome* 65 (1997), pp. 177–232 at pp. 224–7.

<sup>35</sup> Here, I have followed Delogu, "The rebirth of Rome," pp. 33–4.

<sup>36</sup> Joachim Wollasch, "Benedictus abbas romensis: Das römische Element in der frühen benedictinischen Tradition," in Norbert Kamp and Joachim Wollasch, eds., *Tradition als historische Kraft:*

and his immediate successor Gregory III (731–41) took the names of one of their most illustrious predecessors, and sought to emulate at least some of his actions.<sup>37</sup> This new historical awareness in some of the eighth-century popes was concretely realized in their efforts to preserve Rome's architectural heritage. Although war and finances limited the extent of papal restorations, nevertheless seventeen churches were renewed before 772.<sup>38</sup> Later popes, benefiting from Carolingian largesse, would increase the scope of this project enormously, but it had firm antecedents in the first half of the eighth century.

All of this suggests that Chrodegang's visits to Rome introduced him to a city that was noticeably rebuilding itself, at least by fits and starts. When he returned to his own episcopal see, he may well have brought back with him the idea that a bishop should not just lead his flock, reform his clergy, and found monasteries and nunneries, but should also be concerned with refurbishing the churches over which he exercised control. A useful comparison here might be with Boniface, who was Chrodegang's predecessor as the *missus sancti Petri* in Francia, and who visited Rome far more times than he did. The Englishman's ideals regarding the episcopacy were influenced by his ascetic proclivities and his missionary vocation, and although he quite clearly was interested in some of duties of the episcopate, such as promulgating canon law and correcting irregularities in cult and creed, he showed little affinity to any particular location, except perhaps Fulda.<sup>39</sup> In contrast, Chrodegang showed a great attachment to place, and expressed this affection through benefactions to the city: to its physical makeup by building and restoring; to its poor and destitute through his care of the *matricularii* and by being in Paul's words "foster-father [and] a most caring guardian of widows and orphans." Chrodegang's work in Metz helped to restore a very old image of the bishop as the leader of his community, who enhanced its material status by *kosmesis*.<sup>40</sup>

*Interdisziplinäre Forschungen zur Geschichte des frühen Mittelalters* (Berlin, 1982), pp. 119–37 at pp. 126–30.

<sup>37</sup> See above, chapter 4, for the details of this argument. Noble, "Paradoxes and Possibilities," links this growing awareness of Rome on the part of the popes to their slow liberation from Byzantine hegemony.

<sup>38</sup> See Noble, "Paradoxes and Possibilities," p. 61; and Coates-Stephens, "Dark Age Architecture," pp. 181–201, who lists ten churches that were either completely new constructions or were substantially rebuilt between 700 and the 760s.

<sup>39</sup> See for instance Stephanus Hilpisch, "Bonifatius als Mönch und Missionar," in *Sankt Bonifatius: Gedankengabe zum zwölftundertsten Todestag* (Fulda, 1954), pp. 3–21; Peter Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*, The Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures (Hanover, 2002), pp. 26–9; and Coates, "The Bishop as Benefactor," at pp. 530–1.

<sup>40</sup> See for instance Jill Harries, *Sidonius Apollinaris and the Fall of Rome, AD 407–485* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 187–206; Coates, "The Bishop as Benefactor," pp. 547–56; William Klingshirn, *Caesarius of*

Like the evidence for his programme of building and restoration, information regarding Chrodegang's preaching has all but vanished. Paul the Deacon describes Chrodegang as *eloquentia facundissimus, tam patrio quamque etiam latino sermone imbutus*, and links this skill both to his exercise of episcopal office and to his care of the poor.<sup>41</sup> He implies as well that this eloquence figures as part of Chrodegang's apostolic gift.<sup>42</sup> We should also connect Chrodegang's abilities in Latin and Frankish with the duties of preaching as described in the *Regula canonicorum*. Twice the rule specifies that a cleric – either the bishop or someone appointed by him – should preach at certain times. First, when discussing the canons' Chapter meetings in c. 8, he insists that his rule along with sermons and other appropriate texts be read, and presumably explained, to the members of the community. In an even more specific reference in c. 34, on the *matricularii*, he writes that "after a suitable reading from tractates or the homilies of the Holy Fathers that will edify the listeners," the bishop "will teach them the path of salvation, and how, with the help of God, they might come to eternal life."<sup>43</sup> Unfortunately, none of these sermons – indeed, no writing ascribed to Chrodegang other than the *Regula canonicorum* – has come down to us.<sup>44</sup> This makes it hard to assess his rhetorical abilities. Nevertheless, a few comments may be made about his general style of preaching.<sup>45</sup>

Since Paul seems to go out of his way to tell us that Chrodegang not only knew Frankish and Latin, but spoke them both eloquently, we can assume that he delivered sermons in the different languages, depending on his audience. The effectiveness of the sermons he delivered in the cathedral of St. Stephen would especially have benefited from the new construction and renovations undertaken there. Preaching from the *cathe-dra*, he would have held the highest and most honorable place in this hierarchically arranged space.<sup>46</sup> As he looked down on both the canons and

*Arles: The Making of a Christian Community in late antique Gaul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 61–3.

<sup>41</sup> Paul the Deacon, *GEM; MGH SS* 2.267–8.

<sup>42</sup> See Michel Banniard, *Viva Voce: communication écrite et communication orale du IV<sup>e</sup> au IX<sup>e</sup> siècle en Occident latin* (Paris, 1992), pp. 281–6.

<sup>43</sup> *RCan*, c. 34; Schmitz, p. 24.

<sup>44</sup> Thomas Martin Buck, *Admonitio et Praedicatio: Zur religiös-pastoralen Dimension von Kapitularien und Kapitularienahen Texten (507–814)*, Frieburger Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte 4 (Frankfurt, 1997), pp. 282–92, would have us see at least some of the conciliar legislation promulgated through royal capitularies as a kind of preaching as well.

<sup>45</sup> Thomas L. Amos, "Early Medieval Sermons and Their Audience," in Jacqueline Hamesse and Xavier Hermand, eds., *De l'homélie au sermon: Histoire de la prédication médiévale*, Textes, Etudes, Congrès 14 (Louvain, 1993), pp. 1–15, offers some useful methods, drawn mainly from anthropology, on understanding early medieval sermon practices. See more generally Rosamond McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895* (London, 1977), pp. 80–114.

<sup>46</sup> Here I follow Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles*, pp. 151–9.

the people, his surroundings would have been noticeably enriched and beautified by the renovations he had ordered and paid for. Such a setting certainly could help enforce his claims to authority and make his preaching more persuasive. His sermons to the canons, given in the Chapter house he had probably constructed, or in the canons' churches of St. Paul and St. Peter Major, where he undertook other major renovations, and delivered perhaps from the very ambo which Paul describes as decorated with silver and gold, would have equally benefited. Likewise, homilies delivered to the nuns at St-Pierre-aux-Nonnains, a house he perhaps founded, and whose chancel almost certainly dates to Chrodegang's episcopacy, would have found corroboration in the setting which he had supplied. In other places, such as Gorze, Hilariacum/St-Avold, and even Lorsch, his authority would have been reinforced not only as founder, but as bestower of relics as well. The bodies of the "Roman" saints which he so graciously distributed to these monasteries would have furthered his own claims to be heard and heeded.<sup>47</sup> Finally, even though we do not have the actual texts of his sermons, we can assume that the liturgical circumstances that preceded and followed his preaching, about which more later, ensured that his message was at least listened to, if not always acted upon.

Before turning to his liturgical innovations, it is worth noting one final remark that Paul the Deacon makes about Chrodegang's activities. Paul says that Chrodegang sought and obtained from the pope the bodies of three martyrs, and that he brought these relics to northern Francia.<sup>48</sup> While such an act might not strike us as unusual, this was only the second licit translation of Roman saints out of the city.<sup>49</sup> Before the middle of the eighth century, the only sort of relics that were generally distributed by the Romans were *brandea* or other contact-relics, such

<sup>47</sup> Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago, 1981), esp. pp. 86–105; Brown, "Relics and Social Status in the Age of Gregory of Tours," in his *Society and the Holy in late antiquity* (Berkeley, 1982), pp. 222–50; and Raymond van Dam, *Leadership and Community in late antique Gaul*, *The Transformation of the Classical Heritage* 8 (Berkeley, 1985), pp. 202–29.

<sup>48</sup> On the desirability of Roman relics, see Donald Bullough, "Roman Books and Carolingian *Renovatio*," in *Renaissance and Renewal in Christian History*, *Studies in Church History* 14 (Oxford, 1977), pp. 23–50; Rudolf Schieffer, "'Redeamus ad fontem.' Rom als Hort authentischer Überlieferung im frühen Mittelalter," in Arnold Angenendt and Rudolf Schieffer, eds., *Roma – caput et fons: Zwei Vorträge über das päpstliche Rom zwischen Altertum und Mittelalter* (Opladen, 1989), pp. 45–70; and Julia M. H. Smith, "Old Saints, New Cults: Roman Relics in Carolingian Francia," in her *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West*, pp. 317–39.

<sup>49</sup> Wilhelm Hotzelt, "Translationen von Märtyrerleibern aus Rom ins westliche Frankenreich im achten Jahrhundert," *Archiv für elsässische Kirchengeschichte* 13 (1938), pp. 1–52 at pp. 1–7, examines earlier reports of translations from Rome, and argues that they are all either mendacious or lack credibility. His judgment has generally been accepted.

as the so-called *Petrusschlüssel*.<sup>50</sup> But by around 750, the centuries-long habit of the Romans to keep control of the bodies of their dead, beloved or otherwise, began to crumble. One pragmatic reason for this change was due to the Lombards, who, under Aistulf, began a second campaign against Pope Stephen in early 756; by late February of that year, they had been besieging Rome for several weeks.<sup>51</sup> During the time they were bivouacked around the city, they availed themselves of the opportunity to relieve the Romans of some of their jealously guarded relics. While the desperate Romans reacted by quickly translating some of the most vulnerable of the dead inside the walls, the Lombards were still able to remove the body of St Silvester from the catacombs of St Priscilla, and eventually bring it to Nonantola.<sup>52</sup>

The first licit translation of relics from Rome to northern Europe seems to have been undertaken by Chrodegang's colleague, Fulrad abbot of St-Denis.<sup>53</sup> Fulrad, who was Pippin's archchaplain and who retained this position well into the reign of Charlemagne, obtained from Pope Stephen the bodies of Vitus, Alexander, and Hippolytus, perhaps as a token of thanks for his role in ending the Lombard war. He distributed the relics to some of the vast number of churches and monasteries he controlled both as a private individual and as abbot. Several years later, during his last trip to Rome, probably in 762, according to the *Translatio et miraculi sancti Gorgonii*, Chrodegang was visiting the graves and holy sites around the city.<sup>54</sup> At the catacombs *ad duas lauros* on the Via Labicana, he came to the tomb of Gorgonius, where his desire for the saint was

<sup>50</sup> Heinrich Fichtenau, "Zum Reliquienwesen im frühen Mittelalter," *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 60 (1952), pp. 60–89 at pp. 84–6; and Alan Thacker, "In Search of the Saints: The English Church and the Cult of the Roman Apostles and Martyrs in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries," in Smith, *Early Medieval Rome*, pp. 247–77 at pp. 253–5.

<sup>51</sup> *Codex carolinus* 8; *MGH Epp.* 3, *Epp. mero. et karol. aevi* 1, ed. W. Gundlach (Berlin, 1892), pp. 494–8; see on this Jan T. Hallenbeck, "Rome under Attack: An Estimation of King Aistulf's Motives for the Lombard Siege of 756," *Mediaeval Studies* 40 (1978), pp. 190–222; and more generally, Thomas F. X. Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter: The Birth of the Papal State, 680–825*, (Philadelphia, 1984), pp. 91–4.

<sup>52</sup> Hotzelt, "Translationen," p. 7; John M. McCulloh, "From Antiquity to the Middle Ages: Continuity and Change in Papal Relic Policy from the 6th to the 8th Century," in Ernst Dassmann and K. Suso Frank, eds., *Pietas: Festschrift für Bernhard Kötting*, *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* Ergänzungsband 8 (Münster, 1980), pp. 313–24 at pp. 320–1 and 323–4. See also Julia M. H. Smith, "Old Saints, New Cults: Roman Relics in Carolingian Francia," in her *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West*, pp. 55–83.

<sup>53</sup> Hotzelt, "Translationen," pp. 7–20; Friedrich Prinz, "Stadtrömisch-italische Märtyrreliquien und fränkischer Reichsadel in Maas-Moselraum," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 87 (1967), pp. 1–25 at pp. 13–19.

<sup>54</sup> *Miracula sancti Gorgonii*, *MGHSS* 4, ed. Georg Pertz (Hanover, 1841), pp. 238–47. The text reports that the body was deposited at Gorze in 765. The *Annales Laureshamensis s.a. 765*, *MGHSS* 1, ed. G. Pertz (Hanover, 1826), pp. 22–39 at p. 28, notes that the bodies of all three saints rested at Gorze for several months, before Nazarius was brought to Lorsch in the summer of that year.

awakened by the sumptuously decorated tomb.<sup>55</sup> He asked Paul I for the relics of Gorgonius, and some of those of his companions Nazarius and Nabor, and the pope agreed to his request.<sup>56</sup>

One later story has it that after several adventures with the bodies on his way out of Rome, Chrodegang eventually crossed the Alps and arrived at St-Maurice d'Againe.<sup>57</sup> There, the bodies were laid by the altar while the bishop and his companions took a few days' rest. The monks, tempted by the arrival of such precious cargo from Rome, hid some of the newly arrived relics, or at least those of Gorgonius. Chrodegang and his companions asked for them back, only to be scoffed at. Eventually, Chrodegang complains to Pippin, who tells him that if the monks do not return his relics, he has permission to abscond with Maurice. The whole episode ends with Chrodegang leaping on the tomb of Maurice, an axe in hand, ready to smash the tomb and everything in it, only to be thwarted by the united pleas of the bishops of Toul, Trier, and Verdun! A more sober report has the party coming directly to Metz, where the bodies were laid for some time.<sup>58</sup> The body of Gorgonius was then moved to the newly built church at Gorze, which Chrodegang consecrated in 765.<sup>59</sup>

Meanwhile, the relics – and clearly, while Chrodegang seems to have secured most or perhaps indeed all of the body of Gorgonius, the volume of relics of the other two saints was much smaller – of Nabor and Nazarius lay at Metz. The *Annales Laureshamensis* puts the date of Nazarius' arrival at Lorsch at 15 May 765.<sup>60</sup> The appearance of Roman relics could have

<sup>55</sup> On Gorgonius, see *AASS* Sept III, 328–55.

<sup>56</sup> The exact identity of Gorgonius, along with his companions Nazarius and Nabor, is not entirely clear; see *AASS* Sept III, 330–2. They have been identified with the Milanese martyrs Nabor, Felix, Nazarius, and Celsus, but this has been disputed: none of our three had early *vitae* or *passiones*, though Pope Damasus is reported to have written a now lost poem about Gorgonius. The most recent summary regarding the identity of Gorgonius is François Dolbeau, "Un panégyrique anonyme, prononcé à Minden pour la fête de saint Gorgon," *Analecta Bollaudiana* 103 (1985), pp. 35–59 at pp. 39–48.

<sup>57</sup> This colourful version of the events is relayed in the *Vita Chrodegangi episcopi Mettensis*, cc. 30–1; *MGH SS* 10.553–72, ed. G. Pertz (Hanover, 1852), pp. 571–2.

<sup>58</sup> *Notae Gorziensis*, *MGH SS* 15/2, ed. O. Holder-Egger (Hanover, 1882), pp. 974–7, says that the basilica was dedicated in July 762 by Pope John [I], and that Chrodegang brought the bodies from Rome to Francia in 765.

<sup>59</sup> Alcuin, *Carmen* 103; *MGH Poetae latini aevi carolini* 1, ed. Ernst Dümmler (Berlin, 1881), p. 330. On the reliability of this date, and the problematic Gorze charter evidence for the appearance of Gorgonius, see Hotzelt, "Translationen," pp. 31–3.

<sup>60</sup> *Ann. Laur. s.a.* 765; *MGH SS* 1.28. Cf. The *Chronicon Laurissense breve*, ed. H. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, *Neues Archiv* 36 (1911), pp. 15–39 at pp. 29–30. The third chapter of the twelfth-century Lorsch cartulary chronicle records the enthusiasm with which the relics were greeted: see Karl Glöckner, *Codex Laureshamensis I: Einleitung Regesten Chronik* (Darmstadt, 1929), pp. 270–2; on the question of when the relics actually arrived at Lorsch, see Glöckner, *Codex Laureshamensis I*, p. 271 n. 3 and n. 4.

a galvanizing effect for both institutions and the population at large: in each of the five years after the arrival of Nazarius, Lorsch received over one hundred donations of land.<sup>61</sup> Probably around the same time, the relics of Nabor were given to the monastery of St. Paul at Hilariacum. This house was founded (or perhaps refounded) by Sigibald, Chrodegang's predecessor at Metz, and he was buried there, rather than at the more traditional episcopal mortuary basilica of St-Symphorien in the city.<sup>62</sup> Sigibald's apparently friendly relations with Wulfoald, an erstwhile enemy of Charles Martel, have led some scholars to posit the belief that Hilariacum was a house equally unfriendly to the Carolingians. If this were the case, Chrodegang's gift of relics to St. Paul's would be especially meaningful. This significance is clearly seen when shortly after the arrival of the relics, St. Nabor (later vernacularized to St-Avold) replaced St. Paul as the house's patron and namesake.<sup>63</sup> A gift as rare and precious as Roman relics, a thing almost unknown even in the largest and most important monasteries in Francia, bestowed upon a small house like St. Paul's, would create the necessity for some sort of counter-gift: one such could be the creation of new and close ties of friendship and alliance with the bishop and see of Metz, where before there might have been suspicion and hostility.<sup>64</sup> In other words, by conferring upon this small, insignificant, but perhaps hostile house such a distinguished gift, Chrodegang extended *pax* and *concordia* to real or potential enemies, binding them to himself through ties of obligation, gratitude, and *amicitia*.

By examining the less well documented aspects of Chrodegang's life, such as his work as a builder, preacher, and translator of relics, we find many of the same attitudes and acts which characterize the *Regula canonico-rum*. First and foremost, there is the concern with creating communities characterized by the virtues of the apostolic church. We can see this, for instance, in his distribution of the Roman relics, given to his own foundation at Gorze, as well as to Lorsch, a monastery with which he was deeply connected, and Hilariacum, a potential place of enemies, both of his and

<sup>61</sup> Matthew Innes, *State and Society in the Early Middle Ages: The Middle Rhine Valley, 400–1000* (Cambridge, 2000), p. 19.

<sup>62</sup> The history of the house is clouded in obscurity. Legend has it that it was founded in the early sixth century by the Aquitanian Fridolinus, who dedicated it to Hilary of Poitiers – hence the locality was known as Hilariacum. But we do not know anything of its history until the eighth century: see Henri Tribout de Morembert, "Manuscrits de l'abbaye de Saint-Avold, VIIIe–XIe siècle," in *Saint Chrodegang*, pp. 183–201 at pp. 183–5; and the *Vita Sigibaldi*, c. 10, *AASS* Oct 11.941.

<sup>63</sup> See Alcuin, *Carmen*, p. 102; *MGH Poetae latini aevi carolini* 1.329; and Hotzelt, "Translationen," p. 34.

<sup>64</sup> On the role of the gift in Carolingian Francia, see de Jong, *In Samuel's Image*, pp. 268–77.

his patron, Pippin the Short. Such a magnanimous gift would help keep these disparate and geographically dispersed communities bound both to one another and to Metz.<sup>65</sup> The later addition to the Metz *Kirchenfamilie* of a chapel dedicated to St. Gorgonius would only highlight the close and affective links between Gorze and Metz. Such bonds provide a necessary spiritual complement to the legal tie that joined the monastery to the local ordinary.<sup>66</sup> Likewise, the architectural *renovatio* Chrodegang directed at Metz might serve both as a source of civic pride, and directly translates his concern for proper order in the church and among the laity into architectural reality. The chancels at the cathedral of St. Stephen, the canons' church of St. Peter Major, and the nunnery of St-Pierre-aux-Nonnains may strike us, living in the twenty-first century, as overtly inimical to creating a community, separating off, as they did, the clergy from the laity, and probably even dividing the different ranks of the canons amongst themselves.<sup>67</sup> Yet for Chrodegang, as for most people in the early Middle Ages, community could not be equated with egalitarianism. As he makes clear again and again in the rule, Chrodegang believed hierarchy and order to be natural and God-given. The real source of discord within a community or a society was when that hierarchy and order were disturbed. Just as his rule (and his monastic foundations as well) sought to straighten out the confusion between the orders of monks and canons, so the chancels were a physical manifestation of an attempt to straighten out the difference between clergy and laity.<sup>68</sup> A harmonious and unanimous community could not exist if such categories were not distinct, and by commissioning these structures Chrodegang made it clear that, in Metz, such separations will be realized. Finally, although we lack the actual texts of the sermons he preached, we do know that, just as in the Jerusalem community, Chrodegang made the care of widows and orphans, the powerless and the disenfranchised, one of his great concerns. There can be little doubt that such a concern was mentioned in his own sermons as well, and if his eloquence was as great as Paul says, it could well have been to this effect. All this work, then, points to the same goals of creating

<sup>65</sup> Innes, *State and Society*, pp. 18–21, discusses how relics might reify networks of spiritual patronage: see, for instance, his discussion of the relationships between Cancor, the founder of Lorsch, Chrodegang, and Ruthard, a donor to both Gorze and Lorsch, pp. 27–9.

<sup>66</sup> On this legal bond, see above, chapter 1.

<sup>67</sup> In both sets of ivories mentioned earlier, it appears that all the deacons are together, implying that they at least are united, and separated from the other ecclesiastical ranks.

<sup>68</sup> See Jean Chatillon, "La spiritualité canoniale," in *Saint Chrodegang*, pp. 111–22 at pp. 112–14; Charles Derreine, "Chanoines," in *DHGE* 12.353–405, esp. pp. 362–4; Ernst Mayer, "Der Ursprung der Domkapitel zugleich ein Wort zu den Urkunden Dragonis," *ZRG*, kan. Abt. 7 (1917), pp. 1–33; and Ferrigno Poggiaspalla, *La vita comune del clero dalle origine alla riforma gregoriana*, Uomini e dottrine 14 (Paris, 1968), p. 72.

networks of *caritas* and *amicitia*, though which the people of Metz, monks, nuns, canons, and bishop, would be bound into a community of holiness and love.

LITURGICAL INNOVATION: CHRODEGANG AND  
THE ROMAN LITURGY

Beyond the *Regula canonorum*, Chrodegang is probably best known for the role he played in early Carolingian efforts to romanize the Frankish liturgy.<sup>69</sup> The reasons why the Carolingians were so interested in a liturgy based on Roman models have been long discussed by historians and liturgists, and the effectiveness of their efforts to impose either a liturgical unity or a romanized liturgy on their kingdoms has been debated for an equally long time. It is probably fair to say that there have been two significant changes in the discussion over the last generation or so, and I believe that these are in part due to the effects of the Second Vatican Council. Early medieval historians and liturgists, who almost all came out of a "great church" tradition, tended until about a generation ago to use words like "anarchy" when discussing the Frankish and Gallican liturgies of the pre-Carolingian period.<sup>70</sup> The fact that different ecclesiastical provinces kept different feasts, used different sacramentaries, and worshiped in different ways was seen as a sign of Merovingian decadence, and the Carolingian reforms were perceived as a most necessary corrective to this obvious state of chaos. In this version of history, the Carolingians, in a movement that began with Boniface, continued with Pippin and Chrodegang, and reached its full fruition in the reign of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, suppressed this Gallican pandemonium, imposed a unified Roman liturgy and law, and thus began the movement that would

<sup>69</sup> In almost all discussions of the "romanization" of the Frankish liturgy, our bishop is assigned such a significant role that James McKinnon has dubbed him "the ubiquitous Chrodegang of Metz," in McKinnon, *The Advent Project: The Later-Seventh-Century Creation of the Roman Mass Proper* (Berkeley, 2000), p. 75; see also Philippe Bernard, *Du Chant romain au chant grégorien (IVe–XIII siècle)*, Patrimoines christianisme (Paris, 1996), pp. 725–9.

<sup>70</sup> Etienne Delaruelle, "L'église romaine et ses relations avec l'église franque jusqu'en 800," in *Le chiese nei regni dell'Europa occidentale e i loro rapporti con Roma sino all'800*, Settimane 7 (Spoleto, 1960), pp. 143–84 at pp. 162–4; Cyrille Vogel, "Les motifs de la romanisation du culte sous Pépin le Bref (751–768) et Charlemagne (774–814)," in *Culto cristiano politica imperiale carolingia*, Convegni del Centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale 18 (Rimini, 1978), pp. 13–41 at pp. 15–19 (this seems to be the same article as his "Saint Chrodegang et les débuts de la romanisation du culte en pays franc," in *Saint Chrodegang*, pp. 91–109); see more recently Jacques Viret, "La réforme liturgique carolingienne et les deux traditions du chant roman," in *Autour d'Hildegarde*, pp. 117–27, at p. 120. Our sources sometimes take the same tack: see Ep. 13 of Pope Zacharius (*PL* 89.951), in which he complains about the deviant practices of the Gallic liturgy.



create the homogeneous Christian and Catholic culture that characterized the high and late Middle Ages.<sup>71</sup>

Much of this scenario has now been discarded. Whereas Merovingian liturgical diversity was once labeled as degenerate and chaotic, it is now more often regarded as a sign of vitality.<sup>72</sup> It is generally acknowledged that, even in Rome itself, liturgical diversity rather than uniformity was the norm.<sup>73</sup> While few doubt the desire of Charlemagne and his successors to promote the use of a romanized liturgy throughout their kingdoms, when this effort began remains disputed, and their efforts now look much less successful than we once believed.<sup>74</sup> We are not even very sure what they thought was necessary for a uniform liturgical observance. Should all the churches in the Carolingian kingdoms honor the same saints on the same days? Should all perform the same rogations and litanies at the same times? Was it a matter of using the same words or was it the movements and gestures that should be the same?<sup>75</sup> And now it seems that the deck was pretty much stacked against the Carolingians from the very start: even given the wealth a king like Charlemagne had at his disposal, he simply never had the resources to complete such an ambitious and wide-ranging programme.<sup>76</sup> Nevertheless, there can be little doubt that despite the odds, some of the later Carolingians and

<sup>71</sup> Bernard, *Du Chant romain*, has offered a revised version of this scenario, where it is Rome who "pushed the first Carolingians to adopt a policy of reform that the popes had long desired. . . . Frankish Gaul was a capital objective for Roman politics, which conceived it as the capstone of the evangelization (and the concomitant romanization) of the West," p. 695.

<sup>72</sup> Yitzhak Hen, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul, 481–751* (Leiden, 1995), chapters 2–5; Hen "Unity in Diversity: The Liturgy of Frankish Gaul before the Carolingians," in R. N. Swanson, ed., *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, Studies in Church History 23 (Oxford, 1996), pp. 19–30; and Hen, *The Royal Patronage of the Liturgy in Frankish Gaul, to the Death of Charles the Bald (877)*, Henry Bradshaw Society Subsidia III (London, 2001), pp. 21–41.

<sup>73</sup> Guy Ferrari, *Early Roman Monasteries: Notes for the History of Monasteries and Convents at Rome from the V through the X Centuries*, Studi di antichità cristiana 2 (Rome, 1957); Victor Saxer, "L'utilisation par la liturgie de l'espace urbain et suburbain: l'exemple de Rome dans l'antiquité et le haut moyen âge," in *Actes du XIe Congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne: Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève et Aoste, 2.9.17–10.33*; and more recently, Sible de Blaauw, *Cultus et decor: liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardoantica e medievale, Basilica Salvatoris, Sanctae Mariae, Sancti Petri*, Studi e testi 355/6 (Rome, 1994).

<sup>74</sup> Rosamond McKitterick, "Unity and Diversity in the Carolingian Church," in Swanson, *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, pp. 59–82; see also her review of Kenneth Levy, *Gregorian Chant and the Carolingians*, in *Early Music History* 19 (2000), pp. 279–91, where she stresses that the Carolingians were interested in "the production and empire-wide dissemination of *correct* texts as distinct from the insistence that everyone use the same text," p. 282. See now Susan A. Keefe, *Water and the Word: Baptism and the Education of the Clergy in the Carolingian Empire*, Publications in Medieval Studies (Notre Dame, 2002), pp. 116–31.

<sup>75</sup> Hen, "Unity in Diversity," pp. 26–8; Häussling, *Mönchskonvent*, pp. 180–1.

<sup>76</sup> Raymund Kottje, "Einheit und Vielfalt des kirchlichen Lebens in der Karolingerzeit," *ZKG* 76 (1965), pp. 323–42; Rosamond McKitterick, "Unity and Diversity in the Carolingian Church."

perhaps the majority of at least their clerical allies tried to impose some aspects of a common liturgy on their subjects.

The second historiographical sea change has been about the revolutionary character of these changes themselves. The old story had it that shortly after the death of Caesarius of Arles and Gregory the Great, the Gallic church, under the control of the Merovingian kings and the remnants of the Gallo-Roman aristocracy, became a *Landeskirche*, virtually independent of Rome and its control. It was only with the Carolingians – or more properly the Anglo-Saxon missionaries whom they sponsored, and whose influence in this regard was decisive – that the Franks once again turned to Rome, and were again infused with the life-giving spirit derived from unity with the patriarch of the west. A series of articles that began to appear in the 1950s kicked the props out from this belief: it was argued that devotion to Rome and to Peter never waned to the extent that the old orthodoxy had it; that contacts with Rome were maintained throughout the Merovingian period by pilgrims, bishops, and even kings; that although the Anglo-Saxons brought a special devotion to Peter and his vicar with them to the continent, the groundwork for a new relationship with Rome had been laid during at least the previous several generations prior to the arrival of Willibrord and Boniface.<sup>77</sup>

Although there were precedents for Frankish devotion to Peter and to Rome, nevertheless the arrival of the Anglo-Saxons in northern Francia did certainly accentuate existing trends of romanization.<sup>78</sup> But there were other, home-grown reasons why the Frankish leaders became interested

<sup>77</sup> Edith Pfeil, *Die fränkische und deutsche Romidee des frühen Mittelalter*, Forschungen zur mittelalterlichen und neueren Geschichte 3 (Munich, 1929), and Theodor Klauser, "Die liturgische Austauschbeziehungen zwischen der römischen und der fränkisch-deutschen Kirche von achten bis zum elften Jahrhundert," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 53 (1933), pp. 169–89 at pp. 169–77, were among the first to note how some of the trends traditionally described as Anglo-Saxon might have had a more indigenous, Frankish, root. This continued with Eugen Ewig, "Die Kathedralpatrozinien im römischen und im fränkischen Gallien," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 79 (1960), pp. 1–61; Ewig, "Der Petrus- und Apostelkult im spätromischen und fränkischen Gallien," *ZKG* 71 (1961), pp. 215–41; Kassius Hallinger, "Römische Voraussetzungen der bonifatianischen Wirksamkeit in Francia," in *Sankt Bonifatius*, pp. 320–61; see also Bullough, "Roman Books," pp. 32–7; and Hen, *The Royal Patronage of the Liturgy*, pp. 42–64.

<sup>78</sup> Even here, recent scholarship has been cautious about the English contribution: Bullough, "Roman Books," pp. 26–32, notes that the synod of *Clofesho* was much more concerned about romanizing the liturgy than was Boniface's *Germanicum*. See also Hen, *The Royal Patronage of the Liturgy*, pp. 44–5; Robert Markus, "From Caesarius to Boniface: Christianity and Paganism in Gaul," in Jacques Fontaine and J. N. Hillgarth, eds., *The Seventh Century: Change and Continuity*, Studies of the Warburg Institute 42 (London, 1992), pp. 154–68 at pp. 167–8; Rosamond McKitterick, "Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Germany: Reflections on the Manuscript Evidence," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 9 (1989), pp. 291–329; and her "The Diffusion of Insular Culture in Neustria between 650 and 850: The Implications of the Manuscript Evidence," in Hartmut Atsma, ed., *La Neustrie: les pays au nord de la Loire de 650 à 850*, Beihefte der Francia 16/1 (Sigmaringen, 1989), pp. 395–432.

in a more complete process of amalgamating, or bringing into concord, the Frankish and Roman liturgies. Through the second half of the eighth century there was a belief that doctrinal and liturgical agreement should go hand in hand, and a growing anxiety about how this might not be the case for the Franks. For instance, in the *Opus Caroli regis*, Charlemagne states that while the Franks had always been in union with Rome theologically, it was during the time of his father that they began to be in concord with Rome in cult as well.<sup>79</sup> And there certainly seems to have been a practical sense among some of the Carolingian elite that unity in administration should somehow be mirrored in uniformity of cult.<sup>80</sup> The unity of a people, after all, should be manifest in how they worship, and pluralism and diversity here could be seen to herald a dangerous divergence in governance. Likewise, some historians have pointed out that the advent of the Carolingian regime created significant new social tensions, which we can see in the flurry of legislative and military activities that accompanied their usurpation.<sup>81</sup> These tensions were soothed in part by introducing novel ideologies of power and religion, most important among which was highlighting the importance of the relationship between the new royal family and the bishop of Rome.<sup>82</sup> The innovations Chrodegang imposed on the canons of Metz under the guise of reform would likewise call for some sort of new ideology, which in this case took the form of a liturgical revival.<sup>83</sup> And we see as well, beginning in the seventh century, an increasing concern about the efficacy of the rites and liturgies carried out by the late Merovingian clergy.<sup>84</sup> There was, it appears, a growing sense of unease regarding the very nature of

<sup>79</sup> *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum* (*Libri Carolini*), 1.6; *MGH Conc.* 2, Supp. 1, ed. Ann Freeman (Hanover, 1998), p. 135–6; see also the *Admonitio generalis*, c. 80; *MGH Capit.* 1, p. 61. Regarding the literary sources for our knowledge of romanization during the reign of Pippin, see Hen, *The Royal Patronage of the Liturgy*, pp. 47–50; Cyrille Vogel, “Les motifs de la romanisation du culte sous Pépin le Bref (751–768) et Charlemagne (774–814),” in *Culto cristiano politica imperiale carolingia*, Convegno del Centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale 18 (Rimini, 1978), pp. 13–41 at pp. 20–30. Bernard, *Du chant romain*, pp. 656–61, offers another interpretation of these texts.

<sup>80</sup> On the use of cult as a means of ruling, see, for instance, Susan Rankin, “Carolingian Music,” in Rosamond McKitterick, ed., *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 274–316 at pp. 276–7; Hen ably refutes this standard belief in *The Royal Patronage of the Liturgy*, pp. 50–4; but see the discussion of concord as a Carolingian ideal in Karl E. Morrison, “Know Thyself: Music in the Carolingian Renaissance,” in *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell’alto medioevo occidentale*, Settimane 39 (Spoleto: 1992), pp. 369–479 at pp. 380–3.

<sup>81</sup> See for instance Michel Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani du haut moyen âge II: les textes (Ordines I–XIII)*, Etudes et documents 23 (Louvain, 1948), p. xxi; Bernard, *Du Chant romain*, pp. 700–4; Guy Halsall, *Settlement and Social Organisation: The Merovingian Region of Metz* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 275–6.

<sup>82</sup> Bernard, *Du Chant romain*, pp. 698–704. <sup>83</sup> Andrieu, *Les Ordines romani II*, p. xx.

<sup>84</sup> Andrieu, *Les Ordines romani II*, pp. xix–xx; Peter Cramer, *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages, c.200–c.1150* (Cambridge, 1993), pp. 138–9, 143–4, 217–29; Eligius Dekker, “Benedictiones quas faciunt in Galli. Qu’a voulu demander saint Boniface,” in Albert Lehner and Walter Berschin,

the sacraments and of liturgy. Did their power reside in the holiness of the performers? Was absolute accuracy needed to make a particular rite “stick”? How could a variety of ritual and liturgical performance show the unity, both contemporary and historical, of the church?<sup>85</sup>

These were certainly some of the questions churchmen such as Chrodegang were grappling with in the middle of the eighth century. One possible solution to this panoply of questions involved turning to Rome, the source of normative texts, for information if not definitive answers.<sup>86</sup> Chrodegang in particular had special interest in Rome and in discovering the way liturgy was performed *more romano*, for according to Metz legends, the two cities were intimately related. Paul the Deacon tells us that Clemens, the first Christian bishop of Metz, was sent to the city by St. Peter himself, and that among his first acts was setting up an altar in the amphitheatre dedicated to his own master, Peter.<sup>87</sup> That church, St-Pierre-aux-Arènes, was, at least according to locals, the oldest Christian church in the city, and a number of modern historians believe that the old Roman arena was the site of the first Metz cathedral, replaced by St. Stephen’s only after the disastrous fire which destroyed Metz in 451.<sup>88</sup> There is no reason to believe that Paul created this story from whole cloth, and in fact there is every indication that he is reliably reporting Metz traditions. In turning to Rome for liturgical texts, Chrodegang was continuing his search for the *norma rectitudinis* of his diocese. This “historical” context is necessary to understand Chrodegang’s own interest in the Roman liturgy, and his role in promoting its use in Metz and in Francia.

Chrodegang has long been granted an important position in the romanization of the Frankish liturgy: he, working with Pippin, Pippin’s half-brother Remigius of Rouen, and perhaps Fulrad of St-Denis, has been seen as one of the major liturgical innovators, initiating new cultic practices in the Frankish kingdoms.<sup>89</sup> These men were probably introduced to the Roman liturgy during Stephen II’s journey from Italy in

eds., *Lateinische Kultur im VIII. Jahrhundert: Traube-Gedenkschrift* (St. Ottilien, 1989), pp. 41–6; Hen, “Unity in Diversity,” p. 30.

<sup>85</sup> See, for instance, Boniface, Epp. 26, 45, 68, etc.

<sup>86</sup> Klauser, “Die liturgische Austauschbeziehungen,” pp. 172–7; Schieffer, “Redeamus ad fontem,” pp. 48–57.

<sup>87</sup> Paul the Deacon, *GEM; MGH SS* 2.261.

<sup>88</sup> J.-B. Keune, R. Schramm, and G. Wolfram, “Das grosse Amphitheater zu Metz,” *JGLGA* 14 (1892), pp. 340–430.

<sup>89</sup> Häussling, *Mönchskonvent*, p. 67; Klauser, “Die liturgische Austauschbeziehungen,” pp. 175–7; McKitterick, “Royal Patronage,” pp. 99–101; Pierre Riché, “Le renouveau culturel à la cour de Pépin III,” *Francia* 2 (1974), pp. 59–70 at p. 66; Roger Reynolds, “The Organisation, Law, and Liturgy of the Western Church, 700–900,” in *NCMH*, pp. 587–621 at p. 619; Cyrille Vogel, “Les échanges liturgiques entre Rome et les pays francs jusqu’à l’époque de Charlemagne,” in *Le chiese nei regni dell’Europa occidentale e i loro rapporti con Roma sino all’800*, Settimane 7 (Spoleto, 1960), pp. 185–295; Vogel, “Les motifs de la romanisation,” at pp. 26–30; and Vogel, “Saint Chrodegang

753, and his long visit to Francia in 754–755.<sup>90</sup> This gave the members of court and visitors to it ample opportunity to see the way things were done *more romano*, and gave the Frankish liturgical experts, like Chrodegang and Remigius, the chance to experience over the course of several weeks, months, and liturgical seasons the Roman way of liturgy, which would have provided striking evidence of the disparity between Roman and Frankish practices.<sup>91</sup> Sometimes, it seems that those who observed the differences between their own liturgical practices and those of their visitors responded with concern and anxiety. However, Yitzhak Hen has recently argued that most of our sources which describe this early stage of liturgical romanization during the time of Pippin were written during, and even after, the reign of Charlemagne, at a time when liturgical reform and a strict adherence to Roman practices were seen as an important attribute of a good king.<sup>92</sup> This, he believes, compromises their credibility, at least as far as their reports of romanization go, and thus requires that we treat them with great circumspection when they are not corroborated with more contemporary evidence. Our best information on this earliest reaction to the presence of the pope's Roman entourage in Francia comes from the liturgical evidence itself. What we find is a desire to bring the Frankish liturgy more into line with the Roman, though without abandoning important "Gallican" and Frankish traditions.<sup>93</sup> One result of this encounter seems to be the creation of the composite sacramentary known as the "Gelasian of the Eighth Century," a work that some historians and liturgists have argued can be closely connected with Chrodegang or his circle.<sup>94</sup> This text, a careful blending of a variety of liturgical traditions

et les débuts de la romanisation," pp. 99–101; but see his more modest comments in *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, revised and translated by William G. Storey and Niels Krogh Rasmussen (Washington, DC, 1986), p. 76.

<sup>90</sup> The chronology of Stephen's visit to Francia is disputed; here I follow Noble, *Republic of St Peter*, see p. 88, n. 113.

<sup>91</sup> See the *Opus Caroli regis*, cited above, and Walafrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis*, 26, ed. and trans. Alice L. Harting-Correa, *Walafrid Strabo's Liber de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum: A Translation and Liturgical Commentary* (Leiden, 1996), pp. 168–9. Hen, *The Royal Patronage of the Liturgy*, pp. 48–57, esp. pp. 53–7. On the type of music Chrodegang, Remigius, and others would have heard both in Rome and while the pope was in Francia, see McKinnon, *The Advent Project*.

<sup>92</sup> Hen, *The Royal Patronage of the Liturgy*, p. 54; see also McKitterick, review of *Gregorian Chant*, pp. 285–6; Keefe, *Water and the Word*, pp. 125–8.

<sup>93</sup> Kenneth Levy, "A New Look at Old Roman Chant," *Early Music History* 19 (2000), pp. 81–104, and 20 (2001), pp. 173–97, argues that in the generation following Chrodegang this was exactly the origin of Gregorian chant: the editors who compiled the earliest Gregorian chants in Gaul based their melodies primarily on pre-existing Gallican chants.

<sup>94</sup> On this text, see A. Chavasse, "Le Sacramentaire gélasien du VIII<sup>e</sup> siècle, ses deux principales formes," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 73 (1959), pp. 249–98; and Chavasse, *Le Sacramentaire dans le groupe dit "Gélasien du VIII<sup>e</sup> siècle." Une compilation raisonnée: étude des procédés de confection et synoptiques nouveau modèle* (Steenbruges, 1984); Häussling, *Mönchskonvent*, pp. 175–8; Hen, *The Royal Patronage*

that had been circulating in Francia for some time, was probably compiled at the monastery of Flavigny.<sup>95</sup> It proved an immediate success – there are a dozen or more surviving witnesses, but all show some significant variety among themselves.<sup>96</sup> While these Gelasians contain Roman and Italian material, they are essentially "Frankish prayer-books for the Frankish Church," and transmit notable amounts of Gallican material.<sup>97</sup> Some scholars have seen in the Gelasians of the Eighth Century the first, failed, attempt by the Franks at unifying the liturgy around Roman observance. But this is not true. It is not until well after the death of Chrodegang that we can really find any evidence of an attempt to impose liturgical unity on the Frankish church, let alone one based exclusively on Roman models. If the goal of the Gelasians of the Eighth Century was to promote liturgical unity, they must be reckoned a failure, for they simply added another to the many liturgical options that were available in the middle of the eighth century. If the goal, however, was to make available a romanized and romanizing liturgy that could still easily be adapted to meet local circumstances and local needs, and that took considerable account of local Gallic and Frankish traditions, it was a masterful success, for these sacramentaries helped mid-century liturgists resolve the inherent tension between Christianity as a "universal" and a "local" religion.

The Gelasians of the Eighth Century offer one important witness for change and evolution in the Frankish liturgy during Chrodegang's lifetime. Another is the *Ordines romani*.<sup>98</sup> The *ordines* are a series of texts that purport to be, and sometimes are, directions of how to perform

of the Liturgy, pp. 57–61; Marcel Metzger, *Les Sacramentaires*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 70 (Turnhout, 1994), pp. 107–13; Bernard Moreton, *The Eighth Century Gelasian Sacramentary* (Oxford, 1976); Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 73–8. For the historiography on the link between this text and Chrodegang, see Eric Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques: le moyen âge des origines au XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris, 1993), p. 71 n. 1; and Riché, "Le renouveau culturel," p. 66.

<sup>95</sup> Hen, *The Royal Patronage of the Liturgy*, suggests that it was perhaps first compiled either at the monastery of Volvic, or at the more traditional Flavigny; Moreton, *The Eighth Century Gelasian Sacramentary*, p. 173, argues for a community in the Rhaetian Alps.

<sup>96</sup> Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 71–3, lists the manuscripts with their editions; Metzger, *Les Sacramentaires*, pp. 107–8, does the same, and on pp. 111–13 he proposes a *stemma* to suggest how the texts are related to one another.

<sup>97</sup> Hen, *The Royal Patronage of the Liturgy*, p. 60.

<sup>98</sup> The critical edition of the complete cycle of *ordines* is Andrieu, *Les Ordines romani*; it should be supplemented by Josef Semmler, "Ordines aevi regulae mixtae," in Kassius Hallinger, *Initia Consuetudines Benedictinae*, Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum 1 (Seiburg, 1963), pp. 1–104. See also James F. Baldwin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship: The Origins, Development, and Meaning of the Stational Liturgy*, *Orientalia christiana analecta* 228 (Rome, 1987), pp. 130–1; Kassius Hallinger, "Die römische Ordines von Lorsch, Murbach, und St Gallen," in Ludwig Lenhart, ed., *Universitas: Dienst am Wahrheit und Leben: Festschrift für Bischoff Dr Albert Stohr* (Main, 1960), 1.466–77; Häussling, *Mönchskonvent*, pp. 178–82; Hen, *The Royal Patronage of the Liturgy*, pp. 62–4; Aimé-Georges Martimort, *Les "Ordines," les ordinaires et les cérémoniaux*, Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 56 (Turnhout, 1991); and Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 135–224.

various cultic acts in Rome, ranging from a pontifical high mass to daily stationary liturgies to the annual *cursus* of “Benedictine” readings. Because most early medieval sacramentaries did not include instructions on what the celebrant should do at any given moment in the liturgy, having the proper *ordo* was as necessary as having the correct sacramentary or the right evangelary to perform a liturgy correctly: unless one had been trained in the exact way of performing a given rite, there were no directions apart from those provided by the *ordo*. It seems that to many in the eighth century and earlier, it was at least as much the actions of the celebrants as the words themselves that made rituals valid.<sup>99</sup> Even earlier Merovingian legislation that would seem to point toward a desire to standardize the way mass, for instance, was said was really mainly interested in regulating the acts and gestures that accompanied the sacramental words.<sup>100</sup> Chrodegang has been associated with the production of at least one set of *ordines* – those in the *Collectio Sangallensis* (St. Gall Stiftsbibliothek 349).<sup>101</sup> The dating of this collection of Romano-Frankish *ordines*, and their author or authors, is problematic, but it seems the collection was certainly written or redacted sometime between 731 and 787, and more likely in the 750s or 760s.<sup>102</sup> The *Collectio Sangallensis*, which mainly is concerned with the life of monks, was probably written by someone who had personal experience of monastic life in Rome, but who had available a number of sources that were not strictly Roman, or even Italian. It appears to have been written in Austrasia or northern Burgundy, and Chrodegang seems to be referring to one of these *ordines* in his rule.<sup>103</sup> It is tempting to believe that the collection was written under his direction or with his patronage, but unfortunately there is no evidence to support this. Suggestions that he may have been responsible for the creation or production of other *ordines* can likewise only remain that: our lack of evidence makes it impossible to go further.

<sup>99</sup> Arnold Angenendt, “Pirmin und Bonifatius: Ihr Verhältnis zu Mönchtum, Bischofsamt und Adel,” in Arno Borst, ed., *Mönchtum, Episkopat und Adel zur Gründungszeit des Klosters Reichenau*, Vorträge und Forschungen 20 (Sigmaringen, 1974), pp. 251–304 at pp. 290–1; Hen, “Unity in Diversity,” pp. 26–8; Susan Rabe, *Faith, Art, and Politics at Saint-Riquier: The Symbolic Vision of Angilbert*, *The Middle Ages* (Philadelphia, 1997), p. xiii. Häussling, *Mönchskonvent*, pp. 180–1, argues that this must be the case because the *Ordines romani* circulated much more broadly north of the Alps before Roman sacramentaries did.

<sup>100</sup> Hen, “Unity in Diversity,” pp. 26–9.

<sup>101</sup> Andrieu, *Les Ordines romani I*, pp. 330–3; Hallinger, “Die römische Ordines,” pp. 469–70; cf. Semmler, “*Ordines aevi regulae mixtae*,” pp. 8–10, esp. p. 10, who argues, correctly I think, that we do not have enough evidence to support this conclusion.

<sup>102</sup> Semmler, “*Ordines aevi regulae mixtae*,” pp. 8–10, believes that the collection was written by a single author, and was completed and circulating before Chrodegang wrote his rule. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 153–4, holds that it was most probably written between 775 and 780.

<sup>103</sup> Most particularly, in *RCan*, c. 33, on Sunday and festal Chapter.

However, even though one cannot prove that Chrodegang stood as the instigator or patron of the Gelasians of the Eighth Century or any of the *Ordines romani*, their subsequent history and promulgation represent Chrodegang’s own way of proceeding, at least liturgically. There can be no doubt that he found the Roman liturgy satisfying, and that he imported some aspects of it to Metz. There can be little doubt that he also played some role in making others in Francia aware of the beauty and utility of it, and conceivably he sought to convince others of the desirability to adopt it for use in dioceses outside of Metz. But there is no evidence that he sought to impose it outside his own immediate jurisdiction. There is nothing in the councils with which he is associated that implies that there should be a uniformity of liturgical observance in Francia.

The story is different in Metz, where we can directly associate him with some very specific liturgical changes and innovations. Paul the Deacon writes that Chrodegang

ordered his clergy, abundantly imbued with divine law and the Roman way of liturgy (*romana . . . cantilena*) to observe the customs and arrangements of the Roman church (*morem atque ordinem Romanae ecclesiae*), which up to that time had hardly been done in the Metz church.<sup>104</sup>

Thus, Paul tells us that Chrodegang desired that his clergy and people follow the Roman church’s tradition in *cantilena*, *mores*, and *ordines*. He was certainly not the first bishop in northern Europe to bring parts of the Roman liturgy to his diocese: as we have seen, for a hundred years Roman liturgical books had been making their way to Francia, Germany, and Anglo-Saxon England, brought by individual monks and nuns, abbots and bishops, returning from pilgrimage to the shrines of the Apostles.<sup>105</sup> Chrodegang’s efforts, however, were more systematic, and his work at Metz laid the foundations for a further romanization, of a kind he himself probably neither foresaw nor intended, in the century after his death.

When Paul tells us that Chrodegang had his clergy taught *cantilena romana*, he means much more than simply that Chrodegang replaced indigenous melodies with ones from Rome: Chrodegang’s reforms were not the same as no longer singing “All Creatures That On Earth Do Dwell” to the Old One Hundredth. *Cantilena* can be taken to mean

<sup>104</sup> Paul the Deacon, *GEM*; *MGH SS* 2.268.

<sup>105</sup> The Anglo-Saxons had imported at least some Roman liturgical practices for over a century, but this was, typically, a piecemeal effort: see Henry Mayr-Harting, *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England*<sup>3</sup> (University Park, PA, 1991), pp. 168–90; Catherine Cubitt, “Unity and Diversity in the Early Anglo-Saxon Liturgy,” in Swanson, *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, pp. 45–57; Jacques Viret, “La Réforme liturgique carolingienne,” pp. 120–1; Vogel, “Les motifs de la romanisation du culte,” pp. 15–18.

simply that music to which words are sung, and if this were the case, Chrodegang's reform would simply have changed the chants sung at mass and in office.<sup>106</sup> But it is a mistake to take *cantilena* – and likewise *cantus* and *cantare* – in such a limited sense. In the classicizing Latin of Paul the Deacon, *cantare* means the same as *laudare*, *recitare*, or even *praedicare*.<sup>107</sup> *Cantilena*, in other words, means the whole way liturgy was celebrated. Thus, when Paul says Chrodegang introduced *cantilena romana*, he means not only did Chrodegang bring to Metz Roman music (and probably a Roman music master, perhaps drawn from Stephen's entourage<sup>108</sup>), he is telling us that Chrodegang introduced the whole Roman style of performing liturgy: that is, he introduced, if they were not there already, a Roman-style sacramentary, Roman-style *ordines*, a Roman lectionary, Roman feasts, and so forth. It seems most probable that he inaugurated these changes not just in the cathedral complex, but throughout the whole diocese.

Paul's text makes this seem as if it all happened rather simply, and although there is no evidence one way or the other, recent experience with liturgical modifications in the European and American churches – Roman Catholic, Anglican, and such – would suggest that the implementation of Chrodegang's hopes was not done without controversy. Often, neither laity nor clergy takes well to change in what is after all the most public way of worship. One can imagine in particular the canons of the cathedral – the liturgical specialists of Metz – obstructing these changes in liturgy whenever and wherever possible. The liturgical life of a religious community was central to its identity and purpose, and participation in the daily cursus of office, mass, and prayers was the central foundation which gave structure to the *vita communis*.<sup>109</sup> Common prayer acted as one of the most important forces in the creation of a common, and communal, identity.<sup>110</sup> It was the most visible and regular manifestation that religious men and women were working for the common good

<sup>106</sup> Klauser, "Die liturgische Austauschbeziehungen," p. 171, takes *cantilena* in this more restricted sense, though he also says that the change in music was the "springende Punkt" for much more wide-ranging changes that would be introduced later on; cf. Andrieu, *Les Ordines romani II*, p. xxi.

<sup>107</sup> See S. J. P. Van Dijk, "The Urban and Papal Rites in Seventh and Eighth-Century Rome," *Sacris Erudiri* 12 (1961), pp. 411–87 at pp. 435–6; Vogel, "Les motifs de la romanisation," pp. 23–5.

<sup>108</sup> See *MGH Epp. mero. et karol.* 2, no. 226, p. 369. Remigius of Rouen received Symeon, the prior of the Roman *schola cantorum* from Paul I. He was recalled to Rome at Paul's death: *MGH Epp.* 1, no. 41, p. 554.

<sup>109</sup> See Cubitt, "Unity and Diversity," p. 46.

<sup>110</sup> Morrison, "Know Thyself," p. 387, states that common psalmody was the "gymnasial song of Christ's athletes in their struggles against demonic powers and 'carnal and animal men,' beasts in human form."

of their town, region, and kingdom.<sup>111</sup> Changes in prayer could easily be equated with changes in the identity of the community, and hence could be sources of great concern for community members. Chrodegang went even further than this, however. He changed the whole way the community was structured and governed in the *Regula canonicorum*, and the innovations in liturgy must be seen as a part of the more general reform of the lives of the canons.

And yet Chrodegang presumably felt that despite the dissatisfaction and controversy such innovations would have engendered, the battles were worth the result. That all this happened without causing a crisis in the community is hard to imagine. While it is difficult to assess the ease with which Chrodegang introduced these changes, we can perhaps see in the schedule of fees for various liturgical services produced during the reign of his successor, Angilramn, how compliance may have had to be bought for a price.<sup>112</sup> Chrodegang himself did other things to ease the transition from the previous regime to the new one. One might see the renovations and new buildings in the cathedral complex as ways that could make his reforms more palatable to the canons. But what did he hope to accomplish with such global changes?

First of all, the adoption of *cantilena romana* was a most public expression of union with the church of Rome. Given the centrality of cult in the public and private life of Franks in the early Middle Ages, there was no better way to assert the importance of ties with the see of Peter than by adopting its liturgy. The participation in Roman-style liturgies became an almost tangible mark of the union of the Metz church with its mother church in Rome. It re-created a link that had been severed, according to Metz tradition, centuries earlier, and restored to Metz the historical integrity that it had as a full daughter of the Roman church. And *cantilena romana* not only expressed this unity, it played a role in creating it. Public performance of liturgy is both expressive and performative: that is, it not only made a public proclamation about the intimate ties between the sees of Peter and Clemens, it also helped to create this very belief. It is of course one thing to talk about how the churches of Rome and Metz were related historically and doctrinally, but it is far more compelling to make this linkage concrete by having the two churches do the same things liturgically. The historical and geographical chasm between the two churches – the ages of time that divided Peter and Clemens from Chrodegang and Pope Stephen, and vast spaces which separated central

<sup>111</sup> Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani II*, p. xxi.

<sup>112</sup> Michel Andrieu, "Règlement d'Angilramne de Metz (768–791) fixant les honoraires de quelques fonctions liturgiques," *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 10 (1930), pp. 349–69.

Italy from northern Francia – could be overcome when Metz celebrated *more romano*.

Second, it has been suggested that any real reform or improvement of clergy or laity in the eighth century depended upon renewing their religious fervor. If this were the case, attempts at reform presuppose a liturgical revival.<sup>113</sup> While this revival did not preclude a revived “Gallican” liturgy – a renewal of *cantilena gallicana* – a number of factors made this more difficult. As we have seen, romanization of the Frankish liturgy had been underway in a piecemeal fashion for a century, and it was in many ways irreversible. Moreover, returning to the old indigenous liturgy would not accentuate the historical ties between Metz and Rome, about which Chrodegang seems to have been so zealous.<sup>114</sup> Since a liturgical revival of some sort may have been seen as necessary, the opportunity was at hand to introduce a new kind of liturgy as well – that is, one derived from Roman practice. The turn toward Rome brought several benefits other than restoring the putative historical connection that began with its initial christianization. If any liturgical changes would have created some sort of backlash, Chrodegang needed to bring innovations that would have enough authority in and of themselves that they could not be questioned. Clearly, those drawn from Rome (or perhaps claimed to be drawn from Rome) would suffice. Liturgical change *more romano* might be the only option that could escape the medieval rebuke of innovation. It would be this sort of liturgical milieu – one of romanizing reform – that would produce the Frankish versions of the *Ordines romani*.

While it is important to understand that *cantilena* means more than just melodies, it is equally important not to minimize the importance of music and its art to the Carolingians.<sup>115</sup> That an important Carolingian aesthetic category was concord would clearly appeal to Chrodegang, who understood the chief qualities of the apostolic church to be those of the *pax et concordia*. Music, which was counted among the liberal arts, but those of the mathematical quadrivium, was governed not by human usage and custom, as was the case with the arts that belonged to the language-based trivium, but by the very laws which God built into the universe, and thus it gave humans an immediate sort of access into the mind of the Creator.<sup>116</sup> Music and chant strictly defined were of course a central

<sup>113</sup> Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani II*, pp. xix–xxi.

<sup>114</sup> Viret, “La réforme liturgique carolingienne,” p. 123, notes that “tout son [Chrodegang’s] ambition était de suivre scrupuleusement les usages romains, sans doute grâce à la collaboration active de clercs envoyés par le pape.”

<sup>115</sup> Here I follow especially Morrison, “Know Thyself,” and Rankin, “Carolingian Music.”

<sup>116</sup> John J. Contreni, “The Carolingian Renaissance: Education and Literary Culture,” in *NCMH*, pp. 709–57 at pp. 739–40.

part of liturgical ritual as well. Such music most importantly shaped the minds and the hearts of its performers and listeners. Some later Carolingian authors regarded the use of Roman chant as a necessary sign of submission to the see of Peter, and this may have been a concern of Chrodegang’s. More important still, Roman singing shaped the heart and the mind to Roman – that is, orthodox and historically continuous – patterns of belief.<sup>117</sup> Using the right sort of music was thus a tool for conversion, a means of reviving the believer, and a discipline that could reform the hearer and singer both. Its results were both intellectual and emotional transformation, as participants of every kind were inflamed with the right sorts of thoughts and feelings. And finally and perhaps most importantly, given Chrodegang’s overwhelming interest in this, music and chant played a crucial role in the creation of community.<sup>118</sup> Music and choir were a communal task, and we assume in the early Carolingian period its harmonies were monodic. In such a setting, liturgical singing became both a symbol and a manifestation of communal unity.<sup>119</sup> The knowledge, affective and intellectual, that came about through the performance of chant and singing was never the result of a solitary effort: it always happened in the context of a community, whether that of the canons, while they sang their office, or the whole city of Metz, when the town gathered to celebrate major feasts and stationary masses.<sup>120</sup> Thus, singing the right kind of music could mould the hearts, inflame the minds, and unite the souls of a congregation, leading each and every individual to the same understanding of themselves, their world, and God. As Karl Morrison puts it, through liturgical music, “one knew oneself through others.”<sup>121</sup> In the performance of an early medieval liturgy, moreover, the manifestation of hierarchy, which Chrodegang stresses again and again in the rule, is made most public, and is made publicly performative as well. Bishop and priests, deacons and sub-deacons, acolytes, crucifers, and thurifers all play different, if concordant, roles, while masters, cantors, the *schola cantorum* and choir, and people all perform in different ways. Only when each performs his own role, whether it be major or minor, will the harmonious end be achieved. Only when hierarchy is made clear through community will the final goal of unanimity and concord be realized.

While we do not know how difficult it was for Chrodegang to make all of this happen, we do know that he was ultimately successful. Metz, for

<sup>117</sup> Morrison, “Know Thyself,” p. 395.

<sup>118</sup> See Conrad Leyser, *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory the Great*, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford, 2000), pp. 96–8; and McLynn, *Ambrose of Milan*, pp. 225–6.

<sup>119</sup> Rankin, “Carolingian Music,” p. 278.

<sup>120</sup> Morrison, “Know Thyself,” p. 469. <sup>121</sup> Morrison, “Know Thyself,” p. 469.

the rest of the Carolingian period, became the center of study of *cantilena romana* in Gaul.<sup>122</sup> Our sources, literary and artistic, testify to this as clearly as they do to anything. The best-known story that attests this is from the *vita* of Alcuin of York: some Anglo-Saxon monks, on their way to Rome to study, stop at Tours to visit Alcuin, and he diverts them to Metz, saying that it is the best place to learn Roman chant.<sup>123</sup> Another sign of Chrodegang's success in Metz may be found in the very manuscripts that transmit our earliest versions of Romano-Frankish chant. Musicologists ponder when musical notation first began being written down, but it has been at least suggested that one early form of neuming was invented at Metz, devised to facilitate uniformity in transmission of music.<sup>124</sup> While the invention of neumes, or the fame of the Metz *schola cantorum*, cannot be laid at Chrodegang's feet, he set Metz on this path. From his time on, music became as integral to its liturgical life as the sacraments.

## HAGIOPOLIS

In 1929, Theodor Klauser reported of a Paris manuscript, BN lat. 268, that contained, among other items, a list of the churches in Metz where the bishop should say mass for almost every day of Lent and Easter week.<sup>125</sup> Paleographically, the list dates from the ninth century, but the material it contains is older. The list of churches seems to draw on a Roman model, and since it includes Thursday masses during Lent, one terminus must be the pontificate of Gregory II (715–731), who instituted this celebration for days that were previously *aliturgici*.<sup>126</sup> Because the list clearly seems to depend upon an eighth-century Gelasian sacramentary, the other terminus is 791, when the revised Hadrianum-Gregorianum sacramentary was introduced in Metz.<sup>127</sup> Since Klauser's publication of this text more than seventy years ago, almost every historian and liturgist has followed him

<sup>122</sup> See Viret, "La réforme liturgique carolingienne," p. 122; Christian-Jacques Demollié, *Quand le chant grégorien s'appelait chant messin* (Thionville, nd), pp. 1–6; Kenneth Levy, *Gregorian Chant and the Carolingians* (Princeton, 1998), pp. 214–15; Walther Lipphardt, *Der karolingische Tonar aus Metz*, Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 43 (Münster, 1965), pp. 1–4; and Claire Maître, *La Réforme cistercienne du plain-chant: étude d'un traité théorique* (Brecht, 1995), pp. 42–5; all with different references to the school's fame.

<sup>123</sup> *Vita Alcuini* 8; MGH SS 15/1, ed. W. Arndt (Hanover, 1887), pp. 184–97 at p. 189.

<sup>124</sup> Levy, *Gregorian Chant*, p. 246; see also Leo Treitler, "Homer and Gregory: The Transmission of Epic Poetry and Plainchant," *The Musical Quarterly* 60 (1974), pp. 333–72; and Treitler, "The Early History of Music Writing in the West," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 35 (1982), pp. 237–79.

<sup>125</sup> Theodor Klauser, "Notes sur l'ancienne liturgie de Metz," *ASHAL* 38 (1929), pp. 497–510; and Klauser, "Eine Stationsliste der Metzger Kirche aus dem 8. Jahrhunderts, wahrscheinlich ein Werk Chrodegangs," *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 44 (1930), pp. 162–93.

<sup>126</sup> LP 91.9; L. Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis: Texte, Introduction et Commentaire* (Paris, 1886) 1.402.

<sup>127</sup> Klauser, "Eine Stationsliste," p. 184.

in dating the origin of the list to the 750s or 760s, and attributing it to Chrodegang's episcopacy.<sup>128</sup>

The list is a precious bit of evidence for the presence of stational liturgies in mid-eighth-century Metz. A stational liturgy was essentially a public service of worship at a church, cemetery, or other such place in or near a town or city, on a specific day – feast, fast, or commemoration – which was presided over by the local bishop or his representative.<sup>129</sup> Such liturgies developed in the late antique cities of the Roman world, and many looked to Jerusalem as their source or inspiration. We find one of the earliest mentions of this style of liturgy in the *Peregrinatio* of the fifth-century pilgrim *Aegeria*.<sup>130</sup> While in major cities like Constantinople and Rome they developed into an elaborate series of ritual processions and liturgies, many other smaller cities and towns developed stational liturgies on less grand scales, and we find mention of them across a broad range of locales.<sup>131</sup> What makes the Metz list different from the one mentioned, say, in Gregory of Tours' description of the liturgies at Tours under Perpetuus is that it transmits for the first time north of the Alps a complete and entire list of stations during the most important liturgical season of the year.<sup>132</sup>

There are indications that Chrodegang was not the first to introduce this style of liturgy into Metz. Gregory of Tours mentions processions in the city associated with the feast of St. Remigius, and the *Vita Arnulfi* offers a tantalizing hint of a series of processions as well, but whether these were only annual events or a regular and recurring cycle of liturgies

<sup>128</sup> Chrodegang mentions the stations in the *Regula canoniconum*, cc. 8, 20, and 34. The lone exception to ascribing the text to the time of Chrodegang is Patrick Saint-Roche "L'utilisation liturgique de l'espace urbain et suburbain: l'exemple de quatre villes de Francie," *Actes du XIe Congrès international d'archéologie chrétienne: Lyon, Vienne, Grenoble, Genève et Aoste* (Rome, 1989), 2.1103–15, at pp. 1107–8.

<sup>129</sup> On the use of stational liturgies, see Christine Mohrmann, "Statio," *Vigiliae Christianae* 7 (1953), pp. 233–42; Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship*, p. 37; Häussling, *Mönchskloster und Eucharistiefeyer*, pp. 186–201; Richard Hierzegger, "Collecta und Statio," *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie* 60 (1936), pp. 511–54 at p. 512 n. 7; Henri Leclercq, "Stations liturgiques," *DACL* 15.2, pp. 1653–7; and C. Pietri, *Roma christiana: recherches sur l'église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiades à Sixte III (311–340)*, Bibliothèque des Ecoles française d'Athènes et de Rome 224 (Rome, 1976), pp. 587–98.

<sup>130</sup> See Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship*, pp. 83–104; the *Peregrinatio Egeriae* is in E. Franceschini and R. Weber, eds., *Itineraria et alia geographica*, CC 175 (Turnhout, 1965), pp. 29–90.

<sup>131</sup> For Clermont, see Harries, *Sidonius Apollinaris*, pp. 191–7; for Tours, Gregory of Tours, *HLX* 10.31; ed. Krusch, pp. 529–31; for other places in Gaul, Klauser, "Notes," p. 501–2; Richard Hierzegger, "Collecta und Statio," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 60 (1936), pp. 511–54 at p. 512 n. 7; for the Rhineland, see Rolf Zerfass, "Die Idee der römischen Stationsfeier und ihr Fortleben," *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 8 (1958), pp. 218–29 at p. 225 n. 32, etc. Klauser, "Eine Stationsliste," pp. 163–5, provides a useful history of stational liturgies, and a primary source bibliography on where they were known to occur.

<sup>132</sup> Klauser, "Notes," p. 501.

is unclear from our evidence.<sup>133</sup> Be that as it may, it is certainly the case that the Frankish church celebrated the Rogations and at least the occasional liturgy with a procession, and that short pilgrimages to extramural churches, such as the one at Metz to the church of St-Remi, were not unheard of. But Chrodegang's innovation was more than just increasing the number of such processions and masses. Instead, the stational liturgy that our text describes is a complex series of almost daily liturgies that move bishop, canons, and townsfolk from the cathedral complex to various churches within and outside the walls, that in fact offer a grand and well-conceived tour of Christian Metz.<sup>134</sup> Unfortunately, we do not know if a procession between the *episcopium* and stational church was part of the liturgy in Metz. While processions are indicated only twice in the manuscript – on the first ferial day of Lent, when the collect is at St. Peter Major and the station is in the cathedral, and on Palm Sunday, when the collect is at Ste-Ségolène, and the station is St. Peter Major – there does not seem to be any other way to move the episcopal party between the two points. And if there was a procession, it could well have resembled that described in *Ordo romanus I*, a text that describes a papal procession and high mass, a ceremony which Chrodegang almost certainly observed in Rome.<sup>135</sup> Andrieu's sections 36–64 of *OR I* are transmitted in **B**, Bern Bürgerbibliothek 289, and immediately follow our earliest copy of the *Regula canonicorum*, which is contained in that manuscript: it appears to be written in the same hand that copied Chrodegang's rule, and this suggests that at least the scribe saw an intimate connection between the rule and the *ordo*.<sup>136</sup> The processions of the stational liturgy and the masses that followed were both preceded and followed by preaching and other liturgical actions, such as collects, prayers, and celebrating the scrutinies.

In Metz, the assignment of the stations to various churches follows a rather clear geographical order. The station for the Friday after Ash Wednesday is the church of St. Marcellus, east of the cathedral and across the Moselle; the Saturday station is the nearby church of St. Vincent, also across the Moselle. All the Sunday stations during Lent are in the churches of the *episcopium*, usually in St. Peter Major, but once in the smaller church of St. Mary. The pattern for the rest of the stational churches shows they

<sup>133</sup> Gregory of Tours, *HLX* 8.21; ed. Krusch, pp. 387–8; *Vita Arnulfi* 10; *MGH SRM* 2, ed. B. Krusch (Hanover, 1888), p. 435.

<sup>134</sup> Baldovin, *Urban Character*, p. 156.

<sup>135</sup> This procession is described in great detail in *OR I*, which appears in Francia around 750 or so. It reports the Roman liturgy as it was practiced during or after the pontificate of Gregory II (715–31); see Andrieu, *Les Ordines romani*, 2.38–51; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 159–60. Cf. de Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, pp. 36 and 66, who posits a date closer to 700.

<sup>136</sup> The *ordo* is in **B**, Bern Bürgerbibliothek 289, ff. 16<sup>r</sup> to 18<sup>r</sup>.

were chosen in a clockwise fashion, moving from east of the center of the old city to the north, the west, and finally the south.<sup>137</sup> During Holy Week, the stations are all generally in the churches of the *episcopium* as well, the exceptions being the Monday station at S. Maria *in xenodochio*, the most southeasterly church within the walls, and the Tuesday station at St. Victor, close to the cathedral, but not part of its *Kirchenfamilie*. Easter week likewise takes place within the churches of the *episcopium*, except for the Friday station at S. Andreas *in xenodochio*, located in the city, but near the southern wall.

The obvious model for the Metz liturgy was Rome, where our first notice of the stational liturgy is during the pontificate of Hilary I (461–468).<sup>138</sup> This liturgy continued to evolve over the next several centuries, adding new churches into the stational cycle, and augmenting the temporal (the series of feasts that have to do with the life, and especially the death and resurrection, of Jesus, the dates of which are movable) and sanctoral (the recurring sequence of feasts and memorials of the saints, which initially included Christmas) cycles.<sup>139</sup> When Chrodegang was in Rome in the 750s and 760s, the stational liturgy had reached a stage of development that would by and large characterize it for the rest of the Middle Ages. The major feasts of the temporal cycle were held in the patriarchal basilicas, especially those of the Lateran and the Vatican, and the sanctoral stations either were celebrated in the cemeterial churches where the body of the day's saint rested, or were distributed among the various *tituli* of Rome.

Chrodegang introduced the stational liturgy into Metz for many reasons. Most apparently, it was another way that Metz could imitate Rome and Roman practices. In Metz, this liturgy accomplished everything it did in Rome, and more as well. In both cities, the Lenten stations offered a public preparation for the great feast of Easter, and gave the laity of the town the opportunity as a town to join in the ascetic preparation for the Pasch.<sup>140</sup> Like the Roman Lenten liturgy, the distribution of the Metz stations was driven by geography rather than associations with particular churches. In Rome, the Lenten stations were scattered around the city, and the papal procession visited each of the four quarters of the town at

<sup>137</sup> The only exception seems to be the selection of St. Benignus, located in the extramural suburbs to the south of the city, in the quarter known as "ad basilicas," on Monday of the second week of Lent: all the other stations for that week are to the northwest or west of the cathedral.

<sup>138</sup> *LP* 48.11; Duchesne 1.244.

<sup>139</sup> Antoine Chavasse, *La Liturgie de la ville de Rome du Ve au VIIIe siècle: une liturgie conditionnée par l'organisation de la vie in urbe et extra muros*, *Studia anselmiana* 112, *Analecta liturgica* 18 (Rome, 1993), pp. 13–19; Baldovin, *Urban Character*, pp. 143–66; De Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, pp. 27–36; Häussling, *Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeier*, pp. 187–99.

<sup>140</sup> Chavasse, *La Liturgie de la ville de Rome*, pp. 231–5.



least once each week.<sup>141</sup> Rome was of course a much larger city, with a far greater number of churches than Metz, but few other cities in Francia could rival Metz in sheer number of sanctuaries, with thirty-six attested in the stational list. This great number of churches could lead to the possibility of a sort of fragmentation within the local church, either in Metz or in Rome. The stational liturgy helped hold together this potentially divisive situation. In the typical early medieval city, the non-cathedral churches stood isolated from one another, and the bishop would visit a church only infrequently, and perhaps the cathedral clergy never would. While the stational liturgy in Metz must have represented an unprecedented intrusion of the local ordinary into the churches of the town and its suburbs, it also gave Chrodegang the opportunity to enter into the “small worlds” of the urban parishes and chapels of his diocese. The king, whose ability to interact personally with diverse localities and regions was limited, had to rely on directing patronage to various saintly shrines and cult centers; but Chrodegang could use the Lenten stational liturgies to pierce the small neighborhoods of his episcopal city, and come to know both his churches and his people. Just as Chrodegang drew the leading Frankish ecclesiastics together at Attigny, so here he drew the churches of Metz together: in the stational liturgy the churches of the city are no longer isolated from each other, but rather integrated into a united whole. Together, they form, as Angelus Häussling puts it, a new kind of *Verband*, one that unites the cathedral complex, local shrines, basilicas, and parish churches.<sup>142</sup> The stational liturgy achieved the integration of all the churches in town into one *Kirchenfamilie*, and each lost its subordinate status, at least for a day, as the bishop and his clergy made it their ecclesiastical home. But more than this, the daily stational liturgy, both in Rome and in Metz, sought to unite in one place of cult a general assembly of the Christian people around its bishop for the celebration of the Eucharist. It transformed each daily stational church into a “cathédrale liturgique momentanée,” a constantly moving center of the Christian community of the city.<sup>143</sup> Moreover, it made visibly and publicly clear the fact that the bishop – in the case of Metz, Chrodegang – was in reality the only leader of the community of believers. In other words, the stational liturgy safeguarded the principle of the unity of the faithful in the city and at the same time disclosed the importance and power of the bishop.<sup>144</sup>

<sup>141</sup> Chavasse, *La Liturgie de la ville de Rome*, pp. 234–44.

<sup>142</sup> Häussling, *Mönchskonvent und Eucharistiefeyer*, pp. 201–12.

<sup>143</sup> Chavasse, *La Liturgie de la ville de Rome*, p. 234.

<sup>144</sup> John F. Baldwin, “The city as church, the church as city,” in *Worship: City, Church, and Renewal* (Washington, DC: Pastoral Press, 1991), pp. 3–11 at p. 5; de Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, pp. 34–5.

Beyond highlighting the unity of the local church and the significance of the bishop, the stational liturgy in Metz accomplished far more. Metz during Chrodegang’s episcopacy was a society that self-consciously sought out its past, whether real or invented, and created models and behaviors to justify and explain its actions in the present.<sup>145</sup> Those who were the interpreters of this past were the same men who were responsible for the interpretation and realization of the most important texts for the city, texts which ranged from the Bible to the *Regula canonicorum*. This group of men – the bishop, the group of advisors he names as his *fratres spirituales*, the canons, and other literate and religious men and perhaps women – maintained, mobilized, and sometimes invented the traditions that would provide the town and its inhabitants with their historical identity. Given both their influence and their learning, they controlled the transmission of this tradition, which would tell others what and who had been. The clear Roman references of the stational liturgy reinforced the idea that the Metz church was founded by the Romans, and that this filiation was manifest most clearly in the way Metz performed its liturgy. The fact that there was no authentic (historically true, from our point of view) link between the early Christian communities of Metz and Rome made the task of these men all the more urgent. Cities without a living past – cities like Metz – proclaimed their antiquity through a variety of found and imported objects and rituals that could connect them to the history they wanted.<sup>146</sup> By importing the relics of its saints, Chrodegang linked his city to Rome, and by reorganizing, at least partially, the topography of sacred history, he reconfigured the map of Christendom’s holy places.<sup>147</sup> His use of baldaquins – a piece of liturgical architecture that referred to Rome – should probably be understood in this regard. So too should the stational liturgy. In fact, in the highly textualized world of early medieval religious practices, it made the very city itself a sort of intertext that referred to Rome: Metz’s liturgy and its stations referred to other churches, other places, other times, and other texts.<sup>148</sup> While Rome’s stations referred only to itself – its history, its saints, its bishops and their power – Metz’s

<sup>145</sup> Mary Garrison, “The Franks as the New Israel? Education for an identity from Pippin to Charlemagne,” in Yitzhak Hen and Matthew Innes, eds., *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 114–61, shows how concerned the Franks were during the reign of Pippin to understand and construct their past. Brian Stock, “Tradition and Modernity: Models from the Past” in his *Listening for the Text: On the Uses of the Past* (Baltimore, 1990), pp. 159–71, refers to these traits as characteristic of a “traditionalistic” society, and contrasts it with a “traditional” society, which adhered to customary ways unselfconsciously.

<sup>146</sup> See Patricia Fortini Brown, *Venice and Antiquity: The Venetian Sense of the Past* (New Haven, 1996).

<sup>147</sup> Smith, “Old Saints, New Cults,” pp. 318, 327–33.

<sup>148</sup> For a discussion of the relationship between landscape and text, see James S. Duncan, *The City as Text: The Politics of Landscape Interpretation in the Kandyan Kingdom* (Cambridge, 1990), pp. 17–24.

was more polysemic, for they alluded not only to these things, but to another unseen and unspoken referent: Rome.

The stationary liturgies had important effects on both Metz and Rome, and they modified the perception of the city. The first consequence of this religious and episcopal colonization of urban space was to change the very nature of that space. Stationary liturgies express the church publicly, and those who participate in them show in an equally public fashion their desire to be part of the Christian community. This makes sharing in them a counterpart to other ways that Chrodegang sought to Christianize the people of Francia in general and Metz in particular. His conciliar concerns were often centered around promulgating a *disciplina christiana* and encouraging the laity of Francia to show their adherence to the religion publicly by, for instance, marrying in the right way. Such a marriage would make clear to the local community that the individuals involved sought to behave in a proper Christian, and Frankish, way. So too with participation in the stationary liturgy. It showed to the community that one was a faithful Christian, and that one did things in a Christian way: one married outside the prohibited degrees, and one attended the public stationary celebration of the Eucharist. These liturgies thus complemented Chrodegang's efforts as a preacher and teacher. Sermons and theology are often not enough to galvanize the social world, but worship, a public activity that is essentially ritualized and symbolic, can.<sup>149</sup> The stationary liturgies transformed what had been a private activity – the celebration of the Eucharist – into a public and urban one. They made public worship a centralized and centralizing, unified and unifying, experience. In Rome, while the stationary liturgy was often not the only Mass of the day, it was the primary and most important one, and this was probably the case in Metz as well. Because the Eucharist was conceptualized as the concrete symbol of unity and concord among Christians, and was believed to be the most efficacious means to attain that unity, common participation in the stationary liturgy of the day was the clear and obvious indication that individuals were one, that they shared *unanimitas, concordia, and pax*.

Moreover, these liturgies and the processions that accompanied them integrated Metz's urban space into the Christian world, sanctifying the town. Liturgy does not develop isolated from the rest of life; it forms in a dialectic between Christian life and a given social and cultural milieu.<sup>150</sup> This is true even when something like the Metz stations were imposed from above. The choice of churches, the location of the collect, and even the time of day when the service takes place were all affected by the

<sup>149</sup> On this, see Baldwin, "The City as Church, the Church as City," at p. 5.

<sup>150</sup> Baldwin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship*, p. 234.

historical realities of a specific time and place. These liturgies changed the character of the town, charging the processional routes, for instance, with significance, and creating in their wake a new form of sacred space, as liturgical actions poured forth from their "proper" locations in the churches and overwhelmed the urban topography of the city.<sup>151</sup> Where before there had been undifferentiated space, the stationary liturgies created a sense of place.<sup>152</sup> Space is transformed and made significant when it is filled with meaning, and by the process of experiencing deeply. Liturgy naturally can have this effect, and such actions can give previously undifferentiated space a new kind of coherence and an enriched resonance. The stationary liturgies, in Metz, in Rome, in Constantinople, in Jerusalem, and wherever else they were celebrated, had the ultimate effect of making the whole city into a church, and into a sketch of the city of God. As in any church or temple, in this altered and sanctified space there is nothing that is accidental – "everything, at least potentially, is of significance."<sup>153</sup> In such a transformed space, the ordinary and the usual become significant simply by being located in this holy place, and the mundane can point to the divine simply because it is now part of a newly consecrated space.

In implementing the stationary liturgies, Chrodegang laid a new map, palimpsest-like, over the old geography of the city, creating new religious meaning where there had previously been none. The processions traced out, inscribing into the very fabric of the town's topography, a new sacred geometry of the city even while they ritually reenacted moments from the sacred history of Christianity. They created the opportunity to visualize the town as specifically Christian, and created a Christian topography of the city. Perhaps most important here, the stationary liturgies gave all who participated the opportunity to create and express new symbolic meaning for themselves. In this way, involving the laity in liturgical performance gave them the same sorts of opportunities to create new kinds of cultural signification as Chrodegang allowed the canons in the *Regula canonicorum*. The very nature of a stationary liturgy makes the participation of the laity necessary. But this participation comes at the cost of the loss of clerical

<sup>151</sup> See Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion* (New York, 1961), esp. pp. 19–24; Eliade, "Sacred Architecture and Symbolism," in Diane Apostolos-Cappadona, ed., *Symbolism, the Sacred, and the Arts* (New York, 1985), pp. 105–29; Fixot, "Une image," p. 561; and G. Cantino Wataghin, "The Ideology of Urban Burials," in Broglio and Ward-Perkins, *The Idea and Ideal of the Town*, pp. 147–80 at pp. 153–54.

<sup>152</sup> On this distinction between space and place, see Alan Gussow, *A Sense of Place: The Artist and the American Land*, *Earth's Wild Places* 6 (San Francisco, 1972), p. 27; and Yi-Fu Tuan, *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience* (Minneapolis, 1977), pp. 72–4; Jonathon Z. Smith, *To Take Place: Toward a Theory of Ritual* (Chicago, 1987), pp. 24–46, offers an insightful reading of these and other "humanist" geographers, and a useful critique.

<sup>153</sup> Jonathon Z. Smith, *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jamestown* (Chicago, 1982), p. 54.

control over that meaning.<sup>154</sup> Cultural artifacts such as story-telling or ritual performances do not simply reflect meaning; they create and shape it too.<sup>155</sup> While we can have a good idea of how clerics, canons, monks, and nuns understood cultural practices such as the stational liturgy, it is very difficult to figure out how these same performances were interpreted by the average lay man or woman. *Ordo romanus I* makes very clear the extremely hierarchical and sacerdotal nature of a major papal procession, and the fact that such processions in Rome were loosely based in the ancient *pompa triumphalis* only highlights this fact.<sup>156</sup> Certainly one intention of the ritualists who devised the stational liturgy was to accentuate the importance and power of the local ordinary, but how this was understood is another matter, and the fact that the presence of the laity was necessary to make the ritual function properly could subvert clerical intentions for the liturgy. Whether the ordinary believer saw the processions and the stational liturgy as an episcopal attempt to annex or colonize the urban spaces, whether a procession was seen as an indicator of the Christian conquest of the city fabric, whether it was understood to be a mannered performance of the ideal world, these were all goals of the clerical organizers of the stational liturgy.

Nevertheless, religious rituals can unite, at least momentarily, hostile groups and warring castes.<sup>157</sup> They can form an important bond between individuals, and reinforce the sense of community, even when that community is rigidly hierarchical.<sup>158</sup> Enacting the sacred is at its core an attempt to experience oneness and integration, but it is an experience that occurs only through controlled forms.<sup>159</sup> At stake in re-enactments of the sacred, such as occurs in Metz on Palm Sunday when clergy and people process from Ste-Ségolène to St. Peter Major, recalling one of the most dramatic moments of Christ's life, is not only allowing the participants the opportunity to place themselves on the road between Bethany and

<sup>154</sup> See, for instance, Barbara A. Hanawalt and Kathryn I. Reyerson, "Introduction," in their *City and Spectacle in Medieval Europe*, Medieval Studies at Minnesota 6 (Minneapolis, 1994), pp. ix–xx at pp. ix–xii; Janet L. Nelson, "Ritual and Reality in the Early Medieval *Ordines*," in her *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe* (London, 1986), pp. 329–39.

<sup>155</sup> See Marshal Sahlins, *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities: Structure in the Early History of the Sandwich Islands Kingdom* (Ann Arbor, 1981); and Sahlins, *Islands of History* (Chicago, 1984).

<sup>156</sup> Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship*, pp. 235–8; de Blaauw, *Cultus et decor*, p. 60.

<sup>157</sup> See Gerd Althoff, *Venwandte, Freunde und Getreue: Zum politischen Stellenwert der Gruppenbindungen im früheren Mittelalter* (Darmstadt, 1990), pp. 196–9; and Holly Baker Reynolds, "Madurai: *Koyil Nakar*," in Bardwell Smith and Holly Baker Reynolds, eds., *The City as a Sacred Center: Essays on Six Asian Contexts* (Leiden, 1987), pp. 12–44 at pp. 21–34.

<sup>158</sup> See Elliot Deutsch, "Community as Ritual Participation," in Leroy S. Rouner, ed., *On Community*, Boston University Studies in Religion and Philosophy 12 (Notre Dame, 1991), pp. 15–26; and above, chapter 5.

<sup>159</sup> Here I follow Bardwell Smith, "The Pursuit of Equilibrium: Polonnaruva as a Ceremonial Center," in Smith and Reynolds, *The City as a Sacred Center*, pp. 60–87 at pp. 75–6.

Jerusalem and remember past historical events, but urging them toward a deeper self-perception which generates new insights regarding life and existence. This recalling – *anamnesis* – is directed not simply toward the past, but to a reality which transcends time and place, and which can serve to create a clearer vision that can transform quotidian experienced reality. Thus, the recollection of sacred history can lead to a new experience of the sacred in the present, not just through historical sympathy, but because a new understanding of the sacred has been achieved.

One final point: the introduction of the stational liturgies to Metz was part of a more general program Chrodegang undertook to create a new culture in his diocese and its see. Part of this programme involved his reform of the canons, with all those implications I have tried to point out earlier. Part of this involved teaching, through his activities as a preacher and his work as a canonist. Here, the result was to promulgate and make known the *disciplina christiana*. Part of it is seen in the architectural *renovatio* and *restauratio* of churches in Metz, and part in his founding of new monasteries, both within and outside the diocese. A fifth part was the distribution of relics to various monasteries. The final part was the liturgical reforms, such as instituting the stational liturgy, with which he has been associated. The effect of all of this was threefold. While Chrodegang clearly envisaged the canons as the religious specialists of Metz, and he makes provision in c. 32 of the *Regula canonicorum* for the fruits that would come from this specialization, the necessary inclusion of the Metz laity in this new kind of liturgy vastly increases the number of these specialists. While it is clear that the processions and liturgy are hierarchical, nevertheless all involved need to know their roles and play them well for the liturgy to be effective, the religious as well as the laity. For the stational liturgy to "work," everyone needed to participate with the same skill and same devotion, be they priests or peasants. Thus, the whole idea of the canons as a group of men specifically and exclusively designated as ritual experts is cast into uncertainty, since the knowledgeable ritual participation of the people of Metz is as necessary as that of the canons.

The stational liturgies as ritual that demands the public participation of the laity have a second cultural consequence: that ritual commands the people of Metz, as much as the canons and the other religious of the town, to learn a new way to be social. If the old adage of *lex orandi, lex credendi* is true, the way the people of Metz prayed should influence what they believed, and what they believed should influence, at least in theory, how they acted. The strong reference in this liturgy to the Petrine origins of Metz's Christian community would create a new perception of the past, allowing a new kind of social memory that would help bind

the community together.<sup>160</sup> More important than that, it would require that when the townspeople gather, they do so in a new way. No longer would public gatherings be only secular, as when the town held its market. Now, the people of Metz would gather – daily, perhaps, in the hopes of Chrodegang – and work together as a Christian people to achieve a Christian end. If regular enough, all the people of the town would be transformed into a new kind of community, a community where the difference between secular and sacred would diminish and disappear, and a new Christian society would emerge in its place.

Finally, the sacralization of time and space that the stationary liturgy creates would build new meaning into the town itself. Such a city – an “orthogenetic city” in the words of Diana Eck<sup>161</sup> – becomes an expression of the moral order of the world, an earthly reproduction which makes the cosmological order of the universe accessible to humans. Such a city is a fleeting foretaste of the eternal city of God. If a town creates its own image for itself, and its own version of its history, then this is the image of the town that Chrodegang sought to create:<sup>162</sup> a town that mirrored, or rather realized in itself and in its people, the early church portrayed in Acts of the Apostles, a society “renowned for their concord and unanimity,” whose members “were said to be of one heart and one mind,” and who “daily, in the neighbourhood of their houses, broke the bread which they received in common, men as well as women and children, the whole crowd inflamed with burning faith and roused by love of religion.”<sup>163</sup>

Clearly, the role of the bishop and his canons is central in this effort to remake Metz and its people. Just as Chrodegang was the teacher to the canons, the canons must become the teachers to the city. That the ordained had a special power to teach is clear from the most ancient church documents, and the earliest theology of ordination was effectively oriented toward service, toward, as other Carolingian writers would have put it, *utilitas et caritas*.<sup>164</sup> It is the work of caring for the poor, a work that Chrodegang himself seems to have taken particularly seriously, and that he probably enjoined upon others in his sermons, that most clearly

<sup>160</sup> Matthew Innes, “Memory, Orality and Literacy in an Early Medieval Society,” *Past and Present* 158 (1998), pp. 3–36 at pp. 4–11.

<sup>161</sup> Diana L. Eck, “The City as a Sacred Center,” in Smith and Reynolds, *The City as a Sacred Center*, pp. 1–11 at p. 2.

<sup>162</sup> Martin Carver, *Arguments in Stone: Archaeological Research and the European Town of the First Millennium*, The Dalrymple Lectures for 1990 – Glasgow Archaeological Society and the University of Glasgow, Oxbow Monograph 29 (Oxford, 1993), pp. 1–5.

<sup>163</sup> *RCan*, c. 31.

<sup>164</sup> Here I follow Réginald Grégoire, “L’Ordine ed il suo significato: ‘utilitas’ e ‘caritas,’” in *Segni e riti nella chiesa altomedievale occidentale*, Settimane 33 (Spoleto, 1987), pp. 639–97.

shows the joining of *caritas* and *utilitas*. This call to be of service clearly places the ordained man in the community, not above it, and despite the clear understanding that some Carolingian authors had of the hierarchical primacy of the priesthood, Chrodegang stresses over and over in his rule the need for humility.<sup>165</sup> The goal of the teaching is of course to instil *caritas* and *unanimitas*, the same virtues that Chrodegang finds so remarkable in the apostolic church. The sign that the canons are qualified to teach the laity is their own collegial unity, “the essential form of *caritas* which [they] must demonstrate to the community of believers.”<sup>166</sup> The stationary liturgy seeks to use as a model for the whole town the *unanimitas* of the newly organized community of canons in the cathedral. Only when all are united and one in heart and soul could Chrodegang’s reforms truly be accomplished.

When viewed from the perspective of the history of Metz, from the purported Roman origins of its Christianity, Chrodegang’s liturgical changes make great sense. He no longer is the romanizing ideologue whose insufficient efforts were unsuccessful in completing the assigned task of imposing papal standards on the Franks, and whose work had to be redone by the more adept ecclesiastics in the next generations. Instead, he was actively involved in recovering and creating a new version of history for his city, and his reforms were just that: an attempt to return Metz to its authentic Roman heritage. His work is thus analogous to that of some writers of the early Christian period, who sought to “help provide Christians with the past they lacked.”<sup>167</sup> Metz’s early Christian past was thin, yet for Chrodegang, understanding that past was crucial. Uncovering the historical and liturgical significance behind the legends that surrounded the city’s early Christian history, Chrodegang realized that to remedy the “neglect into which the clerics and people had fallen,” a full-scale liturgical revival was necessary. And to accomplish that, he looked to the source of Metz’s own history, and found it at Rome. It was perhaps a fortunate occurrence that Metz could thus look to the only western patriarchal see, the place that many in the eighth century felt embodied orthodox Christianity to the fullest, as its mother. The Roman liturgy was the rightful inheritance of the church in Metz as much as it was for that of Rome, and if it brought to the city the lucky consequence

<sup>165</sup> Grégoire, “L’Ordine,” p. 639; regarding the priestly–secular hierarchy, see Smith, *To Take Place*, pp. 56–71; Walter Ullmann, *The Carolingian Renaissance and the Idea of Kingship*, The Birkbeck Lectures, 1968–9 (London, 1969), pp. 43–124; on the Carolingians, Celia Chazelle, “Archbishops Ebo and Hincmar of Reims and the Utrecht Psalter,” *Speculum* 72 (1997), pp. 1055–77.

<sup>166</sup> Réginald Grégoire, “L’Ordine,” p. 651.

<sup>167</sup> Rachel Moriarty, “‘The Faith of Our Fathers’: The Making of the Early Christian Past,” in R. N. Swanson, ed., *The Church Retrospective*, Studies in Church History 33 (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 5–17, at p. 6.

of moulding the hearts and minds of its citizens to Roman theological and doctrinal norms, that was a fortuitous consequence of the city's own history. In Chrodegang's reform efforts, we see both sides of a historical question: not only how the past creates the present, but how the present shapes the past.<sup>168</sup>

The hoped-for effect of the stationary liturgy was to transform the city into a historically aware church by making public the most unitive and performative aspect of the church – her liturgy. The liturgy was a centralized and unifying experience, as the Christian community gathered around its appointed leader and celebrated the Eucharist. By moving the location of this celebration from place to place, the unity of the town under its bishop is realized, and his control over urban space is made clear. And by integrating this urban space into the liturgy, the town itself becomes a church. This accomplishment mirrors Chrodegang's efforts at redefining the boundaries of the canons' own community. Boundaries are one of the defining aspects that delimit membership in any given community, separating those within from those without. In the conciliar legislation associated with Chrodegang, the boundaries of the Christian community are made clear, for the councils sought to define the limits of belonging to that community. By imposing "outside" standards on previously local and perhaps isolated communities, these councils sought to create new identities for individuals that would overlie their older, locally defined ones. No longer would an individual be identifiable by indigenous or regional customs, but men and women in Francia would now have their primary identity be as "Christian," at least if they followed the mandates of the conciliar canons. In the *Regula canonicorum*, Chrodegang did much the same thing. While the canons were set off from the rest of the community, and while there were different grades within the ranks of the canons themselves, Chrodegang provided a number of integrating devices which bound the community together, and which, while creating and stabilizing the hierarchy men and women of the early Middle Ages thought to be natural and God-given, helped to create a sense of egalitarianism and unity.

The same is true of the effect of the stationary liturgy. While the hierarchical nature of the town would be publicly and prominently displayed, while there would be a clear distinction between those who officiated and those who watched, all would equally be participants, whatever their function in the ceremony, for these liturgies unite the populace of the town and the professional clergy in a joint celebration impossi-

<sup>168</sup> See Elizabeth Tonkin, Maryon McDonald, and Malcolm Chapman, "Introduction," in their *History and Ethnicity*, ASA Monographs 27 (London, 1989), pp. 1–21, esp. pp. 2–11.

ble were either group absent. In a similar fashion, they consecrate the whole of the urban space, and make the Christian buildings in town "a vital factor of urban life."<sup>169</sup> This liturgical conquest of the urban space is the geographical equivalent of Chrodegang's ambiguous terminology regarding membership and rank in the cathedral community. The stationary liturgies integrated the populace of Metz into the church in the same way that Chrodegang's rule integrated the canons into a new society. The canons, now individuals sanctified by their observance of the rule, take the lead in transforming Metz into a sanctified society. This new society was as rigidly structured as the old society from which it was drawn, but structured to different ends. The stationary liturgy, in fine, brought the citizens of Metz into the new community Chrodegang created by his rule. Community creation, one of the most striking features of the *Regula canonicorum*, is enlarged to encompass the whole town, reconstructed, at least during Lent and Easter Week, to resemble a new city of God, an earthly manifestation of a heavenly reality. Community and hierarchy, *concordia* and *unanimitas*, the themes of the rule, become the governing principles in Chrodegang's greater reform work, as not only clerics but the entire populace are drawn back to their own *norma rectudinis*. The negligence of the clerics and people, the observance of which originally motivated Chrodegang to compose the rule, is transformed into communal worship, and the church united becomes the church at prayer.

<sup>169</sup> Baldovin, *Urban Character*, p. 257.