HENRY BRADSHAW SOCIETY

Founded in the Year of Our Lord 1890
for the editing of Rare Liturgical Texts

SUBSIDIA · III

PUBLISHED FOR THE SOCIETY
BY
THE BOYDELL PRESS

THE
ROYAL PATRONAGE OF
LITURGY IN FRANKISH GAUL

To the Death of Charles the Bald (877)

Yitzhak Hen

To Rosamond McKitterick

Contents

Preface

The seeds of this book were sown in 1994, when Michael Lapidge suggested that I should write a monograph on the Frankish liturgy for the Henry Bradshaw Society's subsidia series. Since then, however, the plan and the content of this study were changed drastically. At first I thought of writing a short introductory text-book, surveying the liturgical sources from Frankish Gaul. But after looking once again at Vogel's seminal *Medieval Liturgy* and Palazzo's excellent complementary volume *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, I realised there is no need for another text-book that will survey the evidence and sketch the various stages of development of the Frankish rite. Therefore, I have decided to write something more of an analysis, placed against the historical background of the period and comprehensible even to those unfamiliar with the unique characteristics of liturgical studies. It was only gradually that I came to realise that the royal patronage of liturgy in Frankish Gaul may serve as an excellent topic for such a study. Through it one can clearly get a better understanding of the mechanisms that stood behind some of the most interesting liturgical developments which characterised early medieval Gaul, and it can also provide an opportunity to re-examine some of the most prevailing (and idiosyncratic) notions regarding the Frankish liturgy.

This book could not have been written, or completed, without the assistance and support of many individuals and institutions. I owe a special debt of gratitude to Michael Lapidge, for his interest in my research and for commissioning this book on behalf of the Henry Bradshaw Society. Although, to my great shame, I have managed to annoy him with my sloppy proof-reading habits, he read the entire manuscript with great care, and saved me from a multitude of errors. I should also like to thank my friends and colleagues, particularly Marios Costambeys, Mayke de Jong, Mary Garrison, Simha Goldin, Matthew Innes, Amnon Linder, Rob Meens, Jinty Nelson, Miri Rubin, and Ian Wood, with whom I have discussed various issues related to Frankish history and early medieval liturgy. I also inflicted a drafts of the entire book or sections of it on some of them, and I am grateful for their advice

and helpful comments. Needless to say, none of them is responsible for this study's shortcomings, or for any error in my interpretations.

Yet, the warmest thanks are due to Rosamond McKitterick – a true אשת-חיל. She has been an ever-invaluable oracle on many matters, and has dedicated many hours, that should have been better spent on her own inspirational work, to reading and commenting on several earlier drafts of this book. Her friendship and support have always been crucial and it is to her, with sincere affection and deep gratitude, that I dedicate this book.

It is further a great pleasure to thank the following libraries, where I have spent many hours looking at manuscripts and gathering material: the Bibliothèque royale Albert I, Brussels; the University Library, Cambridge; the University Library, Haifa; the University and National Library, Jerusalem; the Bodleian Library, Oxford; the Bibliothèque National de France, Paris; and the Biblioteca Apostolica, Vatican City. Thanks should also go to the council of the Henry Bradshaw Society, and to the staff of Boydell & Brewer who saw the book through the press.

Finally, I should like to thank my family, especially my wife, Racheli, for her unwavering support, and Nadav, whose birth delayed the completion of this book, but made me happy in a way I will never be able to describe.

Abbreviations

AASS	Acta Sanctorum (Antwerp and Brussels, 1643–)
BM	Bibliothèque Municipale
BNF	Bibliothèque Nationale de France
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis (Turnhout, 1966–)
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina (Turnhout, 1952–)
ChLA	Chartae Latinae Antiquiores. Facsimile Edition of the Latin Charters prior to the Ninth Century, ed. A. Bruckner and R. Marichal (Olten and Lausanne, 1954–)
CLA	Codices Latini Antiquiores. A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century, 11 vols. with a supplement (Oxford, 1935–71; 2nd ed. of vol. II, 1972)
CLLA	Codices Liturgici Latini Antiquiores, ed. K. Gamber, 2nd ed., 2 vols., Spicilegii Friburgensis Subsidia 1 (Freiburg, 1968); supplemented by B. Baroffio et al., Spicilegii Friburgensis subsidia 1A (Freiburg, 1988)
Clm	Codices latini monacenses
CSL	Clavis Scriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi (Turnhout, 1994–)
DACL	Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie, ed. F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq, 15 vols. in 30 (Paris, 1907–53)
HBS	Henry Bradshaw Society Publications
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
Diplomata	Diplomata regum Francorum e stirpe Merowingica (Stuttgart, 1872)
Epp.	Epistulae (Berlin, 1887–1939)
SRG	Scriptores rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum (Hannover, 1871–)
SRM	Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum (Hannover, 1884–1951)
SS	Scriptores in folio (Berlin, 1826–)

PL   Patrologiae cursus completus, series latina, ed. J.-P.
            Migne, 221 vols. (Paris, 1841–64)
SC   Sources chrétiennes (Paris, 1941–)
Settimane   Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto
            medioevo (Spoleto, 1954–)

Introduction

The study of early medieval liturgy requires a preliminary mental readjustment. We must temporarily abandon familiar cultural territory and radically question received intellectual categories. Early medieval society was fundamentally different from our own, and the concepts that we employ to describe contemporary religious phenomena are necessarily ill adapted to the analysis of what early medieval people regarded as the divine sphere. Besides, the function of liturgy cannot be the same in a society where religion, or more precisely Christianity, was thoroughly intertwined with all areas of public and social interaction, and in one such as ours, in which communal life is largely secularised. We have, moreover, to disabuse ourselves of a notion of a disembodied 'essence' of religion; for only then can we treat liturgy as a subject of enquiry like any other one that has a history.

In this book I should like to concentrate on a rather limited aspect of the history of western liturgy, by focusing on liturgical developments and tendencies which occurred in Gaul from late Antiquity to the reign of Charles the Bald, king of the West Franks (d. 877). Yet, before embarking on such a descriptive mission, let us clarify in few words what we mean by liturgy, what is the nature of our evidence, and what royal patronage has to do with it.

Liturgy

In classical Greece, 'liturgy' (λειτουργία) was a compulsory public service imposed upon a rich citizen, who was also expected to meet the cost of the job he had been nominated to carry out at his own expense. In the course of time, the meaning of the term 'liturgy' was broadened, and already by the Hellenistic period it was used to indicate a public work of any kind. A new meaning was added to 'liturgy' in the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible (Septuagint). There, the term 'liturgy' was used to translate the Hebrew word *'avoda* (עבודה) whenever it designated the

service of the Temple. This use of the term was later borrowed by the authors of the New Testament, and subsequently by the Greek Church Fathers. Thus, 'liturgy' has come to be applied to any religious service, and more particularly to the eucharistic rite. In the West, the Latin terms *officium* and *ministerium* were used to indicate religious rites, and only from the seventeenth century onwards was the Latin word *liturgia* and its vernacular derivatives applied to any religious service.[1]

The core of the Christian liturgical rite is the sacramental celebration of the Eucharist, which was originally a common meal to commemorate Jesus' last supper.[2] From a fairly early stage the Eucharist was celebrated with fixed symbolic gestures, accompanied by prescribed prayers and benedictions.[3] Several reading passages from the Scriptures and various supplementary prayers were added to form what is now known as *canon* in the Western Church, or *anaphora* (ἀναφορά) in the Eastern Church.[4] The *canon* is a succession of short prayers, commonly known by their opening words, which are recited in each celebration of the mass. It usually follows the dialogue *Sursum corda*, a preface and the *Sanctus*, and it traditionally begins with *Te igitur*, followed by *Memento [vivorum]*, *Communicantes*, *Hanc igitur*, *Quam oblationem*, *Qui pridie*, *Unde et memores*, *Supra quae*, *Supplices te rogamus*, *Memento [defunctorum]*, *Nobis peccatoribus* and *Per quem haec omnia*.[5] While a wide range of different *anaphorae* existed in the liturgy of the East,[6] in the West a single *canon* evolved.

The earliest written evidence for the Western canon dates back to the late seventh century.[7] This, however, does not mean that a single, uniform way of celebrating the Eucharist existed, nor that a standard text was available. No liturgical uniformity was forced upon the early Christian communities, and the celebrants were free to choose the prayers they deemed appropriate, as will be explained in detail in the following chapter. Consequently, several liturgical traditions emerged during the first five centuries of Christianity, mainly in influential Christian centres such as Alexandria, Antioch or Rome, and in response to efforts made by charismatic Christian patriarchs such as Pope Celestine I (d. 432) who, according to the *Liber pontificalis*, instituted in the West the singing of Psalms before the sacrifice.[8]

It is customary to divide the liturgical traditions of late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages into two groups, following historically determined geo-political and geo-cultural divisions, that is, Eastern liturgy and Western liturgy. Under the classification of Eastern tradition one finds the liturgy of Jerusalem, usually attributed to James, the first bishop of Jerusalem and Jesus' nephew (d. 62); the Nestorian or East Syrian liturgy, attributed to Addai and Mari (s. III^ex–IV^in); the Antiochean or West Syrian liturgy, which is still preserved by the Maronites of Lebanon; the Alexandrian tradition, which developed both in Greek and in Coptic, and from which the Ethiopian liturgy derived; and the Byzantine or Constantinopolitan liturgy, attributed to Basil of Caesarea (d. 379) and John Chrysostom (d. 407).[9]

Among the Western traditions, the most important and influential was the liturgical rite of Rome, whose first stages of development are documented by Hippolytus of Rome (d. *c*. 236).[10] Yet, throughout late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages other liturgical practices emerged in the Latin West, such as the African liturgy, which developed in North Africa (west of Cyrenaica) at least from the time of Cyprian of Carthage

---

[1] On the evolution of the term 'liturgy', see J. Oehler, 'Liturgie', in *Pauly-Wissowa Realencyklopädie der klassischen Altertumwissenschaft*, XII.2 (Stuttgart, 1925), pp. 1871–9; E. Raitz von Frenz, 'Der Weg des Wortes "Liturgie" in der Geschichte', *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 55 (1941), pp. 74–80; S. Marsili, 'Liturgia', in *Anàmnesis. Introduzione storico-teologica alla liturgia*, ed. S. Marsili et al., 2 vols. (Turin, 1974), I, pp. 33–45.

[2] See, for example, I Cor. xi.23–6.

[3] For a useful survey on the evolution of the early Christian rite, see P. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship. Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy* (London, 1992); Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula*. See also Dix, *The Shape of Liturgy*.

[4] On the evolution of the Western *canon*, see B. Botte, *Le canon de la messe romaine* (Louvain, 1935); Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula*, especially pp. 159–215. On the evolution of the eastern *anaphora*, see D. Gelsi, 'Anaphora', in *Encyclopaedia of the Early Church*, ed. A. di Berardino, trans. A. Walford, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1992), I, pp. 33–5; Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula*, especially pp. 217–53; *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayer*, ed. P.F. Bradshaw (Collegeville, 1997).

[5] See *Canon missae*, ed. E. Moeller, I.M. Clément and B.C. Wallant, in *Corpus orationum* X, CCSL 161 (Turnhout, 1997).

[6] See E. Mazza, *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer*, trans. R.E. Lane (Collegeville, 1995).

[7] See *The Bobbio Missal*, cc. 8–22 (ed. Lowe, pp. 9–13), and see also E.A. Lowe, 'Note on the canon of the Bobbio Missal', in A. Wilmart, E.A. Lowe and H.A. Wilson, *The Bobbio Missal. Notes and Studies*, HBS 61 (London, 1924), 147–55. The Bobbio Missal will be discussed more fully in the first chapter.

[8] *Liber pontificalis*, c. 45 (ed. Duchesne, I, p. 230).

[9] For a general survey of eastern liturgies, see A.A. King, *The Rites of Eastern Christendom*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1947–8); I.H. Dalmais, *Liturgies d'orient*, Rites et symboles 10 (Paris, 1980); I.H. Dalmais, 'The eastern liturgical families', in *The Church at Prayer*, ed. Martimort, I, pp. 27–43.

[10] On the liturgy of Rome, see Willis, *A History of Early Roman Liturgy*; A.A. King, *The Liturgy of the Roman Church* (London, 1957).

(d. 258); the Ambrosian or Milanese liturgy, which developed in Milan under Bishop Ambrose (d. 397), and which was practised throughout northern Italy; the Aquileian liturgy, which was practised in the region of Venice and Aquileia; the Mozarabic liturgy, that is, the liturgical practice of Visigothic Spain and the Christian kingdoms of northern Spain and Septimania in the eighth and ninth centuries; the Gallican liturgy, which evolved in Merovingian Gaul; and the liturgies which emerged in Ireland and Anglo-Saxon England.[11] Although in the past scholars were accustomed to evaluate these independent liturgical traditions as mere derivatives of the Roman rite, modern scholars tend to acknowledge greater creativity and individuality in each of these sub-divisions of the Western rite, although it is assumed that all of them made ample use of Roman material.

The nature of liturgical studies

The study of the Christian liturgy goes back to the early days of Christianity. In the late second and early third centuries Christian authors, such as Clement of Alexandria (d.c. 215), Tertullian (d.c. 225), and most importantly Hippolytus of Rome, commented in their works on various aspects of the Christian worship. This trend continued well into the fourth and the fifth centuries, in the works of prominent Christian scholars like Augustine of Hippo (d. 430), John Cassian (d.c. 435), and Pope Leo I (d. 461).[12] By the late fourth century, however, treatises and *expositiones* devoted entirely to the Christian rite began to appear, following the example of Ambrose of Milan (d. 397). Ambrose's *De sacramentis* and *De mysteriis*, it seems, inaugurated the production of comprehensive commentaries on the liturgy of the Church.[13]

In their explanation of the liturgy, late antique and early medieval commentators examined their subject with a variety of approaches. Some, like Egeria, who visited the Holy Land for three years (381–4)

and sketched the liturgy of Jerusalem in her travelogue,[14] simply describe the various acts and gestures involved in the liturgical rite. Others, like Hippolytus of Rome,[15] use an historical approach and describe how the prayers and the rites were formulated. A few, like Isidore of Seville (d. 636) in his *Etymologiae*,[16] employ an etymological approach. But the vast majority of the treatises and commentaries from late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages can be classified as theological, using allegorical methods and interpretations to explain the various liturgical acts and their meaning.[17]

From among all the Western authors who followed Ambrose in his liturgical quest, the most influential was Isidore of Seville, whose *De ecclesiasticis officiis* was the standard basic reference book on liturgical matters throughout the early medieval West.[18] Written at the beginning of the seventh century and dedicated to Bishop Fulgentius of Ecija, Isidore's *De ecclesiasticis officiis* in its present form is divided into two parts: the first deals with the different liturgical offices and rituals; and the second describes the functions of the different grades of the clergy. Although Isidore described the Mozarabic rite of his day in an attempt to regularise the rite and to organise the ecclesiastical structure of Visigothic Spain,[19] the *De ecclesiasticis officiis* enjoyed a wide circulation throughout the early Middle Ages shortly after its publication.[20]

Traces of Isidorian influence can even be detected in the so-called *Expositio antiquae liturgiae gallicanae* which is, most probably, the earliest commentary on the mass from early medieval Gaul.[21] The *Expositio* is preserved in a ninth-century manuscript, probably from the region of Tours,[22] which was discovered in 1709 by Martène and

---

[11] For a general survey of western liturgies, see A.A. King, *Liturgies of the Past* (London, 1959); idem, *Liturgies of the Primatial Sees* (London, 1957); P.-M. Gy, 'History of the liturgy in the West to the Council of Trent', in *The Church at Prayer*, ed. Martimort, I, pp. 45–61.
[12] For a select list of these authors and their works, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 10–11.
[13] Ambrose of Milan, *De sacramentis. De mysteriis*, ed. J. Schmitz (Freiburg, 1990).

[14] Egeria, *Itinerarium*, ed. P. Maraval, SC 296 (Paris, 1982).
[15] Hippolytus of Rome, *Traditio apostolica*, ed. A. Gerhards and S. Felbecker, 5th ed., Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 39 (Münster, 1989); see also *Hippolyte de Rome: La tradition apostolique*, ed. B. Botte, SC 11 bis (Paris, 1984).
[16] Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, books VI and VII (ed. Lindsay).
[17] On these treatises and commentaries, see R.E. Reynolds, 'Liturgy, treatises on', in *Dictionary of the Middle Ages*, ed. J.R. Strayer, 12 vols. and index (New York, 1982–9), VII, pp. 624–33; A. Wilmart, 'Expositio missae', *DACL* V.1, cols. 1014–27.
[18] Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* (ed. Lawson).
[19] See J. Fontaine, *Isidore de Séville et la culture classique dans l'Espagne wisigothique*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1959–83), I, pp. 10–11.
[20] See Reynolds, 'The Visigothic liturgy', pp. 940–2.
[21] This text has been edited many times in the past. The most recent edition is by E.A. Ratcliff, HBS 98 (London, 1971). A new edition is in preparation by P. Bernard.
[22] Autun, BM 184, fols. 113v–122v (?Tours, s. ix). On the palaeography and date of the manuscript, see F. Wormald, 'Palaeographical note', in *Expositio* (ed. Ratcliff), p. ix.

Durand.[23] Since then the *Expositio* had enjoyed a paramount status in the study of the Gallican rite, despite the fact that scholars have not yet reached an agreement regarding the date of its composition and its authorship. The sole manuscript which transmits the *Expositio* attributes it to Germanus, bishop of Paris (d. 576).[24] However, this attribution has been rightly questioned in the past,[25] and recent research has convincingly demonstrated that the author of the *Expositio* borrowed passages from Isidore of Seville's *De ecclesiasticis officiis*; a fact which makes Germanus' authorship impossible.[26]

This short treatise, which was written for the instruction of the clergy, is a technical exposition on how to perform the mass, and what every part of it signifies. To illustrate the uniqueness and fascination of this treatise, let us cite one short passage which describes the entrance of the Gospel:

> *On the Gospel.* The procession of the Holy Gospel goes forth, therefore, as the power of Christ triumphing over death. During the chant of 'Aius' the Gospel book is accompanied by seven burning torches which represent the seven Gifts of the Holy Spirit or the seven lights of the Law, like unto the mystery of the Cross. The procession ascends the tribunal of analogy [i.e. the ambo], as Christ ascends the throne of His Father's kingdom, so that [the bishop] may announce from there the gifts of life. When the clergy cry out: 'Glory to you, O Lord', they represent the angels who, at the Lord's birth, appeared to the shepherds, singing: 'Glory to God in the highest'.[27]

The allegorical interpretation of the various gestures and prayers of the mass offered by this small treatise suits the didactic tendencies of the Carolingian reformers,[28] on account of which scholars might be tempted to attribute it to the liturgical preoccupation of the Carolingian age. Yet, I would submit that the *Expositio* is more likely to be a Merovingian composition, not only because of linguistic and literary peculiarities which it demonstrates, but primarily because it describes the pure Gallican rite, characteristic of Merovingian Gaul.[29] Consequently, I believe, the *Expositio*'s agreement with Carolingian tendencies accounts for its copying and preservation in the ninth century.

The Carolingian period appears to be particularly fertile in the production of liturgical commentaries. From the second half of the eighth century onwards scores of liturgical treatises were written in the Frankish kingdoms,[30] some even by leading Carolingian scholars, such as Agobard of Lyons (d. 840),[31] Walahfrid Strabo (d. 849),[32] Hrabanus Maurus (d. 856),[33] Florus of Lyons (d.*c.* 860),[34] and Remigius of Auxerre (d. 908).[35] Yet, the most original, albeit controversial, of them all was Amalarius of Metz (d.*c.* 850),[36] whose excessive allegorising methods and innovations were harshly condemned by his contemporaries.[37] Notwithstanding Amalarius' creativity, the vast majority of the Carolingian

---

[23] E. Martène and U. Durand, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, 2nd ed., 5 vols. (Paris, 1717), V, pp. 85–100.

[24] This attribution was supported by A. Van der Mensbrugghe, 'L'expositio missae gallicanae est-elle de St Germain de Paris?', *Messager de l'exarchat du patriarche russe en Europe occidental* 8 (1959), pp. 217–49; idem, 'Pseudo-Germanus reconsidered', *Studia patristica* 5 (1962), pp. 172–84. See also L. Duchesne, *Origines du culte chrétien*, 5th ed. (Paris, 1920), p. 163.

[25] See, for example, Bishop, *Liturgica historica*, p. 131, n. 1; A. Wilmart, 'Germain de Paris; lettres attribuées à Saint', *DACL* VI.1, cols. 1049–62; *Expositio antiquae liturgiae gallicanae Germano Parisiensi ascripta*, ed. J. Quasten (Münster, 1934), pp. 5–7; McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 216.

[26] See the introduction to Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* (ed. Lawson), pp. 58*–64* and 151*; F.J. Thomas, 'SS. Cyril and Methodius and a mythical western heresy: trilinguism. A contribution to the study of patristic and medieval theories of sacred languages', *Analecta Bollandiana* 110 (1992), pp. 67–122, at 88–9; A. Ekenberg, 'Germanus oder Pseudo-Germanus? Pseudoproblem um eine Verfasserschaft', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 35–6 (1993–4), pp. 135–9; Bernard, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien*, pp. 644–50.

[27] *Expositio*, c. 11 (ed. Ratcliff, p. 7): 'De Evangelio. Egreditur igitur processio sancti evangelii velud potentia christi triumphantis de morte cum praedictis harmoniis et cum vii

candelabris luminis que sunt vii dona sancti spiritus vel vii legis lumina mysterio crucis confixa ascendens in tribunal analogii velud christus sedem regni paterni ut inde intonet dona vite, clamantibus clericis "Gloria tibi domine" in specie angelorum qui nascente domino "Gloria in excelsis deo" pastoribus apparentes cecinerunt' [trans. Hillgarth, *Christianity and Paganism*, p. 188].

[28] This important point was made by McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p. 216.

[29] See also Hen, *Culture and Religion*, pp. 47–9. Note that I no longer accept Van der Mensbrugghe's assertion regarding the relationship between the *Expositio* and Isidore's *De ecclesiasticis officiis*.

[30] See, for example, the treatises on baptism surveyed by S.A. Keefe, 'Carolingian baptismal expositions: a handlist of tracts and manuscripts', in *Carolingian Essays*, ed. Blumenthal, pp. 169–237. See also Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 12–13.

[31] Agobard of Lyons, *De antiphonario* and *Contra libros quatuor Amalarii*, ed. L. Van Acker, CCCM 52 (Turnhout, 1981), pp. 335–51 and 353–67 respectively.

[32] Walahfrid Strabo, *Libellus de exordiis et incrementis* (ed. Harting-Corrêa).

[33] Hrabanus Maurus, *De institutione clericorum libri III* (ed. Knoepfler).

[34] Florus of Lyons, *Liber de divina psalmodia*, PL 104, cols. 325–30; idem, *De actione missae*, PL 119, cols. 15–70. See also P. Duc, *Étude sur l''Expositio missae' de Florus de Lyons suivie d'une édition critique du texte* (Belley, 1937).

[35] See J.-P. Bouhot, 'Les sources de l'*Expositio missae* de Remi d'Auxerre', *Revue des études augustiniennes* 26 (1980), pp. 118–69, and see there for an edition of the complete text.

[36] Amalarius of Metz, *Opera liturgica omnia* (ed. Hanssens).

[37] On Amalarius and his critics, see below, p. 105, n. 45.

liturgical treatises are largely repetitive, piling layer upon layer of previous commentaries and interpretations. This approach continued well into the later Middle Ages.[38]

Although the origins of liturgical studies can be sought and found in the liturgical commentaries of the early Middle Ages,[39] the beginning of modern interest in the liturgy of the early medieval West is intimately associated with the development of the general interest in medieval history which characterised sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Europe.[40] It is, then, not at all surprising that the man who best epitomises seventeenth-century scholarship in Europe, Jean Mabillon (d. 1707), is also the most outstanding precursor of modern liturgical studies.

Born of a peasant family, Mabillon entered the Benedictine order immediately after completing his education. He spent several years in the monasteries of Nogent, Corbie and Soissons, before joining the congregation of Saint Maur at the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés in Paris, which was already renowned for its scholarly erudition.[41] In 1681 Mabillon published his most famous and ground-breaking work, *De re diplomatica*.[42] Four years later he published his pioneer work on the Gallican liturgy, which was inspired by the discovery of early liturgical texts, such as the Lectionary of Luxeuil and the Bobbio Missal.[43] Subsequent liturgical studies, which benefited from Mabillon's journeys

---

[38] For a selective list of post-Carolingian treatises, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 13–17. See also G. Macy, 'Commentaries on the mass during the early scholastic period', in *Medieval Liturgy. A Book of Essays*, ed. L. Larson-Miller (New York and London, 1997), pp. 25–59.

[39] See, for example, K. Langosch, *Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters: Verfasserlexikon*, 4 vols. (Berlin, 1953), IV, p. 750, and G. Cattin, *Music of the Middle Ages*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1984), I, p. 20, both of whom describe Walahfrid Strabo's *Libellus de exordiis et incrementis* as the first history of liturgy.

[40] On the development of medieval studies in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, see R. McKitterick, 'The study of Frankish history in France and Germany in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries', *Francia* 8 (1991), pp. 556–72 [reprinted in eadem, *The Frankish Kings and Culture*, chapter XIV]; J. Voss, *Das Mittelalter im historischen Denken Frankreichs. Untersuchung zur Geschichte des Mittelalterbegriffes und der Mittelalterbewertung von der zweiten Hälfte des 16. bis zur Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Munich, 1972).

[41] On Mabillon and the Maurists, see D. Knowles, 'Jean Mabillon', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 10 (1959), pp. 153–73; idem, *Great Historical Enterprises* (London, 1963), pp. 35–62; H. Leclercq, 'Mabillon, Jean', *DACL* X.1, cols. 427–724; B. Barret-Kriegel, *Jean Mabillon* (Paris, 1988).

[42] J. Mabillon, *De re diplomatica* (Paris, 1681). A supplement was published by Mabillon in 1704, and a second edition was prepared after his death by T. Ruinart.

[43] J. Mabillon, *De liturgia gallicana libri tres* (Paris, 1685); reprinted in PL 72, cols. 99–447. Both the Lectionary of Luxeuil and the Bobbio Missal will be discussed in the first chapter.

---

throughout Europe in quest of manuscripts and rare books, were published in two volumes of collected essays.[44]

It is true that even before Mabillon, scholars in France, Germany and Italy published material related to the study of medieval liturgy.[45] Yet, it was the liturgical work of Mabillon and his disciples who set the Maurists of Saint-Germain-des-Prés in the very front rank of modern liturgists.[46] Furthermore, the guidelines set by Mabillon in his liturgical research still dominate liturgical studies. Following Mabillon's model, liturgists concentrate on texts, classify them, look for their origins, illustrate their development, and edit them. This is the core of liturgical studies, and very little has changed since the time of Mabillon regarding the questions liturgists ask and the answers they seek. What has changed is, on the one hand, our knowledge of the auxiliary disciplines, such as codicology and palaeography, which enable scholars to date and locate manuscripts more accurately and to produce better editions; and, on the other hand, the widening knowledge of liturgical practices, sources and traditions, which permits scholars to draw more precise conclusions.

The peculiar nature of liturgical studies, as developed in the last three centuries, has set liturgy apart from the general trends of theological and historical research. Scholars who submerge themselves in the study of liturgy too often tend to ignore the context in which the liturgy evolved, as if liturgical texts were produced in a political and cultural vacuum. This resulted in a frustrating segregation and detachment of liturgical studies, which gradually became less and less accessible to historians and theologians.[47] As already noted by one historian:

> Liturgical history is pure scholarship: painstakingly detailed, extremely technical, highly esoteric, and compulsively fascinating. Its practitioners, like the initiates of an ancient mystery cult, pour the fruits of their research into learned journals with splendidly

---

[44] J. Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1687–9); the second volume was reprinted in PL 72, cols. 851–1408.

[45] For a list of the major early works, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 17–20.

[46] Mabillon's devoted pupil and companion, Thierry Ruinart (d. 1709), was not particularly interested in liturgy, so it was basically Edmond Martène (d. 1739) who succeeded Mabillon as the leading liturgist among the Maurists. Martène is best known for his *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus*, 3 vols. (Rouen, 1700–2; reprinted Antwerp, 1736–8).

[47] This detachment is exactly the reason which led Cyrille Vogel to publish his most important and learned introduction to the liturgical sources of the Middle Ages. See Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 1.

arcane titles like *Ephemerides Liturgicae* and *Sacris Erudiri*. It is hard for a mere layman to penetrate these mysteries . . .'[48]

Hence, liturgical studies became an obscure domain for a chosen few.

Only in recent years scholars, such as Arnold Angenendt,[49] Rosamond McKitterick,[50] Janet Nelson[51] and Frederick Paxton,[52] to name only a few of the most outstanding ones, have tried to shift the emphasis of liturgical research, after realising that the importance of the study of liturgy goes far beyond the simple fact that it elucidates the way people celebrated their solemn rites and festivals. As the anthropologist Clifford Geertz has pointed out, 'it is, primarily at least, out of the context of concrete acts of religious observance that religious conviction emerges on the human plane'.[53] In other words, liturgy is a unique and indispensable tool for the study of any Christian society in its historical, cultural and spiritual context. It gives us a rare glimpse of the actual rites people performed, but it also provides a great deal of information about the perceptions, ideas and preoccupations of the society in question.

This, however, must not be taken to imply that liturgical studies, in the textual–philological tradition established by Mabillon, are not necessary anymore. Such studies of the texts, their formulation and their dissemination are the basis for any liturgical investigation. Without them no further research into the cultural aspects of the liturgy can be carried out. Yet, alongside the more traditional lines of inquiry, a new and different appreciation of liturgy is evolving, for it is time to set liturgy fully into its cultural, historical and even theological context. These two approaches are not irreconcilable, but they do give different highlights and tonalities to the study of liturgy.

The nature of liturgical evidence

Although contemporary liturgical commentaries, some of which were mentioned above, provide much information regarding the liturgical rite and its celebration, the core of liturgical studies still rests on close analysis of the manuscript evidence. Thus, it is essential to examine the surviving liturgical manuscripts and fragments of manuscripts, in order to form a more accurate notion of the type of liturgy used, as well as its social and cultural implications.

The liturgical books and fragments which survive from the early Middle Ages are numerous and diverse.[54] Furthermore, the technical medieval and post-medieval terms used to describe these liturgical compositions are extremely confused and inconsistent. The *Missale Gothicum*, for example, is neither a missal, nor is it Gothic in any sense.[55] Thus, as pointed out by Cyrille Vogel, 'not only was there a profusion of separate books with a variety of confusing titles, but little uniformity existed even in any one category of book; each book derived from older types, styles and families of manuscripts, representing different liturgical usages'.[56] No wonder, then, that in the last two centuries a constant effort has been made by eminent liturgists to classify the liturgical manuscripts which survive, and to create a typology of liturgical books and documents.[57]

The first and most obvious typology classifies the surviving liturgical books and fragments according to their content. As far as the Frankish kingdoms of the early Middle Ages are concerned, four major types of liturgical book were used in the celebrations of the Christian rite.[58] The main group of liturgical texts comprises books which contain the text for

---

[48] J. Richards, *Consul of God. The Life and Times of Gregory the Great* (London, 1980), p. 119.

[49] See, for example, Angenendt, 'Missa specialis', pp. 153–221; idem, 'Theologie und Liturgie der mittelalterlichen Toten-Memoria', in *Memoria. Der geschichtliche Zeugniswert des liturgischen Gedenkens im Mittelalter*, ed. K. Schmid and J. Wollasch (Munich, 1984), pp. 79–199; idem, 'Liturgiewissenschaft und Kirchengeschichte am Beispiel der frühmittelalterlichen Taufgeschichte', in *Liturgie: ein vergessenes Thema der Theologie?*, ed. K. Richter (Freiburg, 1986), pp. 99–112.

[50] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, especially pp. 115–54. See also eadem, 'Unity and diversity', pp. 59–82.

[51] See the various papers collected in Nelson, *Politics and Ritual*.

[52] Paxton, *Christianizing Death*.

[53] C. Geertz, 'Religion as a cultural system', in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, 1973), pp. 87–125, at 112–13.

[54] According to Cyrille Vogel, 'scholarly opinion estimates that liturgical *codices* comprise some 10% of the surviving medieval manuscripts, which makes them more numerous than any other category'; see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 1. For a catalogue of the various manuscripts, see *CLLA*. These volumes are still the standard guide to early medieval liturgical manuscripts. Yet, Gamber's analysis and typology are in many cases out of date and in need of revision according to modern scholarship.

[55] The *Missale Gothicum* will be discussed more fully in the first chapter.

[56] Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 4.

[57] See Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 36–43. Palazzo's book in now available in an English translation: É. Palazzo, *A History of Liturgical Books from the Beginning to the Thirteenth Century*, trans. M. Beaumont (Collegeville, 1998).

[58] All these categories are well discussed by Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 47–123 and 187–96. See also D.M. Hope and G. Woolfenden, 'Liturgical Books', in *The Study of Liturgy*, ed. Jones et al., pp. 96–101.

the celebrant of the office. The origin of these books, usually called sacramentaries, is complex and not at all clear, but it seems that they started as small booklets of masses (*libelli missarum*), which were later collected, organised and amplified to form what appears to be a coherent book of prayers for the major feasts of the liturgical year.[59]

The books containing the scriptural readings for the office form the second major group of liturgical texts from the early Middle Ages. These books started as marginal notes in codices of the Bible, indicating the passages (pericopes) that were to be read during mass. Subsequently, lists of pericopes (*capitularia*), which were arranged according to the liturgical year and which indicated the *incipit* and *explicit* of the relevant reading passages for each day, were drawn up on behalf of the celebrant and were appended to the appropriate codex. Finally, proper lectionaries were compiled, containing the reading passages *in extenso* for each celebration. Although three stages of development can be observed in the emergence of lectionaries, throughout most of the early Middle Ages all three types existed simultaneously.[60]

The third category of liturgical books contains all the parts that were sung during the office,[61] and the fourth category contains the *ordines*, that is, the ceremonial directions and instructions for the performance of the rite.[62] There were, of course, other liturgical compositions which circulated at the time, such as collections of homilies or collections of saints' lives to be read on saints' days. Yet these were only a small portion of the liturgical crop of the period. It appears, therefore, that throughout the early Middle Ages several different kinds of books were used at the same time whenever a mass was celebrated. Only towards the end of the ninth century did a new type of liturgical book, the *missalis plenarius* or plenary missal, containing everything to be sung or said at the celebration of the mass with the ceremonial directions, begin

---

[59] Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 61–110; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 47–83; Metzger, *Les sacramentaires*. On the *libelli missarum*, see P.-M. Gy, 'The different forms of liturgical *libelli*', in *Fountain of Life. Essays in Memory of Niels K. Rasmussen* (Washingdon, DC, 1991), pp. 23–34.

[60] Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 314–55; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 103–23; Martimort, *Les lectures liturgiques et leurs livres*.

[61] Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 357–67; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 84–102; M. Huglo, *Les livres de chant liturgique*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Age Occidental 52 (Turnhout, 1988).

[62] Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 135–97; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 187–96; Martimort, *Les 'ordines', les ordinaires et les cérémoniaux*; *Les 'Ordines romani'* (ed. Andrieu).

---

to evolve. The *missalis plenarius* gradually took over the liturgical scene, and by the beginning of the twelfth century the plenary missal became the standard liturgical book.[63]

Classifying early medieval liturgical manuscripts according to their content, however, yields only a partial picture. Other characteristics of the manuscripts in question, such as their destination and their envisaged function, should also be taken into account. In the past, whenever a liturgist or an historian wished to examine the liturgical developments and characteristics of a certain period or a certain region, she or he turned directly to the lavishly produced liturgical manuscripts. This, however, is one of the most misleading notions prevailing in liturgical studies, for it forces the liturgist to concentrate on a select group of liturgical codices, while ignoring a vast number of other liturgical manuscripts and fragments of manuscripts of a lesser artistic or codicological quality, but not necessarily of inferior liturgical importance. It is true that the greater part of the manuscripts which survive to tell us the story of the early medieval practice can be classified as *de luxe* or well-prepared volumes, which were produced for rich and well-established ecclesiastical institutions, such as monasteries or cathedral churches.[64] But this situation can only be a circumstantial anomaly. Luxurious liturgical volumes could not have been the bulk of the liturgical productivity of early medieval *scriptoria*. Priests who served in small rural churches, itinerant priests who wandered around villages throughout the countryside, and of course missionaries, were all in need of liturgical books. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that a great number of smaller, simpler and much cheaper liturgical manuscripts were also copied and distributed, despite the fact that very few of them survive intact.[65]

In an important paper titled 'Célébration épiscopale et célébration prebyteriale: une essai de typologie', the liturgist Niels Rasmussen suggested a new way to arrange the typology of early medieval liturgical manuscripts. According to him both the material aspects and layout of a manuscript, as well as its liturgical content can help us to determine the manuscript's destination and function. Sacramentaries, for example, were produced for monastic, episcopal and presbyterial use, and only by examining their external form and liturgical content can one

---

[63] Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 105–6; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 124–7.

[64] See the various manuscripts discussed by Gamber in *CLLA*.

[65] On the institutional bias in the preservation of liturgical manuscripts, see Hen, 'A liturgical handbook'.

determine to which of the above mentioned categories a certain manuscript belongs.[66] A good example which elucidates Rasmussen's observations is a small liturgical manuscript from Brussels.[67] The modesty in the preparation of this volume, its small and handy form, and the peculiar character of the short sacramentary which it accommodates, containing the prayers for only eleven major feasts of the liturgical year, all suggest that it was produced for a priest of some small rural church.[68]

However, as I have already argued elsewhere, two other criteria can be added to Rasmussen's double yardstick. First, the content of the entire manuscript and not just its liturgical section can disclose the manuscript's functional destination. Second, the combination of two or more types of liturgical book in one manuscript indicates a destination far from an ecclesiastical or a monastic centre. Indeed, the Brussels manuscript just mentioned can help us to illustrate this point as well, for its liturgical section is juxtaposed with a plethora of canonical and doctrinal material, which is usually absent from *de luxe* liturgical manuscripts. The liturgical section itself, furthermore, is composed from a selection of different liturgical pieces, and contains a unique combination of a sacramentary, a lectionary, an antiphonary, several *ordines* and various other ceremonial instructions. These peculiarities imply that the manuscript was composed with a view to assisting an itinerant or rural priest in a remote area, providing him with a selection of liturgical and doctrinal material he might need in order to execute his job.[69] Thus, whenever a classification of liturgical manuscripts is at stake, it should be carried out along a double axis – the type of the liturgical book in question and its functional destination.

Although this study will largely focus on the production of *de luxe* liturgical volumes, which are the bulk of the evidence that survives, smaller and unpretentious manuscripts will also be taken into account, for they give us an extraordinary indication of liturgical trends and models, and they provide an exceptional index for the success of various

reforms and changes. If we resort again to the example of the Brussels manuscript mentioned above, from an analysis of the content of its short sacramentary it is clear that by the year 800, when this particular manuscript was produced, Charlemagne's intentions to replace the Gallican sacramentaries with the Roman *Hadrianum* had not been fully implemented.[70]

The last point that needs to be mentioned here touches on the authenticity of our sources. The peculiar character of liturgical manuscripts in general leaves no room for doubt that they were put together in order to assist and instruct the celebrant (a priest or a bishop) in performing the Christian rites.[71] Several of these liturgical compositions were attributed by their compilers or copiers to prestigious and authoritative ecclesiastical figures, such as Germanus of Paris, Pope Gelasius or Pope Gregory the Great.[72] These dubious attributions were intended to enhance the authority of such texts in the eyes of their contemporaries, by linking the texts themselves or their transmission to well-known sources of authority in the Christian world. Yet, for us as historians of liturgy, such reputable but spurious origins have little significance. Unlike any other written source the authenticity of liturgical texts and treatises does not come from their authors, their relation to the original composition or their transmission. Since these books were in practical use during the period immediately following their composition, one may presume they reflect actual practices, otherwise they would not have been written or copied at all. Thus, the very fact that these texts were composed and copied gives them certain authenticity in respect to their place and date of composition. In other words, these sources reflect the liturgical practices of the place and the time in which they were composed, and each of their manuscripts is a unique entity that can profitably be studied as a reflection of the local circumstances which led to its production.

---

[66] N.K. Rasmussen, 'Célébration épiscopale et célébration prebyteriale: une essai de typologie', in *Segni et riti nella chiesa altomedievale occidentale*, Settimane 33 (Spoleto, 1987), pp. 581–603.

[67] Brussels, BR 10127–10144 (?Liège, *c*. 800); *CLA* X.1548; *CLLA* 856 and 1320. On this manuscript, see Hen, 'A liturgical handbook', and see the further bibliography listed there. The sacramentary of this manuscript was published by C. Coebergh and P. de Puniet; see *Liber sacramentorum excarpsus*.

[68] Hen, 'A liturgical handbook'. See also Rasmussen, *Les pontificaux*, pp. 436–9; Bullough, 'The Carolingian liturgical experience', pp. 48–9.

[69] Hen, 'A liturgical handbook'.

[70] See Hen, 'A liturgical handbook'; *Liber Sacramentorum Excarpsus* (ed. Coebergh and de Puniet), p. 82.

[71] On the peculiar character of liturgical books, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 62–4; Hope and Woolfenden, 'Liturgical Books', p. 96–7.

[72] On this phenomenon, see R. Reynolds, 'Pseudonymous liturgica in early medieval canon law collections', in *Fälschungen im Mittelalter. Internationaler Kongress der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 16–19 September 1986*, 5 vols. (Hannover, 1988), II, pp. 67–77 [reprinted in idem, *Law and Liturgy in the Latin Church, 5th–12th Centuries* (Aldershot, 1994), chapter IX].

In quest of the royal patronage of liturgy

In his vanguard study of medieval society, Marc Bloch regarded patronage as a universal phenomenon. 'To seek a protector', he writes, 'or to find satisfaction in being one – these things are common to all ages.'[73] Nevertheless, from an historical point of view, patronage as a social system was, and still is, subject to fluctuations in importance and intensity.[74] In the Roman empire, for example, patronage (*patrocinium*) assumed substantial importance in the formation of society, operating in competition, and sometimes in collaboration, with other social systems;[75] while in other societies patronage is only a marginal force in the social structure.

Similarly, the patronage of culture is a universal phenomenon, universal across time, space and culture, but still subject to fluctuations in importance and intensity.[76] There are plenty of examples for intensive artistic and literary patronage throughout history, from Bak, King Akhenaten's chief sculptor; through Maecenas who sponsored Virgil, Horace and Propertius,[77] Charlemagne who gathered a number of scholars in his Court, or the Medici family, to François Mitterand who promoted the construction of the new Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. In fact, the history of cultural patronage is analogous to the history of culture itself. Throughout Antiquity, the Middle Ages and the modern era rulers, clerics and rich aristocrats patronised culture, and it seems that the patronage of culture was gradually perceived as one of the obligations of a ruler or a pretentious aristocrat.

The mechanism through which cultural patronage operated in late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages is not always clear. No doubt the availability of material resources was a crucial prerequisite for the pursuit of patronage, and it was the privilege of those who possessed wealth to exercise patronage by commissioning works of art and

---

[73] M. Bloch, *Feudal Society*, trans. L.A. Manyon (London, 1962), p. 147.

[74] J. Bourne, *Patronage in Nineteenth-Century England* (London, 1986), p. 8.

[75] On the role of patronage in Roman society, see the various studies in *Patronage in Ancient Society*, ed. A. Wallace-Hadrill (London and New York, 1990).

[76] See, for example, B.K. Gold, *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome* (Chapel Hill and London, 1987); McDonald and Goebel, *German Medieval Literary Patronage*. See also the various papers in *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell'alto medioevo occidentale*, Settimane 39 (Spoleto, 1992).

[77] Maecenas's name even became synonymous with 'patron' in several European languages, such as French (mécène) and German (Mäzen).

literature. But equating patronage with a specific commission or a specific literary piece written at request, is too narrow and inadequate a definition. Patronage of culture did not necessarily involve commissioning particular objects or works. It could also be an encouraging, supporting or initiating force which gave rise to artistic and literary creativity. Thus, a ruler who created a political and cultural climate favourable to the arts might well be called a patron, even when no specific object or literary piece can be associated with him or her.[78] Hence, a broader definition of patronage will be used in the present study.

A fundamental problem in analysing any act of cultural patronage is tracing its motivation. Patronage of culture, as we are told, 'is emphatically not random aesthetic pleasure or arcane intellectual curiosity, but an organised and determined assembly and deployment of resources to carry out what appears to be specific aims and objectives'.[79] In other words, patronage is an investment, and people patronise because they expect a return, either spiritual or temporal. Unfortunately, the motives behind certain acts of patronage and sponsorship cannot always be firmly traced. Furthermore, there is always the problem of matching the written evidence with surviving artefacts. Only on rare occasions do we find a contemporary notice concerning who produced a certain work and who commissioned it, and unless an artefact bears such a notice naming the person who owned it or commissioned it, we remain ignorant about the precise circumstances which led to its production.

These problems are exacerbated where the patronage of liturgy is concerned. First and foremost, extremely few liturgical manuscripts or prayers can be shown without doubt to have been written by a special commission of a patron, or as the result of a favourable ambience created by patronage. Second, the nature of liturgy itself poses some limitations on the mechanism of patronage itself. Liturgy, we must bear in mind, is not a commodity, nor is it mercantile in any sense. Consequently, the evidence for lay patronage of liturgy is extremely rare.[80] Furthermore, it is inappropriate to speak of patronage in the ecclesiastical orbit. No doubt that archbishops, bishops and abbot deployed their position, and sometimes even the wealth of the Church, to promote

---

[78] McDonald and Goebel, *Medieval German Literary Patronage*, p. 4.

[79] McKitterick, 'Royal patronage of culture', p. 112.

[80] For exceptional liturgical codices that were owned by lay aristocrats in the early Middle Ages, see Eberhard of Friuli's 'Psalterium duplex', Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 11 (?Paris/Corbie/Soissons; s. viii²); *CLA*, I.101; *CLLA* 1617; and the Psalter of Count Achadeus, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 272 (?Rheims; 883–900).

liturgy. The biographers of Caesarius of Arles (d. 542), for example, relate how

> He added and enforced [the rule] that the laity should prepare Psalms and hymns, proses and antiphons, which they should chant in a high and modulated voice, like clerics, some in Greek, some in Latin, and should not have time to waste telling stories in church.[81]

Similarly, Gregory of Tours reports on the Rogations instituted at Clermont by St Gall:

> Then, he instituted the prayers called rogations, and in the middle of Lent he led a procession, singing psalms, on foot to the church of St Julian the Martyr.[82]

Likewise, the Merovingian Church council of Vaison (529) introduced the *Kyrie eleison* and the *sanctus* to the Gallican rite.[83] But could such efforts made by leading ecclesiastical figures be regarded as acts of patronage? I would argue that they could not. Liturgy for archbishops, bishops or abbots was not a luxury so much as an obligation. Taking care of the liturgy and promoting liturgical practices was an inherent part of their pastoral role, and therefore cannot be regarded as an act of patronage. There is little place to doubt that Church leaders like Caesarius of Arles or the Merovingian bishops who convened at Vaison and their successors were the main protagonists in the development of the liturgical rites throughout the Frankish period. Yet, they did not act as external patrons, but as executors of their own duties and responsibility, albeit the fact that they were often used by royal patrons to carry out what appear to be major liturgical changes and reforms. Royal

patronage of liturgy is, then, the core of the matter.[84] Not only is it the only patronage of liturgy traceable in our sources, it also appears to have played an important role in the history of early medieval liturgy, as we shall see below.

In the following pages, I should like to concentrate on the production of liturgical books and prayers in the Frankish kingdoms, and I shall do so mainly by focusing on the manuscript evidence which survives to tell us the story of the Frankish liturgy. Yet, the following chapters are by no means an exhaustive or systematic survey of the manuscript evidence. Rather than enlisting each and every liturgical manuscript that was produced during our period of interest, I shall discuss a select group of manuscripts in their social and cultural context, and I shall focus on the royal patronage of liturgy as a tool for comparative analysis. This, I believe, will illustrate in broad but clear lines the general aspects and directions of liturgical development in early medieval Gaul.

---

[81] *Vitae Caesarii episcopi Arelatensis libri duo*, I.19, ed. B. Krusch, MGH SRM III (Hannover, 1896), pp. 463–4: 'Adiecit etiam atque compulit, ut laicorum popularitas psalmos et hymnos pararet, altaque et modulata voce instar clericorum alii Graece, alii Latine prosas antiphonasque cantarent, ut non haberent spatium in ecclesia fabulis occupari' [trans. Hillgarth, *Christianity and Paganism*, p. 35].

[82] Gregory of Tours, *Liber vitae patrum*, VI.6 (ed. Krusch, p. 234): '. . . rogationes illas instituit, ut media quadragesima psallendo ad basilicam beati Juliani martyris itinere pedestri venirent' [trans. James, pp. 57–8]. See also Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, IV.5 (ed. Krusch and Levison, p. 138).

[83] *Concilium Vasense (5 Nov. 529)*, c. 3 (ed. Gaudemet and Basdevant, *Les canons des conciles mérovingiens*, I, p. 190).

[84] The importance of royal patronage to the development of Frankish liturgy had already been noted by T. Klauser, 'Die liturgischen Austauschbeziehungen zwischen der römischer und der fränkisch-deutscher Kirche vom 8. bis zum 11. Jahrhunderts', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 53 (1933), pp. 169–89.

1

Creative Beginnings

Despite the prevailing theme of literary decline in the sources from late antique Gaul, the late fourth and the fifth century was a significant period of intellectual activity in Gaul as far as the aristocracy was concerned.[1] Local literary circles sprang up throughout southern Gaul, the stronghold of the Gallo-Roman senatorial aristocracy, and they provided those aristocrats with 'additional opportunities to socialise and demonstrate their unity of spirit'.[2] Furthermore, the bishops of Gaul, among them some of the most famous bishops of the period, such as Hilary of Arles (d. 449), Honoratus of Arles (d. 429), Rusticius of Narbonne (d. 461), or Sidonius Apollinaris (d.c. 480), consolidated their influence and authority through participation in an extensive literary circle.[3] Thus, the late fourth and the fifth century was a significant period of literary production in Gaul. At the same time, religious, clerical and especially episcopal status came to be a crucial element in the aristocratic world view, and high offices within the Church were in great demand among members of the Gallo-Roman aristocracy.[4] The widening spread and the

[1] See, for example, R.W. Matthisen, 'The theme of literary decline in late Roman Gaul', *Classical Philology* 83 (1983), pp. 45–52; I.N. Wood, 'Continuity or calamity? The constraints of literary models', in *Fifth-Century Gaul: A Crisis of Identity?*, ed. J. Drinkwater and H. Elton (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 9–18.

[2] See Matthisen, *Roman Aristocrats in Barbarian Gaul*, pp. 105–18; the citation is from p. 111.

[3] R.W. Matthisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism and Religious Controversy in Fifth-Century Gaul: A Regional Analysis* (Washington, DC, 1989), especially pp. 83–5, 235–42, 251–3.

[4] See M. Heinzelmann, 'L'aristocratie et les évêches entre Loire et Rhin jusqu'à la fin du VIIe siècle', *Revue d'histoire de l'église de France* 62 (1976), pp. 75–90 [reprinted with a bibliographical update in *La christianisation des pays entre Loire et Rhin*, ed. Riché, pp. 75–90 and 260–1]; Heinzelmann, *Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien*, Beihefte der Francia 5 (Sigmaringen, 1976); F. Prinz, 'Die bischöfliche Stadtherrschaft im Frankenreich vom 5. bis 7. Jahrhundert', *Historische Zeitschrift* 217 (1973), pp. 1–35; Matthisen, *Roman Aristocrats in Barbarian Gaul*, pp. 89–103.

growing influence of Christianity among the aristocracy of late antique Gaul gave rise to an increasing interest in Christian theology, ethics and rituals, an interest which manifested itself in the production of numerous theological and catechetical treatises. It is, then, not at all surprising that some of these aristocrats turned to liturgical composition as well.

Hilary of Poitiers (d. 367) is the first writer from late antique Gaul whose activity as a liturgist is attested in our sources. Jerome, in his *Liber de viris inlustribus*, composed around 392 as a guide-book of Christian authors and their works,[5] reports that Hilary composed a book of hymns and mysteries (*liber hymnorum et mysteriorum*).[6] The liturgist André Wilmart, following Gian-Francesco Gamurrini, identified this book as the treatise on the mysteries discovered in an eleventh-century manuscript from Arezzo.[7] However, this does not necessarily imply that Hilary did not compose a book of hymns as well. In fact, three hymns, albeit incomplete, were preserved in the same Arezzo manuscript,[8] and several other references confirm the fact that Hilary did indeed compose hymns. Jerome, for example, tells us that 'Hilarius ... in hymnorum carmine Gallos indociles vocat';[9] the fourth council of Toledo (633) endorsed the singing of hymns of the same type as those of Hilary and Ambrose;[10] and Walahfrid Strabo corroborates the fact that Hilary of

[5] Jerome composed his *De viris inlustribus* (c. 392) to show the pagans how many and how excellent were the writers among the Christians. It is basically a bibliography of some 135 Christian authors, and it was substantially augmented (c. 490) by Gennadius of Marseilles, who added eighty-one fifth-century authors. Later on, Isidore of Seville added thirty-three authors, most of whom were Spaniards, and recommended this treatise to his readers as a guide to Christian authors (*Etymologiae*, VI.6.2). On the *De viris inlustribus*, see H. Rouse and M. Rouse, 'Bibliography before print: the medieval *De viris illustribus*', in *The Role of the Book in Medieval Culture*, ed. P. Ganz, 2 vols. (Turnhout, 1986), I, pp. 133–54; McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word*, pp. 200–6.
[6] Jerome, *De viris inlustribus*, c. 100, ed. E.C. Richardson, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 14 (Leipzig, 1896), p. 48.
[7] Arezzo, Biblioteca della Fraternità Santa Maria, VI 3, fols. 1–13 (?Monte Cassino, s. xi); *CLLA* 30; A. Wilmart, 'Le *De mysteriis* de St Hilaire au Monte-Cassin', *Revue bénédictine* 27 (1910), pp. 12–21; G.-F. Gamurrini, *Sancti Hilarii Tractatus de mysteriis et Hymni et sanctae Silviae Aquitanae Peregrinatio ad loca sancta* (Rome, 1887). See also K. Gamber, 'Der "liber mysteriorum" des Hilarius von Poitiers', *Studia Patristica* 5 (1962), pp. 40–9. For an edition of Hilary's mystical treatise, see Hilary of Poitiers, *Tractatus de mysteriis*, ed. P. Brisson, SC 19 bis, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1967).
[8] See Arezzo, Biblioteca della Fraternità Santa Maria, VI 3, fols. 14–15; *CLLA* 40. For an edition, see *Hymni latini antiquiores*, I.1–3 (ed. Bulst, pp. 31–5).
[9] Jerome, *Commentarius in Epistulam ad Galatas*, II.427–8, PL 26, col. 355.
[10] *Concilium Toletanum IV (633)*, c. 13 (ed. Vives, *Concilios Visigóticos e Hispano-Romanos*, pp. 196–7).

Poitiers composed hymns.[11] Nevertheless, we cannot assess Hilary's influence on the liturgical development in late antique Gaul, since the bulk of his liturgical work, as well as that of his immediate successors, is now lost.

It is not until the mid-fifth century, almost a century after Hilary's death, that liturgical production in Gaul is mentioned again in our sources. Gennadius of Marseilles, Jerome's continuator, reports that Musaeus (d.c. 460), a presbyter from Marseilles, composed a lectionary (*lectiones totius anni*), a collection of responsories (*responsoria psalmorum capitula*), and at the request of Bishop Venerius and then Bishop Eustachius 'an extraordinary and substantial sacramentary' (*sacramentarium egregium et non parvum volumen*). The latter included a section for the temporal feasts, a collection of reading passages from biblical sources, and a series of chants and psalms.[12] Germain Morin and Klaus Gamber have argued that Musaeus' lectionary is preserved in a palimpsest codex from Wolfenbüttel,[13] and Gamber has even identified Musaeus' sacramentary with the sacramentary preserved in another palimpsest codex in Milan.[14] Yet, these assertions, as pointed out by Cyrille Vogel, 'are dubious at best'.[15]

Musaeus of Marseilles was by no means the only liturgist of his time. Sidonius Apollinaris reports that Claudianus Mamertus (d.c. 473) composed a lectionary,[16] and his brother, Bishop Mamertus of Vienne, instituted the practice of Rogation in the city:

[11] Walahfrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis*, c. 26 (ed. Harting-Corrêa, p. 156).
[12] Gennadius of Marseilles, *De viris inlustribus*, c. 80, ed. E.C. Richardson, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 14 (Leipzig, 1896), p. 88.
[13] Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Weissenburg 76 (S-E France, s. vi^in); *CLA* IX.1392; *CLLA* 35 and 250; G. Morin, 'Le plus ancien monument qui existe de la liturgie gallicane: le lectionnaire palimpseste de Wolfenbüttel', *Ephemerides liturgicae* 51 (1937), pp. 3–12; K. Gamber, 'Das Lektionar und Sakramentar des Musaeus von Massilia', *Revue bénédictine* 69 (1959), pp. 198–215.
[14] Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, M 12 sup. (origin uncertain, c. 700); *CLA* III.354; *CLLA* 32 and 205; Gamber, 'Das Lektionar und Sakramentar', pp. 198–215.
[15] Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 303.
[16] Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epistula* IV.11.6, lines 16–17 (ed. Anderson, II, p. 108): 'hic sollemnibus annuis paravit, quae quo tempore lecta convenirent'. According to Berti, the above-mentioned Wolfenbüttel lectionary (Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Weissenburg 76) is the work of Claudianus Mamertus. See G. Berti, 'Il più antico lezionario della Chiesa', *Ephemerides liturgicae* 68 (1954), pp. 147–54. See also G. Morin, 'La lettre-préface du Comes ad Constantium se rapporterait au lectionnaire de Claudien Mamert?', *Revue bénédictine* 30 (1913), pp. 228–32; *CLLA* 37.

The solemn observation of these [Rogations] was first initiated, and introduced to us by the father and pontiff Mamertus, who thereby set an example worthy of all reverence and launched a most salutary venture. Before this the public prayers (with all respect to the faith be it said) were irregular, lukewarm, sparsely attended, and, so to speak, full of yawns; their purpose was frequently obscured by the disturbing interruptions for meals, and they tended to become for the most part petitions for rain or for fine weather.... But in these Rogations, which the aforesaid chief priest has both made known to us and made over to us, there are prayer and fasting, psalmody and lamentation.[17]

Sidonius himself, we are told, composed *contestatiunculae*, which were probably prefaces to the mass,[18] and an entire sacramentary.[19] Furthermore, he imported from Vienne those Rogations instituted by Mamertus, in order to combat the boredom and indifference of his congregation.[20] At approximately the same time, Bishop Germanus (d.*c.* 448) incorporated several new saints' feasts into the liturgical calendar of Auxerre,[21] and Bishop Perpetuus of Tours (d. 490) instituted the fasts and vigils which were still observed in the city of Tours a century later.[22] Despite the fact that none of Musaeus', Mamertus' or Sidonius' liturgical works has survived, one can clearly recognise in these early liturgical enterprises the literary atmosphere which characterised late antique Gaul, not the least because of the fact that all our evidence comes from regions south of the Loire, the stronghold of the Gallo-Roman senatorial aristocracy, and all the liturgists we hear of were members of the Gaulish nobility.

The picture which emerges from the liturgical evidence adduced above is that of a primordial state. There was not yet any established tradition of liturgical celebration in fifth-century Gaul, and bishops were primarily occupied with the creation of new liturgical practices in one way or another. Some of them composed new prayers, others instituted new celebrations, and all of them were striving to inculcate liturgical awareness and enthusiasm into the hearts of their bored flocks.[23] Against this background it seems that diversity was the case throughout Christian Gaul during the fourth and the fifth centuries. Bishops were free to institute feasts, fasts and vigils, or to compose prayers and prayer books of their own, while no restrictions were imposed upon them. Moreover, none of our sources mentions, nor even hints at, the importation of liturgical texts or practices from either Rome or anywhere else.

The early Merovingian period

The continuity of liturgical productivity into the Merovingian period seems nothing but natural and appropriate. Even from the little evidence that survives, it is clear that the interest in composing new liturgical material did not die out during the late fifth and the early sixth century.[24] In fact, the production of early Merovingian liturgical books was deeply rooted in the traditional literary productivity which characterised fourth- and fifth-century Gaul. Indeed Gregory of Tours, in his own conservative way, continued to use Sidonius' compositions, which he collected into a little book, and for which he even provided a new introduction.[25] But Gregory also mentions two attempts made in his lifetime to compose new prayers. The first was made by King Chilperic (d. 584), who composed 'short pieces, hymns and masses' (*opuscula vel ymnus* [sic] *sive missas*) which, not surprisingly, were greeted with contempt

---

[17] Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epistula* V.14.2–3 (ed. Anderson, II, pp. 216–19): 'quarum nobis sollemnitatem primus Mamertus pater et pontifex reverentissimo exemplo, utilissimo experimento invenit instituit invexit, erant quidem prius, quod salva fidei pace sit dictum, vagae tepentes infrequentesque utque sic dixerim oscitabundae supplicationes, quae saepe interpellantum prandiorum obicibus hebatabantur, maxime aut imbres aut serenitatem deprecaturae; . . . in his autem, quas suprafatus summus sacerdos nobis et protulit pariter et contulit, ieiunatur oratur, psallitur fletur'.

[18] Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epistula* VII.3.1 (ed. Anderson, II, p. 303); *CLLA* 34; Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula*, pp. 185–7.

[19] Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, II.22 (ed. Krusch and Levison, p. 67).

[20] Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epistula* VII.1.2–3, (ed. Anderson, II, pp. 286–9). On Sidonius Apollinaris and his activities, see J. Harries, *Sidonius Apollinaris and the Fall of Rome* (Oxford, 1994).

[21] See J.-C. Picard, 'Espace urbain et sépultures épiscopales à Auxerre', *Revue d'histoire de l'église de France* 62 (1976), pp. 205–22 [reprinted with a bibliographical update in *La christianisation des pays entre Loire et Rhin*, ed. Riché, pp. 205–22 and 264–5].

[22] Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, X.31.iv (ed. Krusch and Levison pp. 529–31). See also Weidemann, *Kulturgeschichte der Merowingerzeit*, II, pp. 225–7; L. Pietri, *La ville de Tours de IVe au VI siècle: naissance d'une ville chrétienne*, Collection de l'école française de Rome 69 (Rome, 1983).

[23] Sidonius, *Epistulae* V.14.2–3 and VII.1.2–3 (ed. Anderson, II, pp. 216–18 and 286–8).

[24] See also Walahfrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis*, c. 26 (ed. Harting-Corrêa, pp. 166–7), who writes that 'Et quia Gallicana ecclesia viris non minus peritissimis instructa sacrorum officiorum instrumenta habebat non minima.'

[25] Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, II.22 (ed. Krusch and Levison p. 67).

by Gregory.[26] The second attempt was made by Bishop Praetextatus of Rouen who, while in exile on the island of Jersey, composed prayers which were criticised by the Frankish bishops at the council of Mâcon (585) because of their inadequate literary form.[27] Furthermore, early medieval Gaul appears to have been particularly fertile in hymn production.[28] Several hymns composed by Caesarius of Arles,[29] Venantius Fortunatus,[30] Flavius of Chalon-sur-Sâone,[31] and King Chilperic have survived,[32] together with another sixteen anonymous hymns.[33]

Yet, it is basically thanks to the information provided by the sermons of Avitus of Vienne (d.c. 517/25) and Caesarius of Arles, the history books and hagiographical writings of Gregory of Tours, the poems of Venantius Fortunatus, the abundant work of Merovingian hagiographers, and other non-liturgical sources that one can reconstruct to some extent the liturgical scene of the early Merovingian period. In the seventh book of his historical narrative, for example, Gregory of Tours relates that:

> It happened one Sunday that, after the deacon had requested the congregation to stop speaking, in order that the mass might be celebrated, the king turned to them and said: 'Men and women, all people present, I ask you to remain loyal to me, instead of assassinating me, as only recently you assassinated my brothers. . .'. When they had heard what the king had to say, the entire population prayed to God for his safety.[34]

---

[26] Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, VI.46 (ed. Krusch and Levison p. 320).

[27] Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, VIII.20 (ed. Krusch and Levison p. 387).

[28] See J. Szövérffy, *Latin Hymns*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Age occidental 55 (Turnhout, 1989), pp. 39–40 and 130; idem, *Die Annalen der lateinischen Hymnendichtung* (Berlin, 1964), especially pp. 111–66.

[29] *Hymni latini antiquiores*, VI.1–9 (ed. Bulst, pp. 91–8).

[30] *Hymni latini antiquiores*, XI.1–3 (ed. Bulst, pp. 127–9). See also Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmina* II.1–2 and II.6 (ed. Reydellet, pp. 48–52 and 57–8 respectively). These hymns were originally written for the *adventus* of the relics of the Holy Cross to Radegund's nunnery in Poitiers. See J. George, *Venantius Fortunatus: A Poet in Merovingian Gaul* (Oxford, 1992), p. 30–1.

[31] *Hymni latini antiquiores*, X (ed. Bulst, p. 123).

[32] *Hymni latini antiquiores*, IX (ed. Bulst, p. 119).

[33] *Hymni latini antiquiores*, VIII.1–16 (ed. Bulst, pp. 105–16).

[34] Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, VII.8 (ed. Krusch and Levison p. 331): 'Unde factum est, ut quadam die dominica, postquam diaconus silentium populis, ut missae abscultarentur, indixit, rex conversus ad populum dicerit: "Adiuro vos, o viri cum mulieribus qui adestis, ut mihi fidem inviolatam servare dignimini nec me, ut fratres meus nuper fecistis, interematis (*sic*) . . .". Haec eo dicente, omnes (*sic*) populus orationem pro rege fudit ad Dominum' [trans. Thorpe, p. 393]. On this incident, see I.N. Wood, 'The secret histories of Gregory of Tours', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 71 (1993), pp. 253–70, at 260–1.

In a different passage Gregory records that:

> It was on Easter Sunday itself, that holy day, that my brother Sigibert stood in Church, and the deacon stepped forward with the sacred text of the Gospels. A messenger arrived to see Sigibert, and both he and the deacon who was reading the lesson said exactly the same thing: 'Unto you a son is born'.[35]

It is obvious that neither of these stories was written as a description of a liturgical event, for even as talented an observer as Gregory of Tours tended to record liturgical ceremonies only when they impinged on the course of his story. Nevertheless, through these and similar anecdotes one can get a rare glimpse of the liturgical praxis of the age. From the context in which Gunthram's emotional appeal to the people was made, or in which Sigibert received the news on the birth of his child, one can gather an image of the liturgical ceremony that was practised. In this case, the deacon solemnly called for silence before the ceremony began, and later on he carried the Gospels into the *ambo* and read from them.[36] Furthermore, several other passages convey an even more colourful and vivid picture of the celebration itself and of the emotions it incited in the hearts of the people. This is how Venantius Fortunatus, for example, describes the singing of the Parisian clergy:

> Prolonging the nocturnal vigil until daybreak
> the reverent crowd forms an angelic choir.
> Persisting with deliberate steps in its venerable task
> It strengthens and stirs to arms the heavens with its chants
> . . .
> Responding to the urging of the pontiff,
> Clergy, populace, and children sing praises to the Lord.[37]

---

[35] Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, VIII.4 (ed. Krusch and Levison p. 373): 'Nam in diem sanctum paschae, stante fratre meo Sigybertho in aeclesia procedente diacono cum sancto evangeliorum libro, nuntius regi advenit, unaque vox fuit pronuntiantes lectionem evangelicam ac nuntii dicentis: "Filius natus est tibi"' [trans. Thorpe, pp. 436–7].

[36] This information is confirmed by several other sources, for example, *Expositio*, I.2 and I.10–11 (ed. Ratcliff, pp. 3–4 and 7 respectively); Caesarius of Arles, *Sermo* 20.2 (ed. Morin, pp. 92–3).

[37] Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmen* II.9, lines 49–52 and 69–70 (ed. Reydellet, pp. 63–6): 'Previgiles noctes ad prima crepuscula iungens, / construit angelicos turba verenda choros. / Gressibus exertis in opus venerabile constans, / vim factura polo, cantibus arma movet. / . . . / Pontificis monitis clerus, plebs psallit et infans, / unde labore brevi fruge replendus erit.' The translation is taken from C. Wright, *Music and Ceremony at Notre-Dame of Paris, 500–1550* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 41, and see pp. 41–60 for further discussion.

Thus, although not intended to portray the liturgy of the time, much can be gained by collating and co-ordinating the various bits and pieces of information conveyed by the available sources.[38] Together, all these pieces point to a rich and dynamic liturgical scene. Temporal and sanctoral feasts were celebrated throughout Frankish Gaul, and private masses were held for various occasions. There is little place to doubt that the composition of liturgical texts, to back up the intensive liturgical activity of the early Merovingian period, was also carried out, despite the fact that none of its literary products survives intact.

Still, the production of liturgical prayers and hymns in early Merovingian Gaul seems to be the preoccupation of ecclesiastical entrepreneurs, namely charismatic bishops and abbots, who sought to promote Christian observances and beliefs among their parishioners. Consequently, the liturgical practices which emerged from these efforts were extremely diverse and predominantly local. Not only were different saints commemorated in different dioceses and different prayers composed by different churchmen, but each bishop was also free to regularise and organise the liturgical celebrations in his own diocese.[39]

Late Merovingian Francia

More evidence for liturgical productivity comes from the later Merovingian period, primarily in the form of liturgical manuscripts and the Pseudo-Germanus' commentary on the mass.[40] These manuscripts are the best evidence for the prolific liturgical productivity of Merovingian Gaul, and juxtaposed with the information conveyed by non-liturgical sources, the structure and significance of the so-called Gallican liturgy begin to emerge. From among the many fragments and complete (more or less) liturgical manuscripts which survive, the most

---

[38] For such attempts, see H.G.J. Beck, *The Pastoral Care of Souls in South-East France during the Sixth Century*, Analecta Gregoriana 51 (Rome, 1950), especially pp. 95–154; Weidemann, *Kulturgeschichte der Merowingerzeit*, II, pp. 215–37; Hen, *Culture and Religion*, pp. 43–153.

[39] See, for example, the document drawn up at around 592 by Bishop Aunacharius of Auxerre (d. 605), *Institutiones de rogationibus et vigiliis*, which was incorporated into the *Gesta pontificum Autissiodorensium*, c. 19, ed. L. Duru, *Bibliothèque historique de l'Yonne*, 3 vols. (Auxerre, 1850–63), I, pp. 328–30. See also H. Atsma, 'Klöster und Mönchtum im Bistum Auxerre bis zum Ende des 6. Jahrhunderts', *Francia* 11 (1984), pp. 1–96, at 9–10 and 77–87; Hen, *Culture and Religion*, pp. 97–100.

[40] On this commentary, see above pp. 5–7.

---

notable are the Bobbio Missal,[41] the Old Gelasian Sacramentary,[42] the Gothic Missal,[43] the Old Gallican Missal,[44] the Frankish Missal,[45] and the Lectionary of Luxeuil,[46] to which other substantial fragments of sacramentaries and lectionaries, such as the Mone Masses,[47] the so-called palimpsest Sacramentary of Munich,[48] the palimpsest sacramentary of Milan,[49] or the Lectionary of Wolfenbüttel,[50] can be added.[51]

These liturgical compositions were compiled, partially composed for the first time, and later re-copied by men and women in religious communities throughout Gaul, mainly in the regions of Neustria and Burgundy, where active scriptoria flourished throughout the later

---

[41] Paris, BNF lat. 13246 (S-E France, s. viii); *CLA* V.653; *CLLA* 220. For an edition, see *The Bobbio Missal* (ed. Lowe).

[42] Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 316 + Paris, BNF lat. 7193, fols. 41–56 (Chelles/Jouarre, s. viii^med); *CLA* I.105; *CLLA* 610. For an edition, see *Sacramentarium Gelasianum* (ed. Mohlberg et al.).

[43] Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 317 (Burgundy, s. viii^in); *CLA* I.106; *CLLA* 210. For an edition, see *Missale Gothicum* (ed. Mohlberg).

[44] Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Pal. lat. 493 (?Chelles/Faremoutier/ Rebais, s. viii^1); *CLA* I.92–3; *CLLA* 212–14. For an edition, see *Missale Gallicanum Vetus* (ed. Mohlberg et al.).

[45] Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 257 (?Poitiers/Faremoutier/ Rebais, s. viii^1); *CLA* I.103; *CLLA* 410. For an edition, see *Missale Francorum* (ed. Mohlberg et al.).

[46] Paris, BNF lat. 9427 (Luxeuil, s. vii–viii); *CLA* V.579; *CLLA* 255. For an edition, see *Le lectionaire de Luxeuil* (ed. Salmon).

[47] Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Aug. CCLIII (?Reichenau, c. 760–80); *CLA* VIII.1102; *CLLA* 203. For an edition, see *Missale Gallicanum Vetus* (ed. Mohlberg et al.), pp. 61–91.

[48] Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14429 (?Ireland/Northumbria, s. vii^med); *CLA* IX.1298; *CLLA* 211. For an edition, see *Das irische Palimpsestsakramentar im Clm 14429 der Staatsbibliothek München*, ed. A. Dold and L. Eizenhöfer, Texte und Arbeiten 53–54 (Beuron, 1964). Copied, most probably, somewhere in the British Isles, this sacramentary is the most Gallican of all sacramentaries that survive. Yet, because of its Insular connections, the text of this manuscript should be handled with extreme caution. On the liturgical importance of this manuscript, see Y. Hen, 'Rome, Anglo-Saxon England, and the formation of the Frankish liturgy' (forthcoming).

[49] Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, M 12 sup. (S France, s. vii–viii); *CLA* III.354; *CLLA* 205. For an edition, see *Das Sakramentar im Schabkodex M 12 der Biblioteca Ambrosiana*, ed. A. Dold, Texte unde Arbeiten 43 (Beuron, 1952).

[50] Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Weissenburg 76 (S-E France, s. vi^in); *CLA* IX.1392; *CLLA* 35 and 250. For an edition, see *Das älteste Liturgiebuch der lateinischen Kirche*, ed. A. Dold, Texte und Arbeiten 26–28 (Beuron, 1936), and see the corrections suggested by Salmon in his edition of the Lectionary of Luxeuil.

[51] The amount of literature on all these manuscripts is enormous and cannot be listed here. For further bibliography, see *CLLA*; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*; McKitterick, 'Nuns' scriptoria'; Hen, *Culture and Religion*, pp. 44–7.

Merovingian period.[52] These ecclesiastical centres, whose active scriptoria and expanding libraries were the culmination of the intellectual life in Merovingian Gaul, were perceived by their contemporaries as authoritative religious centres.[53] Furthermore, a remarkable preoccupation with authority, orthodoxy and correctness, became the prevailing characteristic of those cultural centres.[54] This preoccupation manifested itself in the production of late Merovingian canon law collections, such as the *Collectio vetus Gallica*,[55] in the copying of authoritative texts,[56] and in the dissemination of approved guide-books, such as the anonymous *De libris recipiendis et non recipiendis* or the Jerome–Gennadius *De viris illustribus*.[57] Thus, it is no mere coincidence that some of these intellectual centres showed a distinctive interest in liturgy, and that most of the Merovingian liturgical manuscripts known to us today originated from these or related centres.

Yet, although their place of production is fairly clear, the origins and development of these liturgical compositions is very difficult to trace. We know neither the circumstances which inspired their composition, nor can we identify the liturgical sources which the compilers used in their work. Nevertheless, it is clear that all these manuscripts are based on earlier liturgical compositions, now lost, which were partly composed in Gaul, and partly adapted, paraphrased or simply reproduced from non-Gaulish liturgical traditions, such as the Roman or the Visigothic (Mozarabic). No single liturgical source can be identified as

[52] See, for example, J. Vezin, 'Les scriptoria de Neustrie, 650–850', in *La Neustrie*, ed. Atsma, II, pp. 307–18; R. McKitterick, 'The scriptoria of Merovingian Gaul: a survey of the evidence', in *Columbanus and Merovingian Monasticism*, ed. Clarke and Brennan, pp. 173–207 [reprinted in eadem, *Books, Scribes and Learning*, chapter I]; eadem, 'The diffusion of Insular culture in Neustria between 650 and 850: the implications of the manuscript evidence', in *La Neustrie*, ed. Atsma, II, pp. 395–432 [reprinted in eadem, *Books, Scribes and Learning*, chapter III].

[53] See, for example, D. Ganz, 'The Merovingian library of Corbie', pp. 153–72; idem, 'Corbie and Neustrian monastic culture', in *La Neustrie*, ed. Atsma, II, pp. 339–47; idem, *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance*, Beihefte der Francia 20 (Sigmaringen, 1991).

[54] See Hen, *Culture and Religion*, pp. 51–2.

[55] See H. Mordek, *Kirchenrecht und Reform*, pp. 79–96; idem, 'Kanonistische Aktivität in Gallien in der ersten Hälfte des 8. Jahrhunderts: eine Skizze', *Francia* 2 (1974), pp. 19–25; R. McKitterick, 'Knowledge of canon law in the Frankish kingdoms before 789: the manuscript evidence', *Journal of Theological Studies* 36 (1985), pp. 97–117 [reprinted in eadem, *Books, Scribes and Learning*, chapter II].

[56] Ganz, 'The Merovingian library of Corbie', pp. 153–72. See also the *Liber scintillarum*, which is a compilation of passages from the Bible and patristic authors put together *c.* 700 by Defensor, a monk from Ligugé near Poitiers. For an edition, see Defensor of Ligugé, *Liber scintillarum*, ed. H.-M. Rochais, SC 77 and 86 (Paris, 1961–2).

[57] McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word*, pp. 200–5.

the exemplar on which the various Merovingian liturgical handbooks are based, and indeed no such hypothetical source can be reconstructed from the manuscripts we possess.[58] Combing through the Merovingian sacramentaries, missals and lectionaries, one can clearly see how they differ from one another, and how diverse is the liturgical practice they represent.

To start with, one can list the differences in their content. The Old Gelasian Sacramentary contains a total of 289 masses, which are divided into three books each dedicated to a different cycle of liturgical prayers – one to the temporal cycle, one to the sanctoral cycle, and one book of various votive masses. The Gothic Missal contains seventy-nine masses which are dedicated to temporal and sanctoral feasts only. The Old Gallican Missal contains forty-nine masses, most of which are for Paschaltide. The Frankish Missal contains only twenty-three masses, mainly for various ordinations and saints' days, but with none for the temporal cycle. Finally, the Bobbio Missal contains in one book the masses for all three cycles together with three reading passages from the Bible for each of these masses. By contrast, the Lectionary of Luxeuil contains only the readings for the masses, without the celebrant's prayers and benedictions.[59]

Furthermore, the saints commemorated in each of these liturgical compositions are different. The Lectionary of Luxeuil, for instance, mentions Stephen, Mary, Peter, Paul and John the Apostles, John the Baptist, Julian, the Holy Innocents, and Geneviève of Paris.[60] The Bobbio Missal on the other hand, omits Julian and Geneviève but adds Michael, Martin and Sigismund.[61] The composer of the Gothic Missal chose to commemorate days in honour of more than twenty saints, and

[58] For an unconvincing attempt to reconstruct the supposed Roman book on which the Old Gelasian was based, see A. Chavasse, *Le sacramentaire gélasien (Vaticanus Reginensis 316). Sacramentaire presbytérial en usage dans les titres romains au VIIe siècle* (Paris and Tournai, 1957). Chavasse's reconstruction has not been generally accepted and is often criticised. See, for example, J. Janini, *Analecta Taraconensia* 31 (1958), pp. 196–8; C. Coebergh, 'Le sacramentaire gélasien ancien', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 7 (1961), pp. 45–88; J.D. Thompson, 'The contribution of *Vaticanus Reginensis* 316 to the history of western service books', *Studia Patristica* 13 (1975), pp. 425–9.

[59] On the Gallican reading system, see the introduction by Salmon in *Le lectionaire de Luxeuil*, pp. lxxxvii–xcii.

[60] *Le lectionaire de Luxeuil*, cc. 9–13, 16, 18, 22–3, 62–3 (ed. Salmon, pp. 11–20, 23–4, 27–57, 64–8, 177–84).

[61] *The Bobbio Missal*, cc. 393–7 and 334–8 (ed. Lowe, pp. 117–18 and 101–2).

the compiler of the Old Gelasian dedicated prayers to more than fifty.[62] The significant difference in the sanctoral cycle of each of these manuscripts is a direct outcome of the scope and nature of the cults of the saints in Merovingian Gaul. Unlike the temporal cycle, whose feasts were fixed and dictated universally, the cult of the saints was a very local activity. Different churches venerated different saints, and different dioceses enlarged their sanctoral cycle by absorbing different new saints, many of whom were local inhabitants of the region.[63] It is, therefore, not at all surprising to find different masses for different saints in each of the Merovingian sacramentaries, not to mention the various prayers which they include to unspecified martyrs, confessors, or virgins.[64]

The flexibility in the use of the prayers themselves is another element which points to the lack of any binding liturgical form. For example, the biblical readings listed by the Lectionary of Luxeuil for a mass *de uno confessore* (II Tim. iii.16–iv.8; Matt. xxv.14–21),[65] were assigned by the Bobbio Missal to a mass *in depositione sancti Martini*,[66] while the Bobbio prayer assigned to the very same feast of St Martin under the title *ad pacem*,[67] is incorporated both as the *collectio sequitur* for a mass in honour of one confessor in the Gothic Missal,[68] and as the preface to the mass *in natale sancti Marceli confessoris* in the Old Gelasian Sacramentary.[69] Even more confusing is the difference between the Merovingian lectionaries in assigning the reading passages to each of the various masses. While the Lectionary of Luxeuil and the Bobbio Missal agree in most cases about the biblical passages to be assigned to each occasion, they are significantly different from the palimpsest Lectionary of Wolfenbüttel, the Lectionary of Paris, the marginal notes to the Gospel Book of St Kilian, or the so-called Bobbio list of pericopes. Thus, for example, the readings which were listed by the

Lectionary of Luxeuil for the mass *in natale sancti Stephani* (Acts. vi.1–viii.2; Matt. xvii.23–xviii.11),[70] are largely different from the passages assigned to the very same mass by the Bobbio Missal (Rom. i.13–17; Matt. xvii.23–6),[71] the Lectionary of Wolfenbüttel (Heb. x.34–9; Matt. xvii.24–xviii.3), the Bobbio list of pericopes (Rom. i.13), or the marginal notes to the Gospel Book of St Kilian (Matt. xxiii.37–9).[72] Many more similar examples of such versatility in using and recycling existing prayers and readings can be found in the Merovingian sacramentaries and lectionaries.

Against the background of the evidence adduced above there is little place to doubt that the considerable diversity in liturgical celebration which characterised early Merovingian Gaul continued well into the later Merovingian period. This diversity is apparent on two different levels of liturgical practice. On the first level, different feasts for different saints were celebrated at different centres around Gaul, and thus turned the liturgical calendar into a very local one. Furthermore, different votive and private masses were celebrated by each of the sacramentaries we possess, probably in response to local demand and personal inclinations of the bishop who commissioned the book.[73] On the second level are the different prayers and reading passages that were assigned to the same mass by different sacramentaries and lectionaries. These reflect not only a diversity in local customs and usages, but also different ideals and standards on the part of the composers. Although commissioned by churches and monasteries throughout Gaul, these volumes enshrined the local predilections of the centres in which they were produced.[74]

The emergence of Merovingian royal patronage of liturgy

The early Merovingian kings and queens were not particularly interested in liturgy, as far as we can tell. Gregory of Tours recounts that King

---

[62] *Missale Gothicum*, cc. 25–50, 94–157, 322–6, 363–476 (ed. Mohlberg, pp. 9–16, 28–45, 81–2, 89–113).
[63] See Van Dam, *Saints and their Miracles*; Hen, *Culture and Religion*, pp. 82–120.
[64] See, for example, *Missale Gothicum*, cc. 432–71 (ed. Mohlberg, pp. 106–12); *The Bobbio Missal*, cc. 339–59 (ed. Lowe, pp. 102–7); *Missale Francorum*, cc. 92–120 (ed. Mohlberg, pp. 23–6); *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, II.804–5 and 1091–119 (ed. Mohlberg, pp. 129 and 166–9).
[65] *Le lectionaire de Luxeuil*, c. 68 (ed. Salmon, pp. 194–5).
[66] *The Bobbio Missal*, cc. 360–2 (ed. Lowe, pp. 107–8).
[67] *The Bobbio Missal*, c. 366 (ed. Lowe, p. 109).
[68] *Missale Gothicum*, c. 463 (ed. Mohlberg, p. 111).
[69] *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, II.810 (ed. Mohlberg, p. 130).

[70] *Le lectionaire de Luxeuil*, c. 10 (ed. Salmon, pp. 12–15).
[71] *The Bobbio Missal*, cc. 80–1 (ed. Lowe, pp. 27–8).
[72] See Salmon's comparative tables in *Le lectionaire de Luxeuil*, pp. civ–cv.
[73] On the development of private masses in Gaul, see Angenendt, 'Missa specialis', pp. 153–221. For a short summary of the various views, see the excursus by Storey and Rasmussen in Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 156–9.
[74] For some more evidence regarding the local variation in liturgical practices, see Bernard, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien*, pp. 652–4.

Chilperic 'composed some . . . short pieces, hymns and masses',[75] and on a different occasion he describes how King Gunthram solicited the prayers of the people at mass.[76] Baudonivia, a nun from Poitiers, relates how Radegund (d. 587), the widow of King Chlothar I (d. 561) and the mother superior of the convent at Poitiers, 'was always solicitous for peace and worked diligently for the welfare of the fatherland. Whenever the different kingdoms made war on one another, she prayed for the lives of the kings, for she loved them all. And she taught us also to pray incessantly for their stability.'[77] Yet there is no hint of large-scale royal patronage of liturgy in the sources from sixth-century Gaul.

This situation, however, changed significantly in the later Merovingian period. From the last decades of the sixth century and, more evidently, during the first half of the seventh century a new doctrine of kingship evolved in the Merovingian kingdoms, and Christian themes came to dominate ideas of rulership and government.[78] One manifestation of this shift of emphasis was the frequent recourse to biblical examples and citations, which denoted the new political thought.[79] Another manifestation was the emergence of liturgical patronage. Chants and prayers became an instrument by which heavenly protection could be sought for the benefit of the kingdom and its ruler, hence the patronage of liturgy became a major concern for the Merovingian kings and queens.[80] This liturgical interest had some considerable economic implications. Large amounts of landed property, precious objects and various immunities were bestowed upon monasteries and religious communities throughout

the Merovingian kingdom in order to secure their spiritual support.[81] In this sense, to paraphrase Paul Fouracre, the endowment of riches and the grant of immunity were a means of exchanging earthly property for supernatural power.[82] Furthermore, the production and copying of liturgical texts require not only willingness, intention and ability, but also appropriate material conditions. Thus, it has been realised that only a well-endowed Church could provide the proper liturgical support at which the Merovingians were aiming.[83]

The interest and concern of the Merovingian kings and queens in liturgy is amply attested in the sources from the seventh century. It was King Dagobert who first made an attempt to establish the *laus perennis* at Saint-Denis,[84] after heaping on the abbey a huge amount of treasure and landed property.[85] Although unsuccessful in the long term,[86] Dagobert's endeavour to institute a perpetual chant in Saint-Denis, following the model of Saint-Maurice of Agaune,[87] is an important turning point in the history of the royal patronage of liturgy in Frankish Gaul.[88]

Dagobert was by no means the first Merovingian to demonstrate some

---

[75] Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, VI.46 (ed. Krusch and Levison, p. 320): 'conficitque . . . et alia opuscula vel ymnus (*sic*) sive missas . . .'. One of Chilperic's hymns survives; see *Hymni latini antiquiores*, IX (ed. Bulst, p. 119).

[76] Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, VII.8 (ed. Krusch and Levison p. 331).

[77] Baudonivia, *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, c. 10, ed. B. Krusch, MGH SRM II (Hannover, 1888), p. 384: 'Semper de pace sollicita, de salute patriae curiosa, quandoquidem inter se regna movebantur, quia totos diligebat reges, pro omnium vita orabat et nos sine intermissione pro eorum stabilitate orare docebat' [trans. J.-A. McNamara, J. Halborg and E.G. Whatley, *Sainted Women of the Dark Ages* (Durham, NC, and London, 1992), p. 93]. For some perceptive notes on Baudonivia's description, see L.L. Coon, *Sacred Biography. Holy Women and Hagiography in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia, 1997), pp. 134–5.

[78] Ewig, 'Zum christlichen Köningsgedanken im Frühmittelalter', pp. 7–73; Anton, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos*, pp. 43–4; Wallace-Hadrill, *Early Medieval Kingship*, pp. 47–53.

[79] See Hen, 'The uses of the Bible', pp. 282–6.

[80] See Ewig, 'Das Privileg des Bischofs Berthefrid', pp. 112–13. See also Nelson, 'Queens as Jezebels', p. 68.

[81] On immunities and their implications in the Frankish kingdoms, see the superb study by Barbara Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*. See also G. Depeyrot, *Richesse et société chez les mérovingiens et carolingiens* (Paris, 1994), pp. 80–2.

[82] P. Fouracre, 'Eternal light and earthly needs: practical aspects of the development of Frankish immunities', in *Property and Power in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. W. Davies and P. Fouracre (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 53–81, at p. 80. See also McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints*, pp. 138–53.

[83] Geary, *Before France and Germany*, pp. 166–7.

[84] Fredegar, *Chronicorum liber quartus*, IV.79 (ed. Wallace-Hadrill, p. 68): '[P]sallencium ibidem ad instar monastiriae sanctorum Agauninsium instetuere (*sic*) iusserat.' See also Walters-Robertson, *The Service-Books of the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis*, pp. 13–18.

[85] Fredegar, *Chronicorum liber quartus*, IV.79 (ed. Wallace-Hadrill, pp. 67–8). See also the much later (*c.* 830) and, in many cases, unreliable *Gesta Dagoberti I*, cc. 7–11 (ed. Krusch, pp. 403–4); *Vita Eligii*, I.32 (ed. Krusch, pp. 688–9).

[86] See Fredegar, *Chronicorum liber quartus*, IV.79 (ed. Wallace-Hadrill, p. 68): '. . . sed facilletas abbatis Aigulfi eadem instetucionem nuscetur (*sic*) refragasse'.

[87] On the chanting instituted at Agaune, see Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, III.5 (ed. Krusch and Levison, p. 101). See also Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum*, pp. 102–4; I.N. Wood, 'A prelude to Columbanus: the monastic achievement in the Burgundian territories', in *Columbanus and Merovingian Monasticism*, ed. Clarke and Brennan, pp. 3–32, at 17–18; B.H. Rosenwein, 'Perennial prayer at Agaune', in *Monks and Nuns, Saints and Outcasts: Religion in Medieval Society. Essays in Honour of Lester K. Little*, ed. S. Farmer and B.H. Rosenwein (Ithaca and London, 2000), pp. 37–56.

[88] See, for example, E. Ewig, 'La prière pour le roi et le royaume dans les privilèges épiscopaux de l'époque mérovingienne', in *Mélanges offerts à Jean Dauvillier* (Toulouse, 1979), pp. 255–67.

interest in the cult and the abbey of Saint-Denis.[89] But it was under Dagobert's father, King Chlothar II (d. 639), and more evidently under Dagobert himself, that Saint-Denis became the focus of attention in the Merovingian court. In two charters granted to the monastery, Chlothar II characterises the saint as *peculiaris patronus noster*,[90] and Dagobert, as we have already noted, bestowed upon the monastery many gifts in lands, property and immunity.[91] It is impossible to estimate the amount donated to the abbey by Dagobert, because, as Wallace-Hadrill pointed out, 'a well-known group of falsified charters stand between the historian and this particular truth'.[92] Nevertheless, there is no place to doubt that Dagobert was responsible for enriching the abbey of Saint-Denis and promoting the saint's cult. So central was Dagobert's role in advancing the status of Saint-Denis, that early historians often described him not merely as the abbey's greatest benefactor, but also as its founder.[93]

According to the ninth-century *Gesta Dagoberti*, Dagobert felt obliged to donate all these riches to the abbey of Saint-Denis, because the saint had protected him during a quarrel with his father.[94] Whether this was the real impetus behind Dagobert's munificence to Saint-Denis, is impossible to confirm. Yet, although true piety as a motive for such royal acts should not be dismissed, there were some pragmatic reasons which might have influenced the king's decision. Dagobert, like his father before him, was dependent on the Church for its support and advice,[95] and through his outstanding donations and grants of immunity Dagobert ensured that the Church, and more particularly the abbey of

Saint-Denis, expanded its economic power.[96] Consequently, he secured its support and increased his chances for future salvation, for Dagobert expected in return the spiritual support of the monks.[97] Hence the attempt to establish the *laus perennis* at Saint-Denis. For the first time in the history of Frankish liturgy a clear connection between liturgy and royal patronage was established.

Dagobert's son and successor, Clovis II (d. 657) continued his father's concern for Saint-Denis and its patron saint.[98] He conferred huge estates on the monastery, granted it various immunities, and even managed to convince Bishop Landericus of Paris to grant the monks an immunity from episcopal interference.[99] Furthermore, in a charter of 22 June 654, Clovis II reinstituted the *laus perennis*, which his father had failed to establish at Saint-Denis.[100] In these acts, Clovis II established a model which was diligently followed by his widow, Queen Balthild, after his death in 657. Balthild's anonymous biographer relates that:

> . . . throughout the senior basilicas of Lord Denys, Lord Germanus, Lord Medard, St Peter, Lord Ainan, and St Martin or wherever her precept reached, she ordered the bishops and abbots, by persuading them for the zeal of Christ, and sent them letters to this effect, that the monks dwelling in these place ought to live under a holy regular order. And in order that they would freely acquiesce in this, she ordered a privilege to be confirmed for them and she also conceded them immunities so that she might better entice them to

[89] See, for example, Gregory of Tours, *Libri historiarum*, V.32 and 34 (ed. Krusch and Levison, pp. 237 and 240–1).

[90] See *ChLA* XIII.550 and 552, pp. 6–7 and 16–17 (also in MGH Diplomata, nos. 10–11, pp. 13–14).

[91] On Dagobert's munificence to Saint-Denis, see L. Levillain, 'Études sur l'abbaye de Saint-Denis à l'époque mérovingienne', *Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartes* 86 (1925), pp. 5–99, at p. 22; Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 126–9; L. Theis, *Dagobert. Un roi pour un peuple* (Paris, 1982), pp. 41–5; Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum*, pp. 163–7; S. McKnight-Crosby and P.Z. Blum, *The Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis from its Beginnings to the Death of Suger, 475–1151* (New Haven and London, 1987), pp. 29–50.

[92] J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Long-Haired Kings* (London, 1962), p. 224.

[93] See, for example, Aimoin of Fleury, *Gesta Francorum*, IV.17, ed. M. Bouquet, Receuil des historiens des Gaules et de la France 3 (Paris, 1869), pp. 125–6; *Les grandes chroniques de France*, ed. J. Viard, 10 vols. (Paris, 1920–53), II, pp. 180–1.

[94] *Gesta Dagoberti I*, cc. 7–9 (ed. Krusch, p. 403).

[95] See Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 154–5; Geary, *Before France and Germany*, pp. 151–4 and 165–7.

[96] It might also be, as suggested by Raymond Van Dam, that 'by promoting their own saints' cults at Paris, Soissons, and Chalon-sur-Saône the Merovingians had effectively created a buffer along the Seine and the Saône rivers between their primary interests in northern and eastern Gaul and St Martin's shrine at Tours'; see Van Dam, *Saints and their Miracles*, p. 27.

[97] See, for example, *ChLA* XIII.551, p. 10 (also in MGH Diplomata, no. 14, p. 16), where he states that he made and confirmed the donation '. . . pro regni stabeletate vel remedium (*sic*) animae nostrae . . .'.

[98] See Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 155–7.

[99] See *ChLA* XIII.555, 556, 558 and 559, pp. 26, 28–9, 36–7 and 44 respectively (also in MGH Diplomata, nos. 17–20, pp. 18–21); *Gesta Dagoberti I*, cc. 49–51 (ed. Krusch, pp. 423–5). See also Rosenwein, *Negotiating Space*, pp. 74–89.

[100] *ChLA* XIII.558, p. 37 (also in MGH Diplomata, no. 19, p. 20): '. . . nos . . . vise fuemus prestetisse, eo scilicet ordene, ut, sicut tempore domni et genetoris nostri ibidem psallencius per turmas fuit instetutus vel sicut ad monasthirium sancti Mauricii Agaunis, die noctoque, tenetur, ita in loco ipso celebretur'. Note that the scribe who wrote this charter confuses e for i as well as i for e and e for o throughout. On the institution of the *laus perennis*, see also Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 129–30; Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum*, pp. 105–6 and 168–9; J. Semmler, 'Saint-Denis: von der bischöflichen Coemeterialbasilika zur königlichen Benedictinerabtei', in *La Neustrie*, ed. Atsma, II, pp. 75–123, at 101–2; Robertson, *The Service-Books of the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis*, pp. 19–24.

exhort the clemency of Christ, the highest king, for the king and for peace. . . . However many she was able to attract, these she entrusted to the holy monasteries, and she ordered them to pray for her.[101]

Balthild and Ebroin, the Neustrian *maior domus*, strove together to extend centralised Neustrian power and to rearrange the ecclesiastical structure into a more efficient instrument of local government.[102] Consequently, Balthild founded and refounded monasteries, nominated bishops and abbots, and supported many religious communities throughout her realm. Ewig chose to call it *Klosterpolitik*,[103] and indeed, to judge from the sources, the queen's actions emerge as a well planned and tendentious policy. This, however, must not be taken to imply that political incentives were the sole motivation for the queen's acts, because Balthild also displayed an unambiguous religious piety as well as a deep concern for the religious life in Gaul.[104]

As far as the patronage of liturgy is concerned, Balthild's biographer bluntly stresses that she did it all in order to 'entice them [i.e. the monks and nuns] to exhort the clemency of Christ, the highest king, for the king and for peace', and, moreover, she ordered all those whom she entrusted to the monasteries to pray for her.[105] It is, then, not at all surprising that all those places mentioned above in relation to the liturgical production of late Merovingian Gaul had something to do with either Balthild or

Ebroin.[106] The material resources for the liturgical production of late seventh-century Gaul were supplied by Balthild's *Klosterpolitik*, which was motivated by both political expediency and religious piety. Following the pattern established by her late husband and his father, Balthild supported many monasteries throughout Neustria and Burgundy with various endowments and immunities, and she expected these religious communities to do the same with prayers.

Like Balthild's biography, there is plenty of evidence for the later Merovingian kings' and queens' concern for prayer on behalf of the country and on behalf of their own success. In the royal precept which appointed Desiderius to the see of Cahors, Dagobert ordered him to pray '. . . for us and for all the ranks of the Church'.[107] The biographer of Eligius of Noyon relates that '. . . anxious by [care for] peace and devoted to the well-being of his homeland, he prayed day and night for the quiet of the churches, wherever they are, and for the peace of the *princeps*'.[108] And even Marculf states in a *formula* of a royal letter to a bishop that 'Your highness should do without any delay [whatever] you ought to do in order to satisfy our wish, and in order to pray, you as well as your people, fully and in perpetual vigil for the stability of the our kingdom.'[109] No doubt, the liturgical practice of praying for the king and for the country became widespread during the seventh century, albeit the fact that Columbanus, when advised to do so, thought it was 'stultum' and 'religione alienum consilium'.[110]

It is, then, no mere coincidence that several of the liturgical books from late Merovingian Gaul contain prayers *pro rege*, *pro regibus* or *in pace*.[111] Let us cite in full the mass *pro regibus* of the Old Gelasian Sacramentary:

---

[101] *Vita sanctae Balthildis*, c. 9 (ed. B. Krusch, pp. 493–4): '. . . quod per seniores basilicas sanctorum domni Dionisii et domni Germani vel domni Medardi et sancti Petri vel domni Aniani seu et sancti Martini, vel ubicumque eius perstrinxit notitia, ad pontifices seu abbates suadendo pro zelo Dei praecepit et epistolas pro hoc eis direxit, ut sub sancto regulari ordine fratres infra ipsa loca consistentes vivere deberent. Et ut hoc libenter adquiescerent, privilegium eis firmare iussit, vel etiam emunitates concessit, ut melius eis delectaret pro rege et pace summi regis Christi clementiam exorare. . . . Quantas enim adtrahere potuit, eas per sancta coenobia commendavit et, ut pro exorarent, eis precepit' [trans. Fouracre and Gerberding, *Late Merovingian France*, pp. 125–6]. On the *Vita Balthildis*, see Fouracre and Gerberding, *Late Merovingian France*, pp. 97–118, and see there for further references.

[102] See Ewig, 'Das Privileg des Bischofs Berthefrid', pp. 106–14. See also Nelson, 'Queens as Jezebels', pp. 67–72; Gerberding, *The Rise of the Carolingians*, pp. 67–91; Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 197–202; Hen, *Culture and Religion*, pp. 54–6; Fouracre and Gerberding, *Late Merovingian France*, pp. 108–14.

[103] Ewig, 'Das Privileg des Bischofs Berthefrid', pp. 106–14; idem, 'Beobachtungen zu den Klosterprivilegien des 7. und frühen 8. Jahrhunderts', in *Adel und Kirche. Festschrift G. Tellenbach*, ed. J. Fleckenstein and K. Schmid (Freiburg, 1968), pp. 52–65 [reprinted in Ewig, *Spätantikes und fränkisches Gallien*, II, pp. 411–26].

[104] See, for example, *Vita sanctae Balthildis*, cc. 8–11 (ed. Krusch, pp. 491–7).

[105] *Vita sanctae Balthildis*, c. 9 (ed. B. Krusch, pp. 493–4).

[106] See Hen, *Culture and Religion*, pp. 54–5.

[107] *Vita Desiderii Cadurcae urbis episcopi*, c. 13, ed. B. Krusch, MGH SRM IV (Hannover, 1902), p. 572: '. . . pro nobis et pro universis ordinibus ecclesiae'.

[108] *Vita Eligii*, II.8 (ed. Krusch, p. 701): '. . . qui de pace sollicitus, de salute patriae curiosus die nocteque pro quiete ecclesiarum, quae ubique sunt, ac pro pace principum supplicabat'.

[109] Marculf, *Formularum libri duo*, I.6, ed. A. Uddholm (Uppsala, 1962), p. 48: 'Agat ergo almitas vestra, ut et nostrae voluntatis devotione incunctanter debeatis inplere, et tam vos quam ipse pro stabilitate regni nostri iugi invigilatione plenius exoretis.'

[110] See *Vita Columbani abbatis discipulorumque eius libri duo*, I.28, ed. B. Krusch, MGH SRM IV (Hannover, 1902), p. 105, where one of Columbanus' Frankish companions suggested that he should pray for the victory of King Theudebert II at the battle of Tolbiac.

[111] See, for example, *The Bobbio Missal*, cc. 492–6 (ed. Lowe, pp. 151–3); *Missale Francorum*, c. 13 (ed. Mohlberg, pp. 20–1); *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, III.56–62 (ed. Mohlberg et al., pp. 213–18). Some of these masses were analysed by McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, pp. 344–7.

ANOTHER MASS FOR KINGS

O God, protector of all the kingdoms and of the greatest Roman empire, let your servants N., our kings, adorn the triumph of your virtue skilfully, so that they, who are *principes* by your command, may always be powerful in their duty.

O God, in whose hand lay the hearts of the kingdoms, lend the ears of your compassion to our humble prayers and give the guidance of your wisdom to our *principes*, your servants, so that drinking from your fountain for their assemblies they may please you and may rise above all the kingdoms.

SECRET: Accept, O Lord, the supplicant prayers and sacrifice of your Church for the safety of N., your servant, and work the old miracles of your arm for the protection of the faith of the people, so that after the enemies of peace are surpassed, the secure Roman freedom may serve you.

DURING THE ACT: Thus, O Lord, accept this oblation of your servant N., which we offer you by the ministry of the sacerdotal office, just as you regarded it worthy to bestow upon him the power of ruling, gracious and generous [as you are] receive [him under your protection]; and implored grant our entreaty, so that confident in the protection of your majesty, he may be blessed with age and kingdom.

AFTER COMMUNION: O God, who prepared the eternal Roman empire by evangelical predicting, present the celestial arms to your servants N., our *princeps*, so that the peace of the churches may not be troubled by the storm of wars.[112]

---

[112] *Sacramentarium Gelasianum*, III.62.1505–9 (ed. Mohlberg et al., pp. 217–18):

ITEM MISSA PRO REGIBUS

Deus, regnorum omnium et romani maximae protector imperii, da servis tuis regibus nostris *illis* triumphum virtutis tuae scienter excolere, ut cuius constitutione sunt principes, eius semper munere sint potentes. Per.

Deus, in cuius manu corda sunt regum, inclina ad praeces humilitas (*sic*) nostrae aures misericordiae tuae ut principibus nostris famulis tuis *illis* regimen tuae adpone sapientiae, ut austis de tuo fonte consiliis et tibi placeant et super omnia regna praecellant. Per.

SECRETA: Suscipe, domine, praeces et hostias aecclesiae tuae pro salute famuli tui *illius* subplicantes et protectione fidelium populorum antiqua brachi (*sic*) tui operare miracula, et superatis pacis inimicis secura tibi serviat romana libertas. Per.

INFRA ACTIONEM: Hanc igitur oblacionem, domine, famuli tui *illius*, quam tibi ministerio officii sacerdotalis offerimus, pro eo quod in ipsum potestatem imperii conferre dignatus es, propicius et benignus adsume; et exoratus nostra obsecratione concede, ut maiestatis tuae protectione confidens et euo augeatur et regno. Per.

These and similar prayers from Merovingian sacramentaries beseech God to protect the kingdom's peace, to secure its stability, and to grant victory to the ruler. It is true that the later Merovingian liturgy stresses the war-like aspects of kingship.[113] Nevertheless, these prayers express a genuine concern for the general well-being of the kingdom. The idea of such services was, no doubt, an inheritance of late antique and Byzantine traditions.[114] Yet, the Merovingians harnessed those traditions and anchored them in a complex network of patronage, endowments and liturgical practice.

Unfortunately, there is almost no evidence for royal patronage of liturgy from the first half of the eighth century, apart from some of the liturgical manuscripts mentioned above, which were copied in Merovingian monasteries that benefited from royal munificence, mainly in the regions of Neustria and Burgundy. Yet, it seems that the precedent of Dagobert, Clovis II and, more importantly, Balthild did not disappear after Balthild's forced retirement to the nunnery of Chelles in 664/5. The fact that the Carolingians, from Pippin III onwards, acted in the very same pattern established by the later Merovingians, implies that the lesson had not been completely forgotten.

POST COMMUNIONEM: Deus, qui praedicando aeterni regni evangelio romanum imperium praeparasti, praetende famulis tuis *illis* principibus nostris arma caelestia, et pax aecclaesiarum nullo turbetur tempestate bellorum. Per dominum.

[113] McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, pp. 344–6; Hen, 'The uses of the Bible', pp. 286–9.

[114] See, for example, McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, especially pp. 238–52. See also P. Bernard, 'La "liturgie de la victoire". Mise en scène du pouvoir, *ordo missae* et psalmodie responsoriale dans l'Antiquité tardive et le haut Moyen Age. Réflexions à partir de l'*Expositio* du Pseudo-Germain de Paris', *Ecclesia orans* 13 (1996), pp. 349–406.

2

Pippin III and the Illusion of Liturgical Reforms

The central theme in Frankish history of the late seventh and the early eighth century is the rising power of the Carolingian house. The involvement of the Carolingians in the politics of early medieval Gaul started at a fairly early stage of Merovingian history. Already in 613 Arnulf of Metz (d. 640/1) and Pippin I (d. 640), the ancestors of the Carolingians, supported the Merovingian king Chlothar II in his bid for power over the entire Frankish kingdom.[1] Yet it was mainly Pippin II (d. 714), Charles Martel (d. 741) and Pippin III (d. 768), who achieved for their house a foremost position among the Frankish nobility. With a strong political and financial base in Austrasia, Pippin II, the Austrasian *maior domus*, managed to bring under his control Neustria and Burgundy as well. Little by little, with a combination of military victory, family and land-holding policy, and *Klosterpolitik*, Pippin II used the very same methods deployed by the Merovingians in order to increase his area of influence and to create new political allegiances.[2]

Pippin II's effective successor, Charles Martel, continued his father's policy. After a short period of political and military turmoil, during which he had to establish his position as Pippin's successor, Charles Martel, backed with a strong support of several Frankish aristocrats, assumed power first in Austrasia and then in Neustria and Burgundy. As

the *maior domus* of both Austrasia and Neustria–Burgundy, Charles Martel did more than any of his ancestors to consolidate the political dominance of the Carolingian house in the Frankish kingdom. Like his predecessors, Charles Martel nominated bishops and abbots, bestowed a large amount of landed property on ecclesiastical institutions, and supported the activities of several missionaries.[3] Thus, using the same methods as Dagobert I, Clovis II and Balthild, the early Carolingians managed to increase their influence over the greater part of the Frankish kingdom. Whether they also patronised liturgy, is not at all clear. A certain mass in the Bobbio Missal reads:

> . . . So may he vivify, save, guard and preserve our *princeps*, always victorious, against all enemies . . .[4]

Eugen Ewig wondered whether the *princeps* of this specific mass is connected with Charles Martel, for the Bobbio prayers, according to him, reflect the political thought of the seventh century.[5] There is no way to confirm or refute such a suggestion, but it is more likely that this specific mass, entitled by Mabillon 'missa pro principe', is a reflection of Burgundian–Agaune tradition,[6] and the use of the term *princeps* is merely a manner of speech, which goes back to Roman–imperial tradition.

Another piece of evidence which might point to the early Carolingians' interest in liturgy comes from a little poem composed, most probably, in the Merovingian court:

> The clerics sing hymns
> In the court of the king and the magnates;
> It drove far off secular talks,
> Remembering the splendid divine meal:
> An unrestrained language was burning with flames.[7]

---

[1] Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 140–9; Gerberding, *The Rise of the Carolingians*, pp. 6–9; N. Gauthier, *L'évangélisation des pays de la Moselle. La province romaine de Première Belgique entre Antiquité et Moyen Age (IIIe–VIIIe siècle)* (Paris, 1980), pp. 371–83.

[2] On the rise of the Carolingians under Pippin II, see McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms*, pp. 22–30; Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 255–66; Gerberding, *The Rise of the Carolingians*, pp. 95–115; Riché, *Les Carolingiens*, pp. 37–43; Schieffer, *Die Karolinger*, pp. 26–33; I. Heidrich, 'Les maires du palais neustriens du milieu du VIIe au milieu du VIIIe siècle', in *La Neustrie*, ed. Atsma, I, pp. 217–29; P. Fouracre, 'Observations on the outgrowth of Pippinid influence in the "Regum Francorum" after the battle of Tertry (687–715)', *Medieval Prosopography* 5 (1984), pp. 1–31.

[3] On Charles Martel and his activities, see McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms*, pp. 30–3; Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 267–303; Gerberding, *The Rise of the Carolingians*, pp. 116–45; Riché, *Les Carolingiens*, pp. 44–60; Schieffer, *Die Karolinger*, pp. 34–49; Fouracre, 'Frankish Gaul to 814', pp. 87–94; and see the various papers in *Karl Martell in seiner Zeit*, ed. Jarnut et al., many of which convincingly lay to rest the idea of a deliberate 'secularisation' of church property by Charles Martel.

[4] *The Bobbio Missal*, c. 492 (ed. Lowe, p. 151): '. . . Ita principem nostrum semper victorem contra cunctus adversarius vivificit, psaluit, tuaeatur, conseruit . . .'.

[5] Ewig, 'Zum christlichen Königsgedanken im Frühmittelalter', p. 42, n. 181.

[6] See Hen, 'The uses of the Bible', pp. 286–7 with n. 62.

[7] On this poem, see D. Norberg, *La poesie latine rythmique du haut Moyen Age*, Studia Latina Holmiensia 2 (Stockholm, 1954), pp. 54–9, the citation is from p. 58: 'Ymnorum

Dag Norberg suggested that in these lines the poet refers to a situation, in which the *aula regis et potentis personae* is clearly the court of the Merovingian king, controlled by the *maior domus*.[8] If indeed that is the case, then it was possibly the *maior domus* himself who gave the impetus for the singing of hymns at the royal court. Nevertheless, there is no firm evidence which points to either Pippin II or Charles Martel.

Pippin III and the reform of the Church

In 741, shortly before his death, Charles Martel divided the Frankish kingdoms between his two sons, Carloman and Pippin III. Carloman succeeded his father in Austrasia, and Pippin III became the *maior domus* of Neustria and Burgundy.[9] However, six years later, Carloman decided to relinquish his worldly state and join the monastery on Mount Soracte near Rome. Pippin III was left as the sole *maior domus* over the entire Merovingian territory. His area of influence was vast, but Pippin III was even more ambitious. Backed with papal approval, 'Pippin was elected king according to the custom of the Franks, anointed by the hand of Archbishop Boniface of saintly memory, and raised to the kingship by the Franks in the city of Soissons. Childeric, who was falsely called king, was tonsured and sent into a monastery.'[10] Hence Pippin III, the most powerful man in the Frankish kingdom, was elevated from the position of *maior domus* to the state of *rex Francorum*.

When Pippin assumed power over the Frankish kingdom, the reform of the Frankish Church had already begun at the inducement of Boniface

---

sonus modulantur clerici / ad aulam regis et potentes personae; / procul exclusit saeculares fabulas, / memora divae epulae esplendidae; / flammas exurit defrenata lingua.'
[8] Ibid., p. 59.
[9] On the opposition which accompanied the accession of Carloman and Pippin III, see McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms*, pp. 33–8; Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 287–90; Fouracre, 'Frankish Gaul to 814', pp. 94–6; Riché, *Les Carolingiens*, pp. 61–9.
[10] *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a. 750 (ed. Rau, p. 14): 'Pippinus secundum morem Francorum electus est ad regem et unctus per manum sanctae memoriae Bonifacii archiepiscopi et elevatus a Francis in regno in Suessionis civitate. Hildericus vero, qui false rex vocabatur, tonsuratus est et in monasterium missus' [trans. Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles*, p. 39]. The amount of literature on Pippin III's coup is enormous and cannot be listed here. For some general discussion, see McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms*, pp. 35–8; Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 290–2; Fouracre, 'Frankish Gaul to 814', pp. 96–7; Riché, *Les Carolingiens*, pp. 73–8; Schieffer, *Die Karolinger*, pp. 50–69. On Pippin III's relations with the papacy, see Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter*, pp. 65–94; Fritze, *Papst und Frankenkönig*, pp. 63–94.

(d. 754) and under the auspices of Charles Martel and subsequently Carloman.[11] Like Caesarius of Arles two hundred years before him, Boniface wanted to bring the Frankish Church into line with ecclesiastical norms from which he thought it had deviated.[12] Thus, throughout most of his mission on the Continent, Boniface was preoccupied with the enhancement of ecclesiastical rules and regulations and with the reorganisation of the Frankish Church.[13] At a fairly early stage of his mission, Boniface travelled to Rome to seek the pope's approval for his activities, and supported by the early Carolingians he completed the reorganisation of the Church east of the Rhine by the early 740s.[14] Under Carloman, Boniface became one of the most influential bishops in the Frankish kingdom, but not for long. After Carloman's retirement, Boniface seems to have had little access to the Frankish court and consequently little influence on the Frankish Church.

---

[11] On Boniface and his mission, see Levison, *England and the Continent*, pp. 70–93; Schieffer, *Winfrid–Bonifatius*; Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 143–61; Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 302–21; *The Greatest Englishman. Essays on St. Boniface and the Church at Crediton*, ed. T. Reuter (Exeter, 1980); R. McKitterick, *Anglo-Saxon Missionaries in Germany: Personal Connections and Local Influences*, Vaughan Paper 36 (Leicester, 1991) [reprinted in eadem, *The Frankish Kings and Culture*, chapter I]; L.E. von Padberg, *Mission und Christianisierung. Formen und Folgen bei Angelsachsen und Franken im 7. und 8. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1995); P. Brown, *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200–1000* (Oxford, 1996), pp. 254–75. For further bibliography, see *Patrologia* IV, ed. di Berardino, pp. 404–11.
[12] See R.A. Markus, 'From Caesarius to Boniface: Christianity and paganism in Gaul', in *The Seventh Century: Change and Continuity*, ed. J. Fontaine and J.N. Hillgarth (London, 1992), pp. 154–68; A. Angenendt, 'Pirmin und Bonifatius: ihr Verhältnis zu Mönchtum, Bischofsamt und Adel', in *Mönchtum, Episkopat und Adel zur Gründungszeit des Klosters Reichenau*, ed. A. Borst (Sigmaringen, 1974), pp. 251–304; H. Löwe, 'Pirmin, Willibrord und Bonifatius: ihre Bedeutung für die Missionsgeschichte ihrer Zeit', in *La conversione al cristianesimo nell'Europa dell'alto medioevo*, Settimane 14 (Spoleto, 1967), pp. 327–72 [reprinted in idem, *Religiosität und Bildung im frühen Mittelalter* (Weimar, 1994), pp. 133–77].
[13] Schieffer, *Winfrid–Bonifatius*, pp. 139–57; H.J. Schüssler, 'Die fränkische Reichsteilung von Vieux-Poitiers (742) und die Reform der Kirche in den Teilreichen Karlmanns und Pippins. Zu den Grenzen der Wirksamkeit des Bonifatius', *Francia* 13 (1986), pp. 47–112; T. Reuter, '"Kirchenreform" und "Kirchenpolitik" im Zeitalter Karl Martells: Begriffe und Wirklichkeit', in *Karl Martell in seiner Zeit*, ed. Jarnut et al., pp. 35–59; R. McKitterick, 'England and the Continent', pp. 72–6.
[14] See Boniface, *Epistolae* 48, 50 and 51 (ed. Tangl, pp. 76–8, 80–6 and 86–92). See also H. Löwe, 'Bonifatius und die bayrische fränkische Spannung: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Beziehungen zwischen dem Papsttum und den Karolingern', *Jahrbuch für fränkische Landesforschung* 15 (1955), pp. 85–128; F. Staab, 'Die Grundung der Bistümer Erfurt, Büraburg und Würzburg durch Bonifatius im Rahmen der fränkischen und päpstlichen Politik', *Archiv für mittelrheinische Kirchengeschichte* 40 (1988), pp. 13–41; McKitterick, 'England and the Continent', pp. 73–5.

A close examination of the sources reveals that Boniface and his Carolingian patrons were not particularly interested in reforming the Frankish liturgy, and that liturgical matters were brought forward only in a very general way. The so-called *Concilium Germanicum*, which was convened by Boniface and Carloman in 742, states that

> We have also decreed according to the canons of the saints, that each priest living in a *parochia* is subordinated to the bishop in whose *parochia* he lives, and that always in Lent he should report to the bishop and reveal the way and the manner [in which he administers] his duty, regarding baptism, the Catholic faith, and prayers.[15]

Pippin III was not slow to follow suit with a Neustrian Church council held at Soissons in 744, which reinforced the decrees of the Austrasian Church council of 742 and thus declares:

> And each priest, who is in a *parochia*, should be obedient and is subordinated to the bishop, and always in Maundy Thursday he should report to the bishop on the way and manner [in which he administers] his duty, he should seek chrism and oil and, whenever the bishop according to the canon law travels around the *parochia* to confirm the people, the bishops, the abbots and the priests should be ready to assist the bishop in need.[16]

Liturgy, it seems, was not high on the lists of reforms promulgated by Boniface and the Carolingian *maiores*, for both Carloman and Pippin III mentioned liturgical practices only in broad outlines.[17] Could it be that liturgical patronage and liturgical reforms in the later Merovingian period were perceived as a royal prerogative? Unfortunately, there is no evidence to support such an hypothesis, but, interestingly enough, all the evidence for early Carolingian involvement in the liturgical affairs of

---

[15] *Concilium Germanicum (742)*, c. 3 (ed. Werminghoff, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, I, p. 3): 'Decrevimus quoque secundum sanctorum canones, ut unusquisque presbiter in parrochia habitans episcopo subiectus sit illi, in cuius parrochia habitet, et semper in quadragesima rationem et ordinem ministerii sui, sive de babtismo sive de fide catholica sive de precibus et ordine missarum, episcopo reddat et ostendat.' See also *Concilium Romanum (743)*, cc. 13–14 (ed. Werminghoff, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, I, p. 18).
[16] *Concilium Suessionense (744)*, c. 4 (ed. Werminghoff, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, I, p. 35): 'Et unusquisque presbyter, qui in parrochia est, episcopo oboediens et subiectus sit et semper in caena Domini rationem et ordinem ministerii sui episcopo reddat et crisma et oleo petat et, quando iure canonico episcopus circumeat parrochiam ad confirmandum populum, episcopi sive abbati sive presbyteri parati sint ad suscipiendum episcopo in adiutorium necessitatis.'
[17] See Vogel, 'Les échanges liturgiques', pp. 194–7.

---

the Frankish kingdom refers to the period following the institution of Pippin III as *rex Francorum*.

Several unrelated pieces of evidence, all later than the time of Pippin III, present Pippin as the first Carolingian ruler to reform the liturgy of Frankish Gaul. The most general reference comes from a letter of Charles the Bald, in which he reminds the clergy of Ravenna that

> For until the time of my great-grandfather Pippin, the divine office was celebrated in the Churches of Gaul and Spain differently than in the Churches of Rome and Milan.[18]

More specific are two references from the time of Charlemagne. In his *Admonitio generalis* of 789 Charlemagne orders the clergy that

> . . . they are to learn the Roman chant thoroughly and that it is to be employed throughout the office, night and day, in the correct form, in conformity with what our father of blessed memory, King Pippin, strove to bring to pass when he abolished the Gallican chant for the sake of unanimity with the apostolic see and the peaceful harmony of God's holy church.[19]

Similarly, in his so-called *Epistola generalis*, Charlemagne states that

> Furthermore, fired by the example of our father Pippin, of reverend memory, by whose zeal all the Churches of the Gauls became graced by singing in the Roman tradition, we, with wise judgement are no less concerned to embellish them with a series of readings of great excellence.[20]

Thus, Pippin III was clearly associated with the introduction of the

---

[18] *Epistola Karoli Calvi Imp. ad clerum Ravennatem*, in Jacob, 'Une lettre de Charles le Chauve', p. 417: 'Nam et usque tempora abavi nostri Pippini Gallicanae et Hispaniae ecclesiae aliter quam Romana vel Mediolanensis ecclesiae divina officia celebrabant.' Jacob cites the edition of S. Baluze, *Capitularia regum Francorum* (Paris, 1677), II, col. 730, which was also cited by J.D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 31 vols. (Florence, 1759–98), XVIII B, col. 502. On this letter and its authenticity, see Jacob, 'Une lettre de Charles le Chauve'.
[19] *Admonitio generalis*, c. 80 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 22, p. 61): 'Omni clero. Ut cantum Romanum pleniter discant, et ordinabiliter per nocturnale vel gradale officium peragatur, secundum quod beatae memoriae genitor noster Pippinus rex decertavit ut fieret, quando Gallicana tulit ob unanimitatem apostolicae sedis et sanctae Dei aeclesiae pacificam concordiam' [trans. King, *Charlemagne*, p. 218].
[20] *Karoli epistola generalis* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 30, p. 80): 'Accesit praeterea venerandae memoriae Pippini genitoris nostri exemplis, qui totas Galliarum ecclesias Romanae traditionis suo studio cantibus decoravit, nos nihilominus solerti easdem curamus intuitu praecipuarum insignire serie lectionum' [trans. King, *Charlemagne*, p. 208].

cantus Romanus into Francia, and consequently he was credited for replacing the *cantus Gallicanus* with what was understood to be Roman musical tradition. In two other independent accounts this reform of the Gallican chant is closely linked with Pope Stephen's visit to the Frankish court at Ponthion in 754. The *Libri Carolini* relate that

> [The Frankish Church] had always maintained a unity of holy religion with [the Roman Church] and differed from it but little – not as touching the faith, that is, merely in the celebration of services: now, thanks to the care and energy of the most illustrious and excellent man (our father of blessed memory) King Pippin and in consequence of the coming to Gaul of the most reverend and most holy Stephen, bishop of Rome, it is entirely at one with it in the order of chanting.[21]

And Walahfrid Strabo recounts that it was Pippin himself who asked the pope to bring with him some material to enable this reform:

> In fact, when Pope Stephen came into Francia to Pippin, Emperor Charles the Great's father, to seek justice for St Peter against the Lombards, his clergy brought the more perfect knowledge of plain-chant, which almost all Francia now loves, to Pippin at his request. From that time onward its use was validated far and wide.[22]

If taken at face value, all the sources adduced above indicate that Pippin III did indeed make an effort to replace the Gallican chant by importing and introducing Roman musical traditions.[23] Similar efforts

---

[21] *Libri Carolini*, I.6 (ed. Freeman, pp. 135–6): 'Quae dum a primis fidei temporibus cum ea perstaret in sacrae religionis unione et ab ea paulo distaret – quod tamen contra fidem non est – in officiorum celebratione, venerandae memoriae genitoris nostri inlustrissimi atque excellentissimi viri Pippini regis cura et industria sive adventu in Gallias reverentissimi et sanctissimi viri Stephani Romanae urbis antestitis est ei etiam in psallendi ordine copulata, ut non esset dispar ordo psallendi, quibus erat conpar ardor credendi' [trans. Bullough, 'Roman books', pp. 7–8].

[22] Walahfrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis*, c. 26 (ed. Harting-Corrêa, pp. 168–9): 'Cantilenae vero perfectiorem scientiam, quam iam pene tota Francia diliget, Stephanus papa, cum ad Pippinum patrem Karoli Magni imperatoris in Franciam pro iustitia sancti Petri a Langobardis expetenda venisset, per suos clericos petente eodem Pippino invexit, indeque usus eius longe lateque convaluit.' On the fact that Walahfrid Strabo did not know the *Libri Carolini*, see ibid., pp. 230–1.

[23] It has been suggested that this was under the influence of the papal delegation which accompanied Pope Stephen on his visit to Pippin's court in 754, among which were two of the two chief instructors of the Roman *schola cantorum* – the *primicerius* Ambrose and the *secundicerius* Boniface. See Walters-Robertson, *The Service-Books of the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis*, pp. 28–9. On the composition of the delegation that accompanied Pope Stephen in 754, see *Liber pontificalis*, c. 94 (ed. Duchesne, I, p. 446–7).

---

were also made by two leading ecclesiastical figures from the time of Pippin III, namely Chrodegang of Metz (d. 766), one of Pippin's closest advisers, and Remedius of Rouen (d. 771), Pippin's own half-brother, both of whom set up schools of chants following the Roman model.[24] Remedius even brought to Rouen Symeon, a *secundarius* from the Roman *schola cantorum*, in order to teach the Roman chant to his clergy.[25] However, Cyrille Vogel warns us against such a narrow interpretation of the sources. According to him, there is no way in which Pippin or any churchman of his time could adopt only the Roman chant, without reforming the entire liturgy to conform with the Roman practice. Therefore, he argues, Pippin III's reforms should be understood as a broader and more comprehensive enterprise than our sources imply.[26] A hint towards that direction, according to Vogel, is given by Paul the Deacon's (d. 799) description of the reformatory activities of Chrodegang of Metz, in which he writes that Chrodegang '. . . instructed the clergy, who were already trained abundantly in the divine law and the Roman chant, to keep the custom and the practice of the Roman Church',[27] and thus stresses the reforms of the entire *ordo*, rather than the chant alone.

As for the nature of Pippin's reforms, Vogel is in no doubt that the sources are right and that shortly after Pope Stephen's visit to Francia Pippin initiated a concerted effort to reform the liturgy of the Frankish Church in accordance with Roman practices. But why did Pippin and his advisers feel it necessary to Romanise the Frankish liturgy and to standardise it according to what they understood to be the Roman practice? Vogel, again, offers a threefold explanation to that. Firstly, by the time Pippin III seized power over Francia the Frankish liturgy was in a state of anarchy and decline, and only tattered remnants of the Gallican

---

[24] On Chrodegang and his reformatory zeal, see Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 174–6; G. Oexle, 'Die Karolinger und die Stadt des heiligen Arnulf', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 1 (1967), pp. 250–364; E. Ewig, 'Saint Chrodegang et la réforme de l'église franque', in *Saint Chrodegang*, pp. 25–53; Vogel, 'Saint Chrodegang', pp. 91–109; CSL I, pp. 270–5. On Remedius of Rouen, see Bernard, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien*, pp. 729–32.

[25] *Codex Carolinus*, no. 41 (ed. Gundlach, pp. 553–4). Remedius became bishop of Rouen in 755.

[26] Vogel, 'Les échanges liturgiques', pp. 231–3; idem, 'La réforme cultuelle', pp. 180–2.

[27] Paul the Deacon, *Gesta episcoporum Mettensium*, c. 37, ed. G.H. Pertz, MGH SS II (Hannover, 1829), p. 268: '. . . clerum abundanter lege divina Romanaque imbutum cantilena, morem atque ordinem Romanae ecclesiae servare praecepit . . .'. See also Bernard, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien*, pp. 725–9.

service books were left.[28] In a letter from about 835, cited by Vogel to support his argument, Abbot Hilduin of Saint-Denis (d.c. 844) complains to Louis the Pious on the shameful state of the Gallican service books,[29] and therefore, concludes Vogel, any reform of the liturgy had to rely on imported liturgical sources. Such sources were sent to Pippin from Rome, as attested by a letter from 758, in which Pope Paul I reports to Pippin that he sent him all the books he could find, that is, 'antiphonale et responsale, insimul artem gramaticam Aristolis, Dionisii Ariopagitis geometriam, orthographiam, grammaticam, omnes Greco eloquio scriptas, necnon et horologium nocturnum'.[30]

Secondly, by the time Pippin began his official effort to reform the Frankish liturgy, the Romanisation process had already begun, and it was irreversible.[31] Furthermore, Pippin III, according to Vogel, felt a real veneration for all things Roman, so there was no reason for him to try and stop the aforesaid Romanisation process of the Gallican rite.[32]

Lastly, and most significantly, Vogel stresses the political reasons which might have promoted the Romanisation of the Gallican rite. On the one hand, 'Liturgical unification would both foster unity within the kingdom and help to consolidate the alliance between the Holy See and the Frankish monarchy.'[33] On the other hand, reforming the liturgy of the Frankish Church in accordance with the Roman practice would also be an effective means to eliminate and by-pass the various Byzantine influences on the Gallican rite – an act which might be interpreted as a more general declaration of independence *vis-à-vis* Byzantium.[34]

Vogel's triple explanation, however, is not entirely convincing. As

---

[28] Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 149; idem, 'Les échanges liturgiques', p. 234; idem, 'La réforme cultuelle', pp. 182–3; idem, 'Les motives de la romanisation', pp. 17–20.

[29] Hilduin, *Epistolae* 5–6, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epp. 5 (Berlin, 1899), p. 300. Some scholars in the past have wished to conflate Hilduin of Saint-Denis with Hilduin, archbishop of Cologne (d. 855), arguing that after the death of Louis the Pious, the one-time chancellor left Louis' kingdom and joined Lothar, his long-time friend, and was made archbishop of Cologne (though he was never consecrated); see, for example, M. Lapidge, 'The lost *Passio metrica S. Dionysii* by Hilduin of Saint-Denis', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 22 (1987), pp. 56–79. This suggestion, however, is still disputed, see, for example, P. Riché, *Dictionnaire des Francs. Les Carolingiens* (Paris, 1997), pp. 123–4.

[30] *Codex Carolinus*, no. 24 (ed. Gundlach, p. 529).

[31] Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 149–50; idem, 'Les échanges liturgiques', pp. 236–7; idem, 'La réforme cultuelle', pp. 183–4; idem, 'Les motives de la romanisation', pp. 35–6.

[32] Vogel, 'Les échanges liturgiques', pp. 234–5; idem, 'La réforme cultuelle', p. 183; idem, 'Les motives de la romanisation', pp. 36–7.

[33] Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 150.

[34] Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 150; idem, 'Les échanges liturgiques', pp. 235–7; idem, 'La réforme cultuelle', pp. 183–5; idem, 'Les motives de la romanisation', pp. 37–41.

---

we have seen in the previous chapter, the state of the Frankish liturgy was in no decline during the later Merovingian period. On the contrary; liturgical manuscripts were still copied in Merovingian scriptoria and a fair amount of creativity was demonstrated by Merovingian compilers.[35] Vogel, it seems, like many scholars before him,[36] interprets the diversity which characterised Merovingian liturgical production as anarchy and decline, and therefore provides a misleading picture of the liturgical situation of Merovingian Gaul. The fact that Hilduin complains in a letter to Louis the Pious on the state of the old Gallican service books, must not be taken to imply that these were already tattered by the middle of the eighth century, but rather that they were in a bad condition when Hilduin wrote his letter, after almost a century of progressive deterioration. All that Hilduin says is that the state of these books deteriorated since the introduction of the Roman practice.[37] Similarly, Vogel's political explanation is based on some misleading assumptions. Firstly, it is doubtful whether liturgical unification with Rome can indeed foster unity within the kingdom or consolidate the alliance with the Papacy. Secondly, the Gallican rite as we know it today from the available sources was not influenced by Byzantine liturgical traditions.[38]

If neither Merovingian decline nor political or personal predilection provide a satisfactory trigger for Pippin's reforms, then what could? According to Philippe Bernard, the Frankish reform movement and, subsequently, the Romanisation of the Gallican rite were initiated and provoked by the Papacy and supported by the Carolingian rulers. The idea to reform the Frankish Church, he argues, like the idea of sacral kingship, was based on the model of the Old Testament kings. It was not a way simply to legitimise the coup of 751, but rather a way to establish Pippin with the *auctoritas* of the pope. Thus, the liturgical reforms which Rome urged Pippin to embrace were promulgated first and foremost because of religious reasons and not because of politics, as thought by Vogel.[39] To justify his observations, Bernard outlines the emergence

---

[35] See Hen, *Culture and Religion*, pp. 70–1; Hen, 'Unity in diversity', pp. 19–30; Bernard, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien*, pp. 656–60 and 687–93.

[36] See, for example, Bishop, *Liturgica historica*, p. 15; *Les 'ordines romani'* (ed. Andrieu), I, pp. xvii–xx.

[37] Bernard, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien*, pp. 656–7.

[38] See Bernard, Du chant romain au chant grégorien, pp. 693–5.

[39] Bernard, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien*, pp. 698–704. This argument is basically derived from Klauser; see T. Klauser, *A Short History of Liturgy. An Account and some Reflections*, trans. J. Halliburton, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1979), p. 73.

of the alliance between the Papacy and the early Carolingians. This alliance, according to him, was formed in three stages. The first stage took place under Pippin II and Charles Martel, and it involved three different steps – the arrival of Willibrord (d. 739) on the Continent in 690 and his visit to Rome at the behest of Pippin II; the mission of Winfrith who also visited Rome, whence he was given the name Boniface; and the special assignment of being the protector of the Roman Church proposed in 739 to Charles Martel by Pope Gregory III. The second stage, according to Bernard, was the first reformatory council of the Frankish Church, which was convened by Boniface in 743 under the auspices of Carloman. Finally, and more importantly, is the advice given by Pope Zacharias to Pippin III in 751, which inspired Pippin to organise a coup.[40] Thus, concludes Bernard, 'l'hypothèse d'une mesure avant tout politique visant à affermir l'unité du *regnum* franc (un seul *regnum*, une seule liturgie) ne tient donc pas. Il faut plutôt tenir compte de la sincère admiration éprouvée par les Pippinides pour la Rome des empereurs et pour ceux qui ont conservé et transmis leur œuvre, les papes.'[41]

It is possible that the early Carolingians, from the time of Pippin II onwards, had some special reverence towards Rome and the Papacy. Yet, this reverence is hardly seen in the incidents cited by Bernard. It is a well known fact that Pippin II supported the missionary activity of Willibrord, and that Charles Martel and subsequently Carloman supported Boniface. Yet, the visits of these two missionaries to Rome cannot serve as an indication of Pippinid reverence to the city and its pope. Willibrord visited Rome twice, and only his second visit to the city, in 695, was made at the encouragement of Pippin II.[42] As to Boniface's visit to Rome in 719, there is no indication whatsoever that it was made at the suggestion or with the support of Charles Martel. Could it be, therefore, that some other reasons than Pippinid reverence towards

Rome brought these missionaries to the papal court? I would argue that it was probably their Anglo-Saxon background which fostered the close relations with Rome and urged Anglo-Saxon missionaries, like Wilfrid, Willibrord or Boniface, to get a papal approval for their mission on the Continent. As already noted by Wilhelm Levison, 'the English Church had been founded and organised by papal emissaries and was conscious of this origin'.[43] Consequently, appeal to the pope in important ecclesiastical matters was a normal course of action in Anglo-Saxon England throughout the early Middle Ages.[44] No wonder, then, that the author of the ninth-century *Gesta abbatum Fontanellensium* could describe the Anglo-Saxons as 'qui maxime familiariores apostolicae sedi semper existunt'.[45] Hence, neither the mission of Willibrord, nor that of Boniface can help us to detect Pippinid attitudes toward the Papacy. Likewise, the appeal made by Pope Gregory III to Charles Martel in 739 is also inadequate evidence for Charles Martel's reverence towards Rome. After all, Charles refused to accept the title and its inherent burden.[46] This is definitely not the kind of response one would expect from a *maior domus* whose reverence for the pope was as great as some scholars would like us to believe.

The second stage in Bernard's hypothesis on the early Carolingian alliance with the Papacy is also based on shaky ground. There is no doubt that Carloman was deeply committed to Church reforms and that his support was a crucial factor in the success of Boniface's mission. Yet, as we have already seen, the *Concilium Germanicum* of 743 had very little Romanisation to offer, if at all, and it seems that the issues discussed in this council as well as its decrees had more to do with Boniface's own preoccupations and ideas of reform than with Carloman's piety or reverence to Rome.[47] Lastly, Bernard's strong emphasis on Pope Zacharias' response to Pippin III's query in 751 is questionable,

---

[40] Bernard, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien*, pp. 701–4.

[41] Ibid., p. 704.

[42] See Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, V.11, ed. B. Colgrave and R.A.B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969; rev. ed. 1991), pp. 484–7; Alcuin, *Vita Willibrordi*, cc. 6–7, ed. W. Levison, MGH SRM VII (Hannover, 1920), pp. 81–141, at 121–2; and see also the note in *The Calendar of Saint Willibrord*, ed. H.A. Wilson, HBS 55 (London, 1918), fol. 39v, marginal note. For some discussions of Willibrord's career, see Levison, *England and the Continent*, pp. 45–59; Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms*, pp. 317–21. See also the two recent volumes of papers dedicated to Willibrord and his time, *Willibrord Apostel der Niederlande Gründer der Abtei Echternach*, ed. G. Kiesel and J. Schroeder (Luxembourg, 1989); *Willibrord, zijn Wereld en zijn Werk*, ed. P. Bange and A.G. Weiler (Nijmegen, 1990).

[43] Levison, *England and the Continent*, p. 15

[44] Ibid., pp. 15–44; M. Deanesly, 'The Anglo-Saxon Church and the Papacy', in *The English Church and the Papacy in the Middle Ages*, ed. C.H. Lawrence (London, 1965), pp. 29–62; Mayr-Harting, *The Coming of Christianity*, especially pp. 144–7. This reverence towards Rome and the Papacy stands in sharp contrast to the Merovingian general indifference, see Hen *Culture and Religion*, pp. 58–9; Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 110–22.

[45] *Gesta abbatum Fontanellensium*, c. 14 (ed. Löwenfeld, p. 42).

[46] See *Codex Carolinus*, no. 1–2 (ed. Gundlach, pp. 476–9); Fredegar, *Chronicorum liber quartus*, Cont. 22 (ed. Wallace-Hadrill, p. 96). On this incident, see J. Jarnut, 'Die Adoption Pippins durch König Liutprand und die Italienpolitik Karl Martells', in *Karl Martell in seiner Zeit*, ed. Jarnut et al., pp. 217–26, especially pp. 222–4.

[47] See McKitterick, 'England and the Continent', pp. 75–6.

especially since Rosamond McKitterick has convincingly argued that the entire episode is nothing more than a later Carolingian fiction.[48]

The abortive attempt to find the reasons behind the Romanisation of the liturgy under Pippin III raises one of the major problems in our investigation – the nature of our sources and the relationship they bear to changing realities. None of the above-cited sources on the liturgical reforms of Pippin III is contemporary with the reforms themselves. Could it be that these sources reflect something other than the reality they report upon? Is it possible that our sources cast Pippin as a reformer, because at the time they were written reform and uniformity in compliance with Roman practices were perceived as the attribute of a good ruler, and thus were already part and parcel of the prevailing political ideology? I would argue that this is exactly the case with the available evidence on Pippin's liturgical reforms. Thus, these documents should not be understood as an accurate report on Pippin's actions, but rather as a reflection of the political ideology and political discourse which developed in the court of Charlemagne and his successors, and which will be discussed more fully in the following chapters. Bearing this in mind, how are we to interpret the liturgical transformation in the time of Pippin III? Unfortunately, we can portray this transformation only in broad lines, and hope for some new evidence to be unearthed.

When Pippin III assumed power over the Frankish kingdom, the Romanisation of the Frankish liturgy had already begun. Various Roman liturgical books found their way to Merovingian Gaul and, as we have noted in the previous chapter, they were amply used by Merovingian compilers.[49] Furthermore, some liturgical practices were even officially introduced by the Merovingian Church councils, like the second Council of Vaison (529) which introduced the *Kyrie eleison* and the *Sanctus*, and demanded their incorporation into every mass.[50] Yet, as Klauser and subsequently Vogel have pointed out, there was no organised attempt to Romanise the Gallican rite, nor did the popes make

---

[48] See R. McKitterick, 'The illusion of royal power in the Carolingian annals', *English Historical Review* 460 (2000), pp. 1–20. This could also explain why two of our sources on the liturgical reforms of Pippin III associate the beginning of Romanisation with the year 754.

[49] See Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 147–8; idem, 'Les échanges liturgiques', pp. 188–97; idem, 'La réforme cultuelle', pp. 174–5.

[50] *Concilium Vasense (5 Nov. 529)*, c. 3 (ed. Gaudemet and Basdevant, *Les canons des conciles mérovingiens*, I, p. 190).

---

any effort to promote the Roman liturgy outside the city of Rome.[51] Pippin III, it seems, simply continued the liturgical policy of his Merovingian predecessors.

In a charter from 753, for example, Pippin confirms the various grants made to the abbey of Saint-Denis '. . . because of God and the reverence to the above mentioned St Denys the Martyr, for the salvation of our soul and for the stability of the kingdom of the Franks, as well as for [the sake] of our sons and their successors . . .', and he explains to Abbot Fulrad (d. 784) and his monks that he did it all '. . . so that it may please them all the more to beseech God's mercy more attentively for the stability of our kingdom and for all our men, and so that always and perpetually he may increase [the prayers] for the sake of God'.[52] In another charter to the abbey of Flavigny, to give just one more example, Pippin III urges the monks to pray earnestly for himself and for his family, present and future, and to chant psalms daily.[53] This is precisely how the later Merovingians, among them Dagobert I, Clovis II and Balthild, patronised liturgy.

There is, however, further evidence which supports the notion that liturgy was indeed close to Pippin's heart. In 765, after a harsh famine, Pippin made an effort to organise liturgical services on a broader scale, and thus he wrote to Bishop Lull of Mainz (d. 786) that

> We understand that it is known to your holiness, what kindness and compassion has God conferred on this land during the present year. He brought about distress because of our faults, but after the distress he brought about big and extraordinary consolation and abundance of crops, which we are just having. And because of that and for other reasons of ours it seems to us necessary to thank

---

[51] T. Klauser, 'Die liturgischen Austauschbeziehungen zwischen der römischer und der fränkisch-deutscher Kirche vom 8. bis zum 11. Jahrhundert', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 53 (1933), pp. 169–89; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 147–8; idem, 'Les échanges liturgiques'. pp. 188–97. See also Hen, 'Unity in diversity'.

[52] *Diplomata Pippini, Carlomanni, Caroli Magni*, no. 6 (ed. Mühlbacher, p. 10): '. . . propter deum et reverencia prefati sancti Dionisii martyris seu pro animae nostrae remedium (sic) vel stabilitate regni Francorum et filiis nostris vel posteritate eorum. . . . ut eis melius delectet pro stabilitate regni nostri vel pro cunctis leudis nostris domini misericordia adtencius deprecare et ut aevis et perennis temporibus ad ipsa causa dei proficiat in augmentum'. On Fulrad, see A. Stocklet, *Autour de Fulrad de Saint-Denis (v. 710–784)* (Geneva, 1994).

[53] *The Cartulary of Flavigny*, no. 3 (ed. Bouchard, pp. 33–4): '. . . ut suscipiatis illam piscinam nomine Glenonem ad opus fratrum, ut habeant inde fratres refectionem et orent assidue tam pro me quam pro omni progenie mea praesenti et futura, et precor ut per omnem diem unum psalmum canatis'.

---

him, because it is appropriate for your servants to console his distress. So it seems to us that, without any fast being declared, each and every bishop should arrange for a litany in his diocese, not with a fast, but only to praise God, who gave us such an abundance; and each and every man should give alms and pass it to the poor. And thus you should provide and arrange exactly as we ordered, that each and every man, whether he want it or not, should give his tithe.[54]

Whether these acts were inspired by the liturgical processions of Rome, by the rogation days instituted in late antique Gaul, or by the exhortation of Boniface, is unknown. But Pippin's attempt to establish such a procession is evidently a clear sign of his interest in and patronage of liturgy.

It is also highly probable that Pippin and his wife, Bertrada, patronised an atelier or a group of connected ateliers which produced some mid- and late-eighth-century *de luxe* sacramentaries, such as the Old Gelasian, the Frankish Missal and the Old Gallican Missal.[55] Furthermore, as our sources specifically report, Pippin made an effort to introduce the Roman chant into Francia, probably under the influence of his half-brother Remedius of Rouen and his close adviser Chrodegang of Metz, who was a great admirer of the Roman rite.[56] This narrow interpretation also accords with the two liturgical books (an antiphonary and a *responsale*) sent by Pope Paul I to Pippin. All these acts of royal patronage, although undoubtedly pointing to the interest of Pippin III in liturgy, do not justify the image of Pippin as the first 'real' Carolingian

---

[54] Lull, *Epistola* 118 (ed. Tangl, p. 254): 'Cognitum scimus sanctitati vestrae, qualem pietatem et misericordiam Deus fecit presenti anno in terra ista. Dedit tribulationem pro delictis nostris, post tribulationem autem magnam atque mirabilem consolationem sive habundantiam fructus terrae, quae modo habemus. Et ob hoc atque pro alias causas nostras opus est nobis illi gratias agere, quia dignatus est servis suis consolare per eius misericordiam. Sic nobis videtur, ut absque ieiunio indicto unusquisque episcopus in sua parochia letanias faciat, non cum ieiunio nisi tantum in laude Dei, qui talem nobis habundantiam dedit; et faciat unusquisque homo sua elimosina et pauperes pascat. Et sic previdere faciatis et ordinare de verbo nostro, ut unusquisque homo, aut vellet aut nollet, suam decimam donet.' It is probable that other bishops in Pippin's kingdom received similar letters.
[55] See McKitterick, 'Royal patronage of culture', pp. 99–103; Hen, *Culture and Religion*, p. 57.
[56] Not only did Chrodegang visit Rome and bring back with him some knowledge of the Roman chant and of the *ordo Romanae ecclesiae*, he also established in Metz a system of stations similar to the Roman one; see T. Klauser, 'Eine Stationsliste der Metzer Kirche aus dem 8. Jahrhundert wahrscheinlich ein Werk Chrodegangs', *Ephemerides liturgicae* 44 (1930), 162–93; Bernard, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien*, pp. 725–9.

---

reformer of the Frankish liturgy, under whom the first 'official' steps towards the Romanisation of the rite were made. Pippin III indeed continued a long tradition of liturgical patronage which characterised the Merovingian rulers of Gaul. Yet, he did not attempt to eliminate the prevailing indigenous Gallican practices, and he did not initiate an official liturgical reform to replace those practices with a new Roman tradition. This notion gets some substantial support from a close examination of two pivotal groups of liturgical compositions from the time of Pippin III – the eighth-century Gelasian sacramentaries and the various collections of Roman *ordines*. While the former are often described as the most important product of the allegedly official attempt to Romanise the Frankish liturgy under Pippin III, the latter are thought to be the instrument *par excellence* for such reforms. Let us, then, examine each of these sources in some detail.

The eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentaries

Shortly after 750, a Frankish clergyman from the entourage of Pippin the Short, probably at the encouragement of the king himself, had the idea to compose a sacramentary by using as a model the Gelasian [Sacramentary] (of the Vat. lat. 316 type) and a Gregorian [sacramentary] (of the Padua D 47 type), which circulated around the Frankish territories for a long time; the compiler also used Gallican books and the Leonine [Sacramentary]. The result was the so-called eighth-century Gelasian – the title does not reflect the syncretic character of the book – of which neither the original nor the archetype is preserved, but which we know from many manuscripts that derived from it.[57]

This is how Cyrille Vogel describes the basic character of the so-called eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary, also know as the Frankish Gelasian, the Mixed Gelasian, the Young Gelasian (*Junggelasiana*), the Sacramentary of King Pippin III, or the Sacramentary of St Boniface. As Vogel points out, we know of the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary only from a series of a dozen or so manuscripts which transmit what are thought to be derivative versions of the original copy.[58] Thus, the only

---

[57] Vogel, 'Les échanges liturgiques', p. 237; idem, 'La réforme cultuelle', p. 186.
[58] The most important manuscripts of this type of sacramentary are listed by Metzger, *Les sacramentaires*, pp. 107–8; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 71–3. See also *CLLA* 801–98.

reliable information on the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary comes from a careful comparison of the different versions which survive with one another and with other types of early medieval sacramentaries. The rest, one must admit, is a mere exercise in intellectual guesswork.[59]

The various versions of the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary which survive have several peculiar features in common. Firstly, all these sacramentaries 'have a certain Benedictine flavour about them', for they provide a set of masses for the feast of St Benedict and his name appears in the *communicantes* of the Canon.[60] Secondly, all these sacramentaries commemorate the feast of the Frankish saint Praiectus (d. 676), and they all have a mass in honour of St Chrysogonus (d. *c.* 304), thought to be rewritten when his basilica was restored in Rome under Pope Gregory III (d. 741).[61] Finally, and more importantly, all these sacramentaries show a great similarity to one another in terms of content, arrangement and use of prayers, on account of which a single archetype for all these sacramentaries was postulated. When, where and by whom this archetype was composed, is not at all clear.

The *terminus post quem* for the composition of the archetype of the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentaries is the pontificate of Gregory II (d. 731), for the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentaries contain masses for the Thursdays of Lent, which before that time had not yet been incorporated into the liturgy. Yet, if one accepts the fact that the mass in honour of St Chrysogonus was introduced to the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary following the restoration of his basilica in Rome, then the date of composition must be later. The *terminus post quem non* is obviously the date of the earliest derivative manuscript, that

[59] The following discussion on the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentaries is based on A. Chavasse, 'Les sacramentaire gélasien du VIIIe siècle: ses deux principale formes', *Ephemerides liturgicae* 73 (1959), pp. 249–98; idem, *Les sacramentaires dans le groupe dit 'gélasiens du VIIIe siècle*, 2 vols., Instrumenta Patristica 14 (Steenbrugge, 1984); Moreton, *The Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary*; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 70–8; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 69–72; Metzger, *Les sacramentaires*, pp. 107–13. See also M. Klöckener, 'Sakramentstudien zwischen Fortschritt und Sackgass', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 32 (1990), pp. 207–30.
[60] Moreton, *The Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary*; pp. 15–16; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 73.
[61] See L.C. Mohlberg, 'Elementi per precisare l'origine del sacramentario Gelasiano del secolo VIII', *Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia* 7 (1932), pp. 19–32; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 73–4; and compare B. Moreton, 'Mohlberg, Chrysogonus, and the eighth-century Gelasians', in *Studia Patristica* 10, ed. F.L. Cross, Texte und Untersuchungen 107 (Berlin, 1970), pp. 391–5. See also B. Moreton, 'A pastoral festival? Saint Praiectus and the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary', *Journal of Theological Studies* 27 (1976), pp. 370–80.

is, the Sacramentary of Gellone, which is dated to the last decade of the eighth century.[62] However, bearing in mind that even the Sacramentary of Gellone shows some signs of liturgical evolution beyond the archetype, it is clear that the archetype's date of composition should be earlier than the date of the Gellone manuscript itself. Hence, scholars have reached the conclusion that the archetype of the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary was assembled by a team of Benedictine monks late in the reign of Pippin III.[63]

Where the archetype was composed is also a mystery. But again the eighth-century Gelasians' peculiarities may give us a clue. The relics of the Frankish martyr Praiectus, who is commemorated by all the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentaries, were housed at the monastery of Volvic in the Auvergne.[64] In 755, however, his body was transferred to the Benedictine monastery of Flavigny in Burgundy,[65] which was already dedicated to Praiectus,[66] and which enjoyed the patronage of Pippin III. In about 750 Pippin donated a fishpond to the monks of Flavigny and in 755 he supervised the translation of the saint's bones to the abbey's church.[67] Thus, although in the past scholars have tried to attribute the composition of the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary to Boniface, Remedius of Rouen or Chrodegang of Metz,[68] on the basis of the evidence adduced above it is better to identify the compiler of the eighth-century Gelasian with a monk or a group of monks from Volvic or, more likely, Flavigny.[69]

What about the content of this new sacramentary? It is commonly accepted nowadays that the eighth-century Gelasian sacramentaries are

[62] Paris, BNF lat. 12048 (Meaux; 790–800);*CLA* V.618; *CLLA* 855. For an edition, see *Liber sacramentorum Gellonense* (ed. Dumas and Deshusses).
[63] *Liber sacramentorum Gellonense* (ed. Dumas and Deshusses), II, pp. xxiii–xxvi; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 75–6.
[64] See *Passio Praiecti episcopi et martyris Arverni*, ed. B. Krusch, MGH SRM V (Hannover, 1910), pp. 225–48. See also AASS, Jan. II (Antwerp, 1643), pp. 628–30.
[65] See Hugo of Flavigny, *Chronicon*, I (ed. Pertz, p. 351). On the fact that Flavigny followed the Benedictine rule, see Prinz, *Frühes Mönchtum*, p. 281.
[66] See the will of its founder, Widerad, dated to 717, in *The Cartulary of Flavigny*, no. 1 and 57 (ed. Bouchard, pp. 13–17 and 135–40).
[67] See *The Cartulary of Flavigny*, no. 3 (ed. Bouchard, pp. 33–4); Hugo of Flavigny, *Chronicon*, I (ed. Pertz, p. 351).
[68] On all these theories, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 119–20, n. 195.
[69] See, for example, *Liber sacramentorum Gellonense* (ed. Dumas and Deshusses), II, p. xxiii; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 74. Moreton, however, argues that the archetype was produced by a Benedictine community in the Rhaetian Alps, on account of the fact that the derivative versions from that area are the least affected by outside traditions. See, Moreton, *The Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary*, p. 173.

basically Gallican modifications of Roman usage (similar to the one represented by the ninth-century Sacramentary of Padua),[70] based on earlier Frankish exemplars of the Old Gelasian Sacramentary and with ample use of prayers from the later Merovingian period.[71] The Old Gelasian, we must remember, although evidently compiled from *libelli missarum* used in seventh-century Rome, has some distinctive Gallican characteristics, and it is obvious that Gallican elements were crucial in its compilation.[72] Similarly, Gallican elements were crucial in the gathering of the eighth-century Gelasians, and thus if one is looking for Romanisation, this is the wrong place to look for it. Both the Old Gelasian and the eighth-century Gelasians are significantly different from the liturgical compositions known to us from Italy and Rome, and although Roman material is embedded in many of their prayers, these sacramentaries are basically Frankish prayer-books for the use of the Frankish Church. Furthermore, these sacramentaries preserve many Frankish practices, such as rogation days,[73] consecration of churches,[74] and more significantly, the Frankish episcopal blessings which were despised and harshly condemned by Pope Zacharias in a letter to Boniface.[75] As far as liturgical uniformity is concerned, there is no doubt that the eighth-century Gelasian sacramentaries demonstrate a high degree of structural unity, which undoubtedly derives from the fact that all surviving manuscripts can be traced back to a single archetype. However, even within this unity, a striking degree of diversity was

---

[70] Padua, Biblioteca Capitolare D 47 (S. Germany; s. ix^{med}); *CLLA* 880. For an edition, see *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses, I, pp. 609–84). On the Sacramentary of Padua, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 92–7, and see the further bibliography listed there.

[71] See Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 74–5; Moreton, *The Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary*, passim.

[72] See above, pp. 29–31. See also Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 66–9, for an excellent summary of research on the Old Gelasian. For some new observations on the Old Gelasian, see Y. Hen, 'The liturgy of St Willibrord', *Anglo-Saxon England* 26 (1997), pp. 41–62, especially at 48–53.

[73] See, for example, *Liber sacramentorum Gellonense*, cc. 131–6 (ed. Dumas and Deshusses, I, pp. 121–4).

[74] See, for example, *Liber sacramentorum Gellonense*, cc. 356–68 (ed. Dumas and Deshusses, I, pp. 360–75).

[75] See Boniface, *Epistola* 87 (ed. Tangl, p. 198): 'Pro autem benedictionibus, quas faciunt Galli, ut nosti, frater, multis vitiis variantur. Nam non ex apostolica traditione hoc faciunt, sed per vanam gloriam operantur sibi ipsis dampnationem adhibentes . . . .' On these episcopal blessings, see E. Dekkers, ' "Benedictiones quas faciunt Galli". Qu'a voulu demander saint Boniface?', in *Lateinische Kultur im VIII. Jahrhundert. Traube-Gedenkschrift*, ed. A. Lehner and W. Berschin (Saint-Ottilien, 1989), pp. 41–6.

---

created by various alterations, additions and omissions.[76]

Pippin's interest in Flavigny and the fact that he regarded St Chrysogonus, to whom a mass is dedicated in the eighth-century Gelasians, as his *protector* must not be taken to imply that he was personally involved in the compilation of the archetypal sacramentary. We have no evidence for such royal involvement in the compilation process, nor do we have any evidence which suggests a royal involvement in its dissemination and distribution. Nevertheless, shortly after its production, the eighth-century Gelasian enjoyed a vast circulation, as the various manuscripts of its derivative versions suggest. Why it was so popular within the Frankish Church, one could only guess. According to Bernard Moreton, 'since there is no evidence of any official interest in the book, it is most probable that whatever authority it possessed was given neither by contemporary civil or ecclesiastical powers, nor indeed by the name of Gelasius, but was inherent in the Sacramentary itself, a manifestly convenient collection of the tradition'.[77] It is highly probable that the new sacramentary was appreciated by contemporary ecclesiastics as a more complete, more up-to-date and more handy composition, properly adapted to the Frankish rite. This explains not only the local variations and alterations in the various derivative versions, but also the fact that even after the official introduction of the *Hadrianum* by Charlemagne, eighth-century Gelasian sacramentaries were still being copied in the Frankish kingdom. Yet, it could also be that the archetype of the eighth-century Gelasian sacramentaries was perceived as a sacramentary with some kind of royal approval, because it was produced in a monastery that enjoyed the king's patronage and it commemorated the king's own patron saint. Thus, it is possible that Pippin III's munificence to Flavigny and his personal connection with the cults of Praiectus and Chrysogonus, might have had some strong implications on the promotion and dissemination of the eighth-century Gelasian sacramentaries.[78]

---

[76] See Moreton, *The Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary*, pp. 170–2; idem, 'The *liber secundus* of the eighth-century Gelasian sacramentaries: a reassessment', in *Studia Patristica* 13, ed. E.A. Livingstone, Texte und Untersuchungen 116 (Berlin, 1975), pp. 382–6.

[77] Moreton, *The Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary*, pp. 173–4.

[78] One should not underestimate the influence of royal connections, even if not direct or explicit, on the attitudes of their people. See, for example, the influence of royal conversion on the conversion of their people, discussed in C.E. Stancliffe, 'Kings and conversion: some comparisons between the Roman mission to England and Patrick's to Ireland', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 14 (1980), pp. 59–94; R. Collins, 'King Leovigild and the conversion of the Visigoths', in *El Concilio III de Toledo. XIV centenario (589–1989)* (Toledo, 1991), pp. 1–12.

The Ordines Romani *and other liturgical compositions from the time of Pippin III*

As with the sacramentaries, there is no evidence that Pippin III or his advisers commissioned or encouraged the compilation and copying of other types of liturgical literature. Nevertheless, several liturgical compositions from the time of Pippin III survive, and scholars have turned to them in order to confirm their assertions on the Romanisation of the Frankish rite and, by implication, to confirm their views on the allegedly 'official reform' of the liturgy directed by Pippin. Yet, when examined carefully and placed against the broader liturgical context of the later Merovingian and the early Carolingian period, these sources seems rather less suggestive.

Let us take for example the *ordines*.[79] Like the *libelli missarum* which formed the basis for the Gallican sacramentaries, the Roman *ordines* made their way to Gaul in a somewhat sporadic and haphazard manner, and as a result of private initiatives. In Francia these *ordines* were gradually adapted for use in the Frankish Church (and not the other way around as one would expect if an official Romanisation of the cult was at stake), and subsequently gathered in small collections of *ordines*. This is the way we encounter these *ordines*, and it is worthwhile noting that no such collections from outside the Frankish kingdom survive, and none of them survives in a manuscript earlier than the late eighth or even the early ninth century. This fact is of crucial significance when the place of such texts in the Romanisation process of the Frankish liturgy is assessed.

The earliest collection (A) is thought to be purely Roman, and according to scholars who have studied the *ordines*, was put together in Francia sometime around 700–50, although its earliest manuscript is dated to the beginning of the ninth century.[80] Yet even this collection, we are told, shows some significant signs of Frankish alterations.[81] Surely,

this collection, like the *libelli missarum* which left Rome for Gaul, may have contributed to the spread of Roman usage in the Frankish kingdoms. Yet, there is no evidence which connects the compilation of this collection to Pippin III's initiative or to his supposedly 'official Romanisation of worship', and there are major difficulties in regarding this collection as part of an intentional Romanisation of the rite.

All subsequent collections of *ordines* show even stronger signs of adaptation to the Frankish usage. The Gallicanised collection (B), for example, was assembled in Lotharingia during the early years of Louis the Pious' reign, and 'was not only better adapted to Frankish conditions than Collection A, it was deliberately designed for ordinary episcopal use'.[82] Similarly, the collection of Saint-Amand, thought to be copied in Saint-Amand late in Pippin III's reign or early in Charlemagne's, the collection of Saint-Gall, copied around 775–80 by an Austrasian or a Burgundian monk, and the other lesser collection,[83] are all examples of the 'Gallicanisation' of the Roman *ordines* circulating in Gaul. Furthermore, I would argue that it is no mere coincidence that the earliest manuscripts of the *ordines* are dated to the later years of Charlemagne's reign or the early years of Louis the Pious'. Such collections, as we shall see later, would fit perfectly the liturgical trends and the political ideology that nourished liturgical patronage at the end of the eighth and the beginning of the ninth century.

An examination of other liturgical compositions, such as the lists of liturgical readings for the mass (*pericopes*),[84] or the antiphonary preserved in a Brussels manuscript and thought to be a copy of the one sent to Pippin III by Pope Paul I,[85] yield similar conclusions. There is no doubt whatsoever that Roman liturgical material did indeed circulate around the Frankish kingdoms throughout the seventh and the eighth centuries. However, this material was neither brought to Gaul as part of an official effort to Romanise the liturgy, nor was it forced upon liturgists and celebrants by either the secular or the ecclesiastical authorities. In fact, whenever one finds Frankish liturgists using Roman material,

---

[79] The following discussion is based on *Les 'ordines romani'* (ed. Andrieu); Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 135–224; idem, 'Les échanges liturgiques', pp. 246–61; idem, 'La réforme cultuelle', pp. 195–209; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 187–96; Martimort, *Les 'ordines', les ordinaires et les cérémoniaux*.

[80] See Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 145–7; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 193–4. The earliest manuscript of this collection is Montpellier, Bibliothèque Universitaire, 412 (Tours; s. ix^in).

[81] See, for example, *Ordo XXVIII* (ed. Andrieu, III, pp. 347–72).

[82] Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 150–2; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 194–5.

[83] On all these collections, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 152–5; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 195–6.

[84] Vogel, 'Les échanges liturgiques', pp. 261–2; idem, 'La réforme cultuelle', pp. 209–10.

[85] Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 10127–10144, fols. 90r–115v. On this antiphonary, see Vogel, 'Les échanges liturgiques', pp. 262–5; idem, 'La réforme cultuelle', pp. 210–13; Bernard, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien*, pp. 712–14.

they combined it with ample traditional as well as new Frankish material, and even in those cases when Roman elements were incorporated into Frankish liturgical compositions wholesale, it is obvious that these elements were altered, adapted and significantly changed so as to fit the Frankish way of doing things.

To sum up, many scholars in the past have attributed the introduction of liturgical reforms as well as the beginning of the official Romanisation of the Frankish rite to Pippin III. Yet, as we have seen, such attribution is not supported by the available liturgical and narrative sources. Although Pippin III initiated and promoted the reforms of various secular and ecclesiastical matters, as far as liturgical practices are concerned, his reign was a direct continuation of the Merovingian period. New liturgical compositions were compiled, using both Roman and indigenous Frankish material, old liturgical compositions were updated and adapted to suit the Frankish use, and no official attempt to Romanise or unify the Frankish rite originated from the royal court. Indeed, as Pope Paul I's letter implies, Pippin did receive some liturgical books from Rome in what seems to be an official papal gesture. It is also possible, as reported by later Carolingian sources, that he played a certain role in the promotion of the *cantus Romanus* in Francia. But these two incidents should not be interpreted as the initiation of an official reform movement, aimed at Romanising the prevailing liturgy of Gaul. Things, however, were about to change shortly, during the reign of Pippin's son and successor, Charlemagne.

3

The Age of Charlemagne

In 768 the Frankish kingdom was divided between Charlemagne and his brother Carloman, who succeeded their father, Pippin III, to the Frankish throne.[1] Three years later, in December 771, Carloman died and his share of the kingdom was peacefully annexed by Charlemagne, who then became the sole ruler of the Franks.[2] The reign of Charlemagne, from his accession to the throne in 768 till his death in 814, was, in more than one respect, a crucial phase in the history of the Frankish kingdoms, and consequently in the history of early medieval Europe as a whole.[3] As far as the Frankish liturgy is concerned, the age of Charlemagne was a significant turning point. For the first time in the history of the western rite a concerted interest in liturgy was demonstrated by a ruler who obviously recognised the political and social advantages that lay within the patronage of liturgy. It is on this phase of liturgical development, guided by Charlemagne and his advisers, that I wish to concentrate in this chapter.

The reforms of Charlemagne

Some efforts to reform the Frankish Church were already made under the auspices of Carloman and Pippin III.[4] As early as 747, for example,

---

[1] *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a. 768 (ed. Rau, p. 22); Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, c. 3 (ed. Rau, pp. 169–70); Fredegar, *Chronicorum liber quartus*, Cont. 53 (ed. Wallace-Hadrill, pp. 120–1).

[2] *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a. 771 (ed. Rau, p. 26); Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, c. 3 (ed. Rau, pp. 169–70); *Annales Mettenses priores*, s.a. 771, ed. B. von Simson, MGH SRG 10 (Hannover, 1905), pp. 57–8.

[3] The narrative of Charlemagne's various conquests and reforms is a story too well known to require rehearsal here. For some basic surveys, see McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms*, pp. 64–105; Riché, *Les Carolingiens*, pp. 93–145; Schieffer, *Die Karolinger*, pp. 70–111; Fouracre, 'Frankish Gaul to 814', pp. 101–9; R. Collins, *Charlemagne* (London and Toronto, 1998).

[4] See above, pp. 44–57.

Pippin III had obtained from Pope Zacharias a small collection of canon law,[5] and several years afterwards, Pippin and his advisers formulated rules and regulations drawn from canonical texts.[6] Although these reforms, aimed at the establishment of Church hierarchy, the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline and the correction of morals, achieved very little, they certainly laid the foundations for the grandiose effort made by Charlemagne.[7]

The first years of Charlemagne's reign, however, were not particularly dedicated to ecclesiastical matters or reforms.[8] In 769 Charlemagne directed his first campaign against a rebellion led by Hunald in Aquitaine; in 772 he launched his first Saxon campaign; and in 773, at the request of Pope Hadrian (d. 795), he attacked the Lombard kingdom.[9] Charlemagne, it appears, was more concerned with oppressing rebels, conquering new territories, and neutralising what he perceived as a threat from his brother, Carloman. Yet, although each campaign was launched because of political reasons, both the Saxon campaign of 772, which led to the destruction of the Saxon cult-site at the Irminsul, and the Italian campaign of 773–4, had a distinctive religious aspect to them, which suggests that Christianity, the Church and its leaders were close to the heart of the Frankish king.

Soon after capturing Pavia in 774, Charlemagne, like his father before him, received from the pope a canon law collection. This time Pope Hadrian presented the Frankish king with the so-called *Dionysio-Hadriana*, that is, a revised version of the canon law collection compiled by Dionysius Exiguus at the beginning of the sixth century.[10] We do not know who initiated this move. If it was the pope's own idea, then such a gift could be interpreted as an encouragement to reform. But if it was Charlemagne himself who asked for this collection, then it might indicate that a full programme of reform was already envisaged by the king. Whichever possibility one chooses to believe, the *Dionysio-Hadriana*, it seems, was perceived by the Franks as an authoritative collection of canon law and it served Charlemagne with a source for his ecclesiastical legislation.[11]

In 779, only five years after procuring the *Dionysio-Hadriana*, Charlemagne issued the first genuine capitulary in which he advocated reform, that is, the Capitulary of Herstal.[12] Ten years later, in March 789, Charlemagne issued the *Admonitio generalis*, which contains the clearest statement of his programme for the reform of the Church, and which draws extensively from the *Dionysio-Hadriana*.[13] In subsequent legislation regarding religious matters Charlemagne and his advisors made ample use of canonical material,[14] and we are even told that at the council of Aachen in 802 the *Dionysio-Hadriana*, or parts of it, were read aloud and commented upon.[15] Collections of canon law, then, and foremost among them the *Dionysio-Hadriana*, played a major role in

---

[5] Boniface, *Epistola* 77 (ed. M. Tangl, p. 160).

[6] See, for example, *Decretum Compiendiense (757)* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 15, pp. 37–9); *Decretum Vermeriense (758–768?)* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 16, pp. 39–41).

[7] In this respect I completely agree with Tom Noble who argues that although Church reforms did indeed begin in the time of Pippin III and Carloman, 'it was in Charlemagne's reign that the resources of the Carolingian state were enthusiastically committed with results unimaginable in the previous reign'. See Noble, 'From brigandage to justice', pp. 51–2.

[8] See the enlightening observations by Noble, 'From brigandage to justice'. See also D.A. Bullough, '*Aula renovata*: the Carolingian court before the Aachen palace', in idem, *Carolingian Renewal*, pp. 123–60 [originally published in *Proceedings of the British Academy* 71 (1985), pp. 267–301].

[9] On all these campaigns, see *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a. 769, 772 and 773–4 (ed. Rau, p. 22–4, 26 and 26–30 respectively); Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, cc. 5–7 (ed. Rau, pp. 170–6).

[10] On the *Dionysio-Hadriana*, see F. Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande* (Graz, 1870), pp. 441–76; H. Wurm, *Studien und Text zur Dekretalsammlung des Dionysius Exiguus*, Kanonistische Studien und Texte 16 (Bonn, 1939); Kottje, 'Einheit und Vielfalt', pp. 334–40. The copy given to Charlemagne does not survive, but several descendant copies of it are known; see Mordek, *Kirchenrecht und Reform*, pp. 241–9. The earliest copy with the pope's dedicatory poem is Paris, BNF lat. 11710 (Burgundy; 805).

[11] H. Mordek, 'Kirchenrechtliche Autoritäten im Frühmittelalter', in *Recht und Schrift im Mittelalter*, ed. P. Classen, Vorträge und Forschungen 23 (Sigmaringen, 1977), pp. 237–55.

[12] *Capitulare Haristallense (799)* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I. no. 20, pp. 46–51).

[13] *Admonitio generalis (789)* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 22, pp. 52–62). On the *Admonitio generalis*, see McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 1–8; Noble, 'From brigandage to justice', pp. 55–60; Brown, 'Introduction', 17–20; Buck, *Admonitio und Praedicatio*, especially pp. 67–156.

[14] McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 1–79; R. Reynolds, 'The organisation, law and liturgy of the Western Church, 700–900', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, II, ed. McKitterick, pp. 587–621, at 613–17; Y. Hen, 'The knowledge of canon law among rural priests: the evidence of two Carolingian manuscripts from around 800', *Journal of Theological Studies* 50 (1999), pp. 117–34.

[15] *Annales Laureshamenses*, s.a. 802, ed. G. Pertz, MGH SS 1 (Stuttgart, 1826), p. 39. See also the document drawn up in preparation for this assembly, *Capitula ad lectionem canonum et regulae s. Benedicti pertinentia (802)*, cc. 1–18 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 37, pp. 107–9).

Charlemagne's attempts to reform the Frankish Church.

The ecclesiastical reforms promulgated by Charlemagne and his counsellors in a series of royal capitularies and synodical canons aimed at ordering the Church hierarchy, restoring ecclesiastical discipline and correcting the morals of both the clergy and the lay population of the Frankish kingdom.[16] The ultimate goal, of course, was the creation of a better Christian society whose salvation is assured, and thereby ensures the salvation of the king. 'What glory will be yours, most blest king,' wrote Alcuin to Charlemagne in 796, 'when all these, who have been turned from the worship of idols to know the true God by your good care, follow you as you stand in happy case before the judgement seat of your Lord Jesus Christ and your reward of eternal joy is increased through them all.'[17] It is against this broader background of Church reforms that one should examine the liturgical developments in the age of Charlemagne.

Charlemagne and the Frankish liturgy

From a fairly early stage of his reign Charlemagne showed some interest in liturgy and in the way it was celebrated. Already in his first capitulary, dated to around 769, Charlemagne ordered that each priest '. . . should always in Lent report and explain to the bishop the method and procedure [in which he performs] his ministry, concerning baptism, the Catholic faith, the prayers, and the *ordo* of the mass'.[18] Furthermore, in the same capitulary he decrees that 'priests, who do not know properly [how] to perform their ministry and are not too busy to learn with all their energy according to the order of their bishops, or [those who]

seem to disregard the canons, must be removed from the office itself, until they should know these completely without any mistakes'.[19] Similar concern was shown by Charlemagne in subsequent legislation and canonical decrees.[20]

However, Charlemagne took more than a supervisory interest in the details of liturgical worship and ceremonies. Liturgy, as noted by Gregory Dix, 'was a subject upon which his views were decided and obstinate'.[21] With the assistance of his advisers, most notably Alcuin of York (d. 804) and Theodulf of Orléans (d. 820),[22] Charlemagne published a whole series of legislation in which he took straightforward measures to reform the liturgical practices of his age. In his *Admonitio generalis*, Charlemagne reiterated his fathers' instructions 'that they [i.e. the clergy] are to learn the Roman chant thoroughly and that it is to be employed throughout the office, night and day, in the correct form, in conformity with what our father of blessed memory, King Pippin, strove to bring to pass when he abolished the Gallican chant for the sake of unanimity with the apostolic see and the peaceful harmony of God's holy Church'.[23] In the same capitulary he also introduced the Roman

---

[16] On the ecclesiastical reforms promulgated by Charlemagne, see McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*; Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 180–204; Brown, 'Introduction', pp. 16–28;

[17] Alcuin, *Epistola* 110 (ed. Dümmler, p. 157): '. . . quando hi omnes, qui per tuam bonam sollicitudinem ab idolatriae cultura ad cognoscendum verum Deum conversi sunt, te ante tribunal domini nostri Iesu Christi in beata sorte stantem sequentur et ex his omnibus perpetuae beatitudinis merces augetur' [trans. Allott, *Alcuin of York*, p. 72].

[18] *Karoli Magni capitulare primum (c. 769)*, c. 8 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 19, p. 45): '. . . et semper in quadragesima rationem et ordinem ministerii sui, sive de baptismo sive de fide catholica sive de precibus et ordine missarum, episcopo reddat et ostendat'. This canon repeats *Karlomanni principis capitulare (742)*, c. 3 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 10, p. 25). The authenticity of this capitulary is disputed by scholars; see Buck, *Admonitio und Praedicatio*, pp. 292–5, and see the further references listed there.

[19] *Karoli Magni capitulare primum (c. 769)*, c. 15 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 19, p. 46): 'Sacerdotes, qui rite non sapiunt adimplere ministerium suum nec discere iuxta praeceptum episcoporum suorum pro viribus satagunt vel contemptores canonum existunt, ab officio proprio sunt submovendi, quousque haec pleniter emendata habeant.'

[20] See, for example, *Admonitio generalis (789)*, c. 70 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 22, p. 59); *Capitulare Francofurtense (794)*, c. 33 (ed. Werminghoff, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, I, no. 19(G), p. 169); *Karoli regis mandatum ad Arnonem archiepiscopum Salisburgense directum (799/800)*, c. 2 (ed. Werminghoff, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, I, no. 24(B), p. 213). For further references, see Vogel, 'La réform cultuelle', pp. 218–23.

[21] Dix, *The Shape of Liturgy*, p. 575. On the liturgical reforms of Charlemagne, see Bishop, 'The liturgical reforms of Charlemagne'; Bishop and Wilmart, 'La réforme liturgique de Charlemagne'; Vogel, 'Les échanges liturgiques', pp. 265–92; idem, 'La réforme cultuelle', pp. 214–40; idem, 'La réforme liturgique sous Charlemagne', in *Karl der Große*, ed. Braunfels, II, pp. 217–32; McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 115–54.

[22] The amount of literature on Alcuin and Theodulf is vast, and cannot be listed here. A useful summary on both is provided by Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 205–25, and see pp. 430–2 for a fuller bibliography. On Alcuin, see also the seminal study by Bullough, 'Alcuin and the kingdom of heaven'. See also *Alcuin of York*, ed. L.A.J.R. Houwen and A.A. MacDonald, Germania Latina 3 (Groningen, 1998); M. Garrison, *Alcuin's World through his Letters and Verse* (Cambridge, forthcoming).

[23] *Admonitio generalis (789)*, c. 80 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 22, p. 61): 'Ut cantum Romanum pleniter discant, et ordinabiliter per nocturnale vel gradale officium peragatur, secundum quod beatae memoriae genitor noster Pippinus rex decertavit ut fieret, quando Gallicanum tulit ob unanimitatem apostolicae sedis et sanctae Dei aeclesiae pacificam concordiam' [trans. King, *Charlemagne*, p. 218].

practices regarding the kiss of peace and the recitation of the names of the dead during mass,[24] and subsequent legislation as well as conciliar decrees repeated these demands, either in general or in particular terms.[25] Moreover, various other Roman practices, such as the Roman psalmody,[26] Roman regulations regarding Lent,[27] or the Great Litany,[28] were gradually introduced as well. What is noteworthy about Charlemagne's legislation is not so much that it was original, but that it was clearly stated and consistently applied.

Yet, Charlemagne was no amateur. He perfectly understood that legislation alone is not sufficient and that in order to implement such reforms there is a need for 'properly corrected catholic books' and a trained clergy that can use them.[29] Every student of the so-called 'Carolingian Renaissance' knows by heart canon 72 of the *Admonitio generalis* in which Charlemagne bids that schools should be created in every monastery and episcopal residence and that corrected catholic books should be prepared, 'for often, while people want to pray to God in the proper fashion, they yet pray improperly because of uncorrected books'.[30] Similarly, in his famous *Epistola de litteris colendis* to Abbot Baugulf of Fulda (d. 802), Charlemagne declares that:

> . . . together with our *fideles* we have deemed it beneficial that, in addition to a way of life based on a rule and the practice of holy piety, the cathedral clergy and monastic communities entrusted, with Christ's favour, to us for governing ought also to devote

[24] *Admonitio generalis (789)*, c. 53 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 22, p. 57): '. . . ut pax detur ab omnibus, confectis Christi sacramentis'; ibid., c. 54 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 22, p. 57): '. . . ut nomina publice non recitentur ante precem sacerdotalem'.
[25] See, for example, *Karoli epistola generalis* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 30, p. 80); *Capitulare Francofurtense (794)*, cc. 50–1 (ed. Werminghoff, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, I, no. 19(G), p. 171).
[26] See, for example, *Capitula de examinandis ecclesiasticis (802)*, c. 2 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 38, p. 110).
[27] *Statuta Rispacensia, Frisigensia, Salisburgensia (800)*, cc. 42–3 (ed. Werminghoff, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, I, no. 14(A), p. 212).
[28] *Concilium Moguntinense (813)*, c. 33 (ed. Werminghoff, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, I, no. 36, p. 269).
[29] *Admonitio generalis (789)*, c. 72 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 22, pp. 59–60): '. . . libros catholicos bene emendate . . .'. See also *Karoli epistola de litteris colendis (780–800)* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 29, pp. 78–9).
[30] *Admonitio generalis (789)*, c. 72 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 22, pp. 59–60): 'quia saepe, dum bene aliqui Deum rogare cupiunt, sed per inemendatos libros male rogant' [trans. King, *Charlemagne*, p. 217].

themselves zealously to teaching the study of letters to those who by the Lord's gift are able to learn, each according to his capacity; . . . For although it is better to do what is good than to know it, yet knowing comes before doing. Each man ought therefore to learn about what he hopes to accomplish, that the more fully his mind may understand what he ought to do, the less his tongue may run into the stumbling-blocks of falsehood in his praise of almighty God. For since falsehood is to be avoided by all men, how much more ought it to be shunned, as far as is possible, by those who are recognised as chosen for one purpose alone, that they should be the truth's peculiar servants?[31]

These measures were, of course, only part of an overall attempt initiated by Charlemagne to correct the morals and regulate the behaviour of the Frankish clergy, as well as to improve the level of their education.[32] By these measures Charlemagne strove to create a new infrastructure for transforming Frankish society into a better and more devoted Christian society. The clergy was to be educated and prepared to carry out their pastoral duties, and various authoritative texts were to be checked, corrected and copied for the benefit of the clergy, from whom so much was now expected.

Charlemagne's concerns did not remain on the national level, but also penetrated well into the diocesan and parochial levels of the Frankish

[31] *Karoli epistola de litteris colendis (780–800)* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 29, p. 79): '. . . quia nos cum fidelibus nostris consideravimus utile esse, ut episcopia et monasteria nobis Christo propitio ad gubernandum commissa praeter regularis vitae ordinem atque sanctae religionis conversationem etiam in litterarum meditationibus eis qui donante Domini discere possunt secundum uniuscuiusque capacitatem docendi studium debeant impendere, qualiter, sicut regularis norma honestatem morum, ita quoque docendi et discendi instantia ordinet et ornet seriem verborum; . . . Quamvis enim melius sit bene facere quam nosse, prius tamen est nosse quam facere. Debet ergo quisque discere quod optat implere, ut tanto uberius quid agere debeat intelligat anima, quanto in omnipotentis Dei laudibus sine mendaciorum offendiculis cucurrerit lingua. Nam cum omnibus hominibus vitanda sint mendacia, quanto magis illi secundum possibilitatem declinare debent, qui ad hoc solummodo probantur electi, ut servire specialiter debeant veritati' [trans. King, *Charlemagne*, p. 232].
[32] On the reform of the clergy under Charlemagne, see Brown, 'Introduction', pp. 11–18; McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 1–79. On the educational reforms, see the excellent chapter by J.J. Contreni, 'The Carolingian Renaissance: education and literary culture', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, II, ed. McKitterick, pp. 709–57. See also P. Riché, *Écoles et enseignement dans le Haut Moyen Age. Fin du Ve siècle – milieu du XIe siècle*, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1989), pp. 69–79; M.M. Hildebrandt, *The External School in Carolingian Society*, Education and Society in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance 1 (Leiden, New York and Cologne, 1992), pp. 49–71.

Church. Bishops were constantly requested and reminded to supervise their priests and particularly their liturgical performance, and some of them dedicated much time and effort to executing this duty. Archbishop Arno of Salzburg, for example, convened a provincial council at Rispach in 798 and ordered his suffragans to ensure that their priests 'could celebrate masses according to the custom', and that each priest should have a sacramentary.[33] Similarly, the episcopal statutes or *capitula episcoporum*, which were composed by a number of Carolingian bishops, were addressed to the diocesan priests, and were designed to instruct them on matters of clerical conduct, on the performance of the liturgical offices, on the administration of baptism, on penance, and on various rites for the sick and the dying.[34] The authors of these *capitula* also urged their priests to become acquainted with all the books and ceremonies they might need to carry out. The earliest *capitula episcoporum* known to us – two by Theodulf of Orléans,[35] three by Gerbald of Liège,[36] one by Waltcaud of Liège (d.c. 831),[37] and one anonymous[38] – are all dated to early years of the ninth century, before the reform councils of 813, and they all reflect a preoccupation with correctness and orthodoxy.

Furthermore, Charlemagne was well aware of the prevailing diversity

[33] *Concilium Rispacense (798?)*, c. 4 (ed. Werminghoff, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, I, no. 22, p. 198): '. . . missas secundum consuetudinem caelebrare'. The decree goes on to say 'sicut Romana traditio nobis tradidit'. This, however, must not be taken to imply that the *consuetudo* itself was Roman, but rather that the obligation to celebrate the mass properly according to the prevailing custom was handed down to the priests by Roman tradition.

[34] On the *capitula episcoporum*, see McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 45–79; P. Brommer, 'Capitula episcoporum: Bemerkungen zu den bischöflichen Kapitularien', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 91 (1980), pp. 207–36; idem, '*Capitula episcoporum*': *die bischöflichen Kapitularien des 9. und 10. Jahrhunderts*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Age occidental 43 (Turnhout, 1985); Bullough, 'The Carolingian liturgical experience', pp. 37–8.

[35] Theodulf of Orléans, *Capitula episcoporum* (ed. Brommer, *Capitula episcoporum*, I, pp. 103–42 and 148–84). On Theodulf's *capitula episcoporum*, see P. Brommer, 'Die bischöfliche Gesetzgebung Theodulfs von Orléans', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte – kanonistische Abteilung* 60 (1971), pp. 1–120; idem, 'Die Rezeption der bischöflichen Kapitularien Theodulfs von Orléans', *Zeitschrift der Savigny- Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte – kanonistische Abteilung* 61 (1975), pp. 113–60; McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 52–7.

[36] Gerbald of Liège, *Capitula episcoporum* (ed. Brommer, *Capitula episcoporum*, I, pp. 16–21, 26–32 and 37–42). On Gerbald and his *capitula episcoporum*, see W.A. Eckhardt, *Die Kapitulariensammlung Bischof Ghaerbalds von Lüttich* (Göttingen, 1955); McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 50–2.

[37] Waltcaud of Liège, *Capitula episcoporum* (ed. Brommer, *Capitula episcoporum*, I, pp. 45–9).

[38] *Capitula ecclesiastica* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 81, pp. 178–9).

of practice in his kingdom and of the variety of texts, some of which were old and erroneous, which this diversity fostered. With the encouragement and support of his advisers he decided to create a new, corrected and, most of all, orthodox repertoire of ecclesiastical texts, which eventually would become the standard Christian handbooks throughout his realm. Thus, sometime in the 780s Charlemagne had commissioned Paul the Deacon to prepare a new corrected homiliary for the use of the Frankish clergy, and in a letter addressed to the lectors (786) he explains the impetus behind this commission:

> For we discovered that despite correct intentions the readings compiled for the night office by the fruitless toil of certain men were by no means suitable, inasmuch as they were set out without the names of their authors and abounded with the distortions of innumerable errors, and we therefore . . . turned our mind to altering the form of these to the better. And we charged Paul the Deacon, our client and a man close to us, with the completion of this task. . . . He has read through the treatises and sermons of the various Catholic fathers, culled all the best things and offered us two volumes of readings, suitable for each separate festival throughout the whole course of the year and free from errors.[39]

In this letter Charlemagne gives us an extraordinary glimpse of the concern with authority, orthodoxy and correctness which preoccupied the early Carolingians, and which became one of the prevailing characteristics of the Carolingian reforms.[40] This preoccupation is also attested by the successive attempts made at the behest of the Carolingian kings

[39] *Karoli epistola generalis* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 30, pp. 80–1): 'Denique quia ad nocturnale officium compilatas quorundam casso labore, licet recto intuitu, minus tamen idonee repperimus lectiones, quippe quae et sine auctorum suorum vocabulis essent positae et infinitis vitiorum anfractibus scaterent, . . . Idque opus Paulo diacono, familiari clientulo nostro, elimandum iniunximus, . . . Qui . . . tractatus atque sermones diversorum catholicorum patrum perlegere et optima quaeque decerpens, in duobus voluminibus per totius anni circulum congruentes cuique festivitati distincte et absque vitiis nobis obtulit lectiones' [trans. King, *Charlemagne*, p. 208]. On Paul the Deacon's homiliary, see Grégoire, *Les homéliaires du moyen âge*, pp. 71–114; idem, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux*, pp. 425–78; McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 102–5; Martimort, *Les lectures liturgiques et leurs livres*, pp. 87–9. See also Y. Hen, 'Paul the Deacon and the Frankish liturgy', in *Paolo Diacono: Uno scrittore fra tradizione longobarda e rinnovamento carolingio*, ed. P. Chiesa (Udine, 2000), pp. 205–21.

[40] See McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word*, particularly pp. 200–10. I shall discuss this preoccupation more fully later.

to produce an approved and corrected edition of the Latin Bible,[41] and by the promotion of the Rule of St Benedict.[42] In some cases, as with Paul the Deacon's homiliary, authoritative texts were commissioned and prepared at home, but more often such texts were acquired from well-known centres of authority abroad. In 774, as we have already seen, Charlemagne received from Pope Hadrian the canon law collection known as the *Dionysio-Hadriana*.[43] Similarly, in 787, while visiting Monte Cassino, Charlemagne asked the abbot for a copy of Benedict's autograph version of the Rule, and was duly sent one.[44] Clearly, it is against this background that the arrival of the so-called *Hadrianum* at the court of Charlemagne is to be understood.

Charlemagne and the Gregorian Sacramentary

Sometime in the early 780s, taking advantage of Paul the Deacon's visit to Rome on his way back to Monte Cassino, Charlemagne bid him to ask Pope Hadrian for a copy of the authentic sacramentary put together by Pope Gregory the Great. This request must have embarrassed the pope, for no sacramentary used in Rome at that time went back to Pope Gregory's pontificate. Nevertheless, after some delay, a copy of the so-called Gregorian Sacramentary reached the court at Aachen between 786/7 and 791, as the letter attached to it reports:

> As for the sacramentary arranged by our predecessor Pope Gregory: some time ago Paul the Grammarian asked us to send you a copy that would be free from all additions and in accordance

---

[41] See B. Fischer, 'Bibeltext unde Bibelreform unter Karl dem Großen', in *Karl der Große*, ed. Braunfels, II, pp. 156–216; idem, 'Bibelausgaben des frühen Mittelalters', in *La Bibbia nell'alto Medioevo*, Settimane 10 (Spoleto, 1963), pp. 519–600; McKitterick, 'Royal patronage of culture', pp. 110–17.

[42] See M. de Jong, 'Carolingian monasticism: the power of prayer', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, II, ed. McKitterick, pp. 622–53, especially at 629–34.

[43] See above, pp. 66–7. On the implications of Roman books brought to Francia, see Bullough, 'Roman books and Carolingian *renovatio*'.

[44] See *Theodemari abbatis Casinensis epistola ad Karolum regem* (ed. K. Hallinger and M. Wegener, *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum*, I, pp. 157–75), and compare J. Neufville, 'L'authenticité de l'*Epistola ad regem Karolum de monasterio sancti Benedicti directa et a Paulo dictata*', *Studia Monastica* 13 (1971), pp. 295–310. The earliest surviving copy of the so-called *Aachener Urexemplar* is St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 914 (Reichenau; s. ix). On this manuscript, see L. Traube, *Textgeschichte der Regula Sancti Benedicti*, Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften 25 (Munich, 1910).

---

with the use of our holy church; we now dispatch it to your highness by means of John the monk, abbot of Ravenna.[45]

On account of this gift, the particular type of the Gregorian Sacramentary sent by Pope Hadrian to Charlemagne is commonly know as the *Hadrianum*.[46] But this sacramentary was neither a copy of the sacramentary arranged by Pope Gregory the Great, nor was it the current sacramentary used in Pope Hadrian's time. What Charlemagne received was a copy of a sacramentary which was redacted, most probably, under Pope Honorius I (d. 638) and which was augmented in the course of the seventh and the eighth centuries to conform with new Roman feasts and stational liturgies.[47] Whether the pope and his advisers did not understand Charlemagne's request and therefore sent him a gift rather than an accessible sacramentary, as suggested by Cyrille Vogel,[48] or whether the pope really made a genuine effort to send Charlemagne a copy of an authoritative old sacramentary, the closest he could get to the supposedly Gregorian compilation, as I would submit, remains an open question, on which no clear answer can be given.

Shortly after its arrival, the *Hadrianum* was deposited in the royal library. The particular copy which Charlemagne received from the pope did not survive, but luckily we can reconstruct the lost original from several copies made from it, all of which bear (with minor variations and alterations) the following heading: 'This exposition of the sacraments for the entire year, edited by St Gregory the Roman pope, was

---

[45] *Codex Carolinus*, no. 89 (ed. Gundlach, p. 626): 'De sacramentario vero a sancto disposito praedecessori nostro, deifluo Gregorio papa: immixtum vobis emitteremus, iam pridem Paulus grammaticus a nobis eum pro vobis petente secundum sanctae nostrae ecclesiae tradicionem, per Iohannem monachum atque abbatem civitatis Ravennantium vestrae regali emisimus excellentiae' [trans. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 81]. This letter, usually dated to 784/5, is now convincingly redated to 786/7 by D.A. Bullough, 'Ethnic history and the Carolingians: an alternative reading of Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardorum*', in idem, *Carolingian Renewal*, pp. 97–122, at p. 116, n. 7 [originally published in *The Inheritance of Historiography, 350–900*, ed. C. Holdsworth and T.P. Wiseman, Exeter Studies in History 12 (Exeter, 1986), pp. 85–105].

[46] On the *Hadrianum*, see *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, pp. 60–3; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 80–5; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 75–7; Metzger, *Les sacramentaires*, pp. 78–80.

[47] See *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, pp. 50–61; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 79–80; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 72–9; Metzger, *Les sacramentaires*, pp. 57–80.

[48] Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 85.

copied from the authentic book in the palace library.'[49] Foremost among these copies is the Sacramentary of Bishop Hildoard of Cambrai, which is the earliest surviving complete and apparently uncorrected copy of the original *Hadrianum*.[50]

The *Hadrianum*, like any Gregorian Sacramentary known to us, is significantly different from the so-called Gelasian family of sacramentaries in three major points. Firstly, unlike the Old Gelasian Sacramentary, the *Hadrianum* is not divided into three different books, but amalgamates the temporal and the sanctoral cycles into a single continuous series of masses. Secondly, the *Hadrianum* has only three prayers for each mass (*oratio*, *super oblata* and *ad complendum*), whereas the Gelasian sacramentaries have normally several *orationes* as well as a blessing *super populum* and a wide range of *praefationes*.[51] A third, and most important, point is the fact that the Gregorian Sacramentary which served as a basis for the *Hadrianum*, was originally designed for papal use and, consequently, contained only stational masses for use in the basilicas of Rome as well as several masses for a few solemn circumstances and feasts.[52] Thus, the *Hadrianum* was ill-suited for the needs of any Frankish episcopal church, let alone a parochial one.

Not so long after its arrival and subsequent diffusion throughout the Frankish kingdom, the shortcomings of the papal sacramentary sent to

---

Charlemagne were noted, and therefore it was reorganised, corrected and supplemented. Although in the past scholars attributed the *Hadrianum*'s supplement to Alcuin of York,[53] it is nowadays almost unanimously attributed to Benedict of Aniane (d. 821), following the argument put forward by Jean Deshusses.[54] In his preface to the supplement, Benedict explains what he did and why he did it:

> Since there are other liturgical materials which the holy Church finds itself obliged to use but which the aforesaid Father [i.e. Gregory the Great] omitted [from the *Hadrianum*] because he knew they had already been produced by other people, we have thought it worth our while to gather them like spring flowers, arrange them in a beautiful bouquet and – after carefully correcting and amending them and giving them appropriate titles – present them in this separate work so that diligent readers may find everything they need for the present. Note that almost everything included here has been drawn from other sacramentaries.[55]

Thus, Benedict of Aniane acknowledged the deficiencies of the *Hadrianum* and the need to adapt it for use in Gaul.

---

[49] *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses, I, p. 85): 'Hic sacramentorum de circulo anni exposito, a sancto Gregorio papa Romano editum, ex authentico libro bibliothecae cubiculi scriptum.' It is worth noting, that several copies of the *Dionysio-Hadriana* bear a similar heading ('Iste codex est scriptus de illo authentico quem domnus Hadrianus apostolicus dedit gloriosissimo regi Francorum ... quando fuit Romae'); see H. Lietzmann, *Das Sacramentarium Gregorianum*, Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 3 (Münster, 1921), p. vi. Whether, the 'bibliotheca cubiculi' (literally 'the bedroom's library'), should be understood as the private royal library of Charlemagne, where various other authoritative texts, such as the Rule of St Benedict, the *Dionysio Hadriana* and the autograph copy of Paul the Deacon's homiliary, were deposited, is not at all clear. See B. Bischoff, 'The Court Library of Charlemagne', in idem, *Manuscripts and Libraries*, pp. 56–75, especially n. 15, pp. 58–9 [originally published as 'Die Hofbibliothek Karls des Großen', in *Karl der Große*, ed. Braunfels, II, pp. 42–62; reprinted in Bischoff, *Mittelalterliche Studien*, III, pp. 149–69], and compare Bernard, 'Benoît d'Aniane', pp. 32–3.
[50] Cambrai, BM 164 (olim 159), fols. 35v–203v (Cambrai; 811/812); *CLLA* 720. For an edition, see *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses, I, pp. 85–348).
[51] There is also a difference in terminology; wherever the Gregorian sacramentaries use *super oblata*, *praefatio* and *ad complendum*, the Gelasian sacramentaries use *secreta*, *contestatio* and *post communionem*. The *praefatio*, beginning with the words 'It is worthy and just...' (*Vere dignum et justum est...*), is the variable prayer preceding the *sanctus*.
[52] On the stational liturgy of Rome, see Willis, *A History of Early Roman Liturgy*, pp. 68–77.

[53] See, for example, L.C. Mohlberg, 'L'ouvre liturgique d'Alcuin', *Annuaire de l'Université de Louvain* 73 (1909), pp. 418–28; L. Cabrol, 'Les écrits liturgiques d'Alcuin', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 19 (1923), pp. 507–21; Bishop, *Liturgica historica*, p. 55.
[54] Deshusses, 'Le supplément au sacramentaire grégorien'; idem, 'Le sacramentaire grégorien pré-hadrianique'; *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, pp. 62–70 and III, pp. 66–75; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 85–92; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 76–7; Metzger, *Les sacramentaires*, pp. 114–19; McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 130–8. For an edition of the supplement, see *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses, I, pp. 351–602). More recently Philippe Bernard argued that it was not Benedict of Aniane who composed the *Supplementum* and its preface, but a councillor at the royal court of Charlemagne, most probably Alcuin. Furthermore, Bernard attributes the impetus for the composition to Charlemagne himself, and dates the composition to an earlier stage of Charlemagne's reign. See Bernard, 'Benoît d'Aniane'. However, Bernard's learned and interesting analysis is completely unconvincing, and it is far beyond the scope of this study to respond in detail to each and every section of his argument.
[55] *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, c. 1019b (ed. Deshusses, I, p. 352): 'Sed quia sunt et alia quaedam, quibus necessario sancta utitur ecclesia quae idem pater ab aliis iam edita esse inspiciens praetermisit, idcirco opere pretium duximus, ea velud flores pratorum vernantes carpere, et in unum congerere, atque correcta et emendata, suisque capitulis praenotata, in huius corpore codicis seorsum ponere, ut in hoc opere cuncta inveniret lectoris industria, quaecumque nostris temporibus necessaria esse perspeximus, quamquam plurima etiam in aliis sacramentorum libelli invenissemus inserta' [trans. Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 86]. In addition to the studies cited above, see R. Amiet, 'Le prologue *Hucusque* et la table des *capitula* du supplément d'Alcuin', *Scriptorium* 7 (1953), pp. 177–209.

In the course of his revisions, Benedict supplemented the *Hadrianum* mainly with Sunday and votive masses, to which a series of *praefationes*, episcopal blessings and texts for the ordination of the minor orders, was appended.[56] As he clearly states in the preface, throughout his revision Benedict extracted from older versions of Frankish sacramentaries available to him, namely a version of the Old Gelasian Sacramentary, a version of the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary and a version of the Gregorian Sacramentary. The result of this enterprise was an amalgam of late eighth-century Roman material, older practices thought to be Roman, and indigenous Frankish–Gallican prayers, and thus, Benedict's supplement is the most extraordinary evidence of the force and vitality of the Gallican rite, even under Charlemagne. Whether Benedict was commissioned to draw up the *Supplementum* by either Charlemagne or Louis the Pious is unclear. It is certain, however, that the *Hadrianum* with the supplement did not circulate widely before the reign of Louis the Pious who, with the assistance of Helisacher, his chancellor, and the liturgist Amalarius of Metz, continued Charlemagne's initiative in reforming the Frankish rite.

The limits of liturgical reforms

The impression received from combing through the abundant legislation and conciliar decrees issued from the court and touching on liturgical matters, is that Charlemagne's programme for the reforms of the Frankish liturgy was basically aimed at correcting the prevailing liturgical practices by imposing a form of liturgical uniformity in the territories under Frankish rule. It has been commonly accepted by modern scholars, furthermore, that by requesting and adopting the *Hadrianum* as the standard sacramentary of the Frankish kingdom, Charlemagne sought to unify the Frankish rite and to standardise it according to what was understood or claimed to be Roman practice. Thus, according to the predominant notion, *correctio*, *unanimitas* and *secundum Romanum usum* became the key issues in Charlemagne's programme of reforms. However, some idiosyncrasies in this concept of Charlemagne's liturgical

---

[56] See Deshusses, 'Le supplément au sacramentaire grégorien', according to whom the first section was drawn up by Benedict, sometime between 810 and 815, whereas the second section was originally compiled in the late ninth century, to complement a Gelasian sacramentary.

---

reforms point to the fact that things were slightly more complicated than scholars would have liked us to believe.

Firstly, there is no evidence whatsoever that either Charlemagne or his advisers made any attempt to impose the use of the *Hadrianum* on the Frankish Church. This fact did not escape the attention of modern liturgists, but it was immediately and straightforwardly dismissed as insignificant. 'Though we have no extant copies of any royal edicts imposing the use of the Roman sacramentary in the Carolingian kingdom', writes Jean Deshusses, 'one feels that such decrees must have existed.'[57] Yet, no such a document exists, and none of the Frankish capitularies or Church councils refers or even alludes to the imposition of the *Hadrianum*. Bearing in mind that we are well informed on the various measures taken by Charlemagne and his counsellors in order to reform the Frankish Church, this anomaly seems to be extremely significant.

Secondly, when the *Hadrianum* arrived at Charlemagne's court, it was given the cold shoulder by Alcuin, the mind behind Charlemagne's reforms.[58] 'What need is there for new when the old are adequate?',[59] he wrote to Eanbald of York, and continued to use older sacramentaries. In 1978 Jean Deshusses effectively argued that two late ninth-century sacramentaries from Tours represent the closest copies of the two sacramentaries which Alcuin adapted for his own use at the abbey of Saint-Martin in Tours.[60] The first, based on a pre-Hadrianic Gregorian Sacramentary,[61] similar to the Sacramentary of Trent,[62] was drafted by

---

[57] J. Deshusses, 'The sacramentaries: a progress report', *Liturgy* 18 (1984), pp. 13–60, at p. 48 [originally published as 'Les sacramentaires: état actuel de la recherche', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 24 (1982), pp. 19–46].

[58] On Alcuin and the Carolingian reforms, see F.C. Scheibe, 'Alcuin und die *Admonitio generalis*', *Deutsches Archiv* 14 (1958), pp. 211–19; idem, 'Alcuin und die Briefe Karls des Großen', *Deutsches Archiv* 15 (1959), pp. 181–93; Wallach, *Alcuin and Charlemagne*, especially pp. 198–226; Bullough, 'Alcuin and the kingdom of heaven'; Noble, 'From brigandage to justice', pp. 59–61.

[59] Alcuin, *Epistola* 226 (ed. Dümmler, p. 370): 'Quod opus est nova condere, dum vetera sufficiunt?' [trans. Allott, *Alcuin of York*, pp. 27–8].

[60] J. Deshusses, 'Les anciens sacramentaires de Tours', *Revue bénédictine* 89 (1979), pp. 281–302. The first of these manuscripts is divided between Tours, BM 184 and Paris, BNF lat. 9430 (Tours; 880–90); the second manuscript is Paris, BNF nouv. acq. lat. 1589 (Tours; 890–900).

[61] On the pre-Hadrianic Gregorian Sacramentaries, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 92–102; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 77–8; Deshusses, 'Le sacramentaire grégorien pré-hadrianique'; idem, 'Le sacramentaire grégorien de Trent', *Revue bénédictine* 78 (1968), pp. 261–82; *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), III, pp. 88–91.

[62] Trent, Castel del Buon Consiglio, no number (olim codex Vindobonensis 700) (Salzburg; s. ix); *CLLA* 724. On this sacramentary, see below, pp. 106–7.

Alcuin shortly after his arrival at Tours, sometime in 797 or 798. The second of Alcuin's sacramentaries was compiled *c.* 799–800, using material both from his first sacramentary and from an eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary that was available at Tours. Unfortunately, none of Alcuin's sacramentaries survives, but it is obvious that he did not favour the *Hadrianum*. Furthermore, Benedict of Aniane, held by Cyrille Vogel as the 'reformer *par excellence* of the Carolingian period',[63] was commissioned to revise and adapt the *Hadrianum* for use, which he did by resorting to older Gallican sources. Although Benedict's preface to his supplement is extremely polite and full of reverence to the authority of the *Hadrianum*, a blunt paraphrase of it would read: 'here in Francia we do things differently, and therefore we need different sacramentaries'.

Lastly, there is the issue of diversity. If Charlemagne did indeed intend to create a unified liturgy according to what he understood to be the Roman practice, he obviously did not succeed. The prolific liturgical productivity and creativity which characterised Merovingian Gaul, continued well into the reign of Charlemagne, and resulted in a considerable diversity of liturgical practices. The older Gallican books were still copied in Charlemagne's realm, and they were circulated through the kingdom even after the arrival of the *Hadrianum*. In fact, all the extant manuscripts of the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentaries were copied during or even after the last decade of the ninth century.[64] It should also be noted that the earliest copy of an eighth-century Gelasian (the Gellone Sacramentary) was, most probably, commissioned by the same bishop – Hildoard of Cambrai – who is also responsible for the earliest extant copy of the *Hadrianum*. Despite the various attempts made by Charlemagne and his advisers to reform the liturgy, the variety of rite throughout the Frankish kingdom of the early ninth century was, if anything, even greater that it had been in the Merovingian period. Thus, just as various homiliaries and collections of homilies continued to be copied and used after the introduction of Paul the Deacon's homiliary,[65] and just as many different Bible texts circulated around the Frankish

kingdom,[66] so did a plethora of liturgical books and practices exist in Charlemagne's time.[67] Once the lack of uniformity is acknowledged, it is tempting to speculate whether Carolingian control was insufficient to enforce any liturgical unity. Yet, such a discussion, I would argue, is futile, first and foremost because there is no evidence that Charlemagne and his advisers made any effort to attain such a liturgical uniformity.

Against this background, it seems that the neat textbook description of early Carolingian attempts to impose a form of liturgical unity through the use of a Roman sacramentary, can no longer be accepted at face value. Although there were indeed successful attempts at reform through the introduction of Roman books, this was not the case as far as the Frankish liturgy is concerned. Whether one looks at the Roman *ordines* or the *Hadrianum*, it is obvious that immediate and very substantial modifications of these texts were carried out, and that local and indigenous traditions were abundantly preserved.[68] This is not what one would expect to find if Romanisation of the Frankish rite was at stake. It is, then, necessary to reassess the liturgical policy of Charlemagne, and to place it against the ideological and political development of his age.

Uniformity, Romanisation and the rhetoric of reforms

Two major issues become extremely important when one attempts to understand and reassess the liturgical reforms promulgated by Charlemagne and his advisers. The first is the political ideology which emerged in the Carolingian court; the second is the early Carolingian preoccupation with orthodoxy. Let us, then, rehearse briefly the major points regarding these two aspects of Carolingian thought.

The Carolingian political ideology is a complicated matter, first and

---

[63] See Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, p. 86.

[64] For a list of manuscripts, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 71–3; *CLLA* 801–98.

[65] See McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 80–114; Grégoire, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux*; idem, *Les homéliaires du moyen âge*.

[66] See, for example, R. McKitterick, 'Carolingian Bible production: the Tours anomaly', in *The Early Medieval Bible: Its Production, Decoration and Use*, ed. R. Gameson (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 63–77.

[67] For an example of the great liturgical diversity practised in the Carolingian kingdom, see Reynolds, 'The Visigothic liturgy in the realm of Charlemagne'.

[68] See also Kottje, 'Einheit und Vielfalt'; McKitterick, 'Unity and diversity'; R.E. Reynolds, 'Unity and diversity in Carolingian canon law collections: the case of the *Collectio Hibernensis* and its derivatives', in *Carolingian Essays*, ed. Blumenthal, pp. 99–135; N.K. Rasmussen, 'Unité et diversité des pontificaux latins aux VIIIe, IXe et Xe siècles', in *Liturgie de l'église particulière et liturgie de l'Église universelle*, Bibliotheca Ephemerides liturgicae, subsidia 7 (Rome, 1975), pp. 393–410; idem, *Les pontificaux*, pp. 504–5.

foremost, because the political ideas of the period have to be recovered from a variety of sources, none of which contains a coherent and systematic political philosophy. Delineating the various ideas and concepts of the Carolingian political ideology is far beyond the scope of this survey,[69] but one aspect of Carolingian political thought is of significant importance to our discussion, that is, the theocratic concept of rulership.[70] In the Carolingian period, biblical kings offered an attractive general model of theocratic kingship over a chosen people, and as early as 775 Charlemagne was addressed by Cathwulf as both David and Solomon.[71] Subsequently, the Franks were called 'New Israel',[72] and the references to this line of thought in our sources from the Carolingian period are abundant.[73] Yet, when Charlemagne presented himself in the prologue to the *Admonitio generalis*, he did it neither as David nor as Solomon, but as Josiah:

But we have also subjoined a number of articles from the provisions of the canons which have seemed to us particularly necessary. May no one, I beg, deem presumptuous the recalling of such piety, by which we are anxious to correct what is erroneous, to cut away what is inadmissible, to strengthen what is right; may it rather be received in a benevolent spirit of charity. For we read in the Books of the Kings how the holy Josiah, by visitation, correction and admonition, strove to recall the kingdom which God had given him to the worship of the true God. I say this not to compare myself with his holiness, but because it is our duty, at all

---

[69] On the Carolingian political ideology, the starting point is Anton, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos*. See also idem, 'Zum politischen Konzept karolingischer Synoden und zur karolingischen Brudergemeinschaft', *Historische Zeitschrift* 99 (1979), pp. 55–132; Nelson, 'Kingship and empire'; eadem, 'Kingship and royal government'; K.F. Morrison, *The Two Kingdoms: Ecclesiology in Carolingian Political Thought* (Princeton, 1964); W. Ullmann, *The Carolingian Renaissance and the Idea of Kingship* (London, 1969).

[70] The clearest sign of this concept is the incorporation of the formula 'rex Dei gratia' into the official royal title; see H. Wolfram, *Intitulatio*, I: *Lateinische Königs- und Fürstentitel bis zum Ende des 8. Jahrhunderts*, Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 21 (Vienna, 1967), p. 213.

[71] Cathwulf, *Epistola*, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epp. 4 (Berlin, 1895), pp. 503–5. On Cathwulf's letter, see Anton, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos*, pp. 75–9; M. Garrison, 'Letters to a king and biblical authority: the example of Cathuulf and Clemens Peregrinus', *Early Medieval Europe* 7 (1998), pp. 305–28. See also J. Storey, 'Cathwulf, kingship, and the royal abbey of Saint-Denis', *Speculum* 74 (1999), pp. 1–21.

[72] On the Franks as the 'New Israel', see E. Ewig, 'Zum christlichen Königsgedanken', pp. 39–45; Garrison, 'The Franks as the new Israel?'.

[73] For some examples, see Anton, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos*, pp. 419–36; Staubach, '"Cultus divinus" und karolingische Reform', especially pp. 546–57; Noble, 'Tradition and learning in search of ideology', pp. 239–40.

---

times and in all places, to follow the examples of the holy and necessary for us to gather together whomsoever we can for the study of the good life in praise and glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.[74]

Similarly, Theodulf of Orléans gave Josiah a prominent place among the available biblical models:

Obedience, O Josiah, was your first consideration; it raised high your illustrious name, in that you removed the ungodly shrines of ancient wickedness; you renewed, as much as you could, the laws of your fathers.[75]

Hence, the Old Testament Josiah, the king who 'did the right in the eyes of the Lord and followed all the way of his father David',[76] was evoked as a model for emulation, mainly on account of the religious revival and the moral reforms he pursued.[77] As the chosen king, *rex Dei gratia*, the reform of the Christian Church and the moral life of the Frankish people was the ultimate goal at which Charlemagne aimed by promulgating his legislation, and thus *correctio* and *emendatio* became fundamental to the political ideology which evolved at Charlemagne's court.

Correctio and *emendatio* were also central to Charlemagne's preoccupation with authority, orthodoxy and correctness. This preoccupation, as we have already seen, revealed itself in his legislation, where, among other things, he orders for 'correct catholic books' to be prepared

---

[74] *Admonitio generalis (789)*, prologue (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 22, pp. 53–4): 'Sed et aliqua capitula ex canonicis institutionibus, quae magis nobis necessaria videbantur, subiunximus. Ne aliquis, quaeso, huius pietatis ammonitionem esse praesumtiosam iudicet, qua nos errata corrigere, superflua abscidere, recta cohartare studemus, sed magis benivolo caritatis animo suscipiat. Nam legimus in regnorum libris, quomodo sanctus Iosias regnum sibi a Deo datum circumeundo, corrigendo, ammonendo ad cultum veri Dei studuit revocare: non ut me eius sanctitate aequiparabilem faciam, sed quod nobis sunt ubique sanctorum semper exempla sequenda, et, quoscumque poterimus, ad studium bonae vitae in laudem et in gloriam domini nostri Iesu Christi congregare necesse est' [trans. King, *Charlemagne*, p. 209].

[75] Theodulf of Orléans, *Carmen* 28 (*Contra iudices*), lines 77–80 (ed. Dümmler, p. 495): 'Haec tibi, Iosias, fuit observantia, princeps, / Haecque celebre tulit nomen ad alta tuum, / Impia qui sceleris demis monumenta vetusti, / Et patrias leges qua potes usque novas' [trans. N. Alexandrenko, 'The poetry of Theodulf of Orléans: a translation and critical study' (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Tulane University, 1971), p. 161]. This poem is discussed by L. Nees, *A Tainted Mantle. Hercules and the Classical Tradition at the Carolingian Court* (Philadelphia, 1991), pp. 21–143.

[76] II Kings xxii.2. The Vulgate translation reads, 'fecitque quod placitum erat coram Domino et ambulavit per omnes vias David patris sui'.

[77] See II Kings xxii–xxiii; II Chron. xxxiv–xxxv. See also McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 2–3.

and disseminated throughout his realm, as well as in the various attempts to produce and promote a standard, corrected and authoritative text of the Latin Bible, the Rule of Saint Benedict, or Paul the Deacon's newly composed homiliary.[78] To sharpen this point, one can even mention Theodulf of Orléans' *Libri Carolini*, written to rebut the actions of the seventh ecumenical council of Nicaea (787),[79] and the production of the so-called *Codex Carolinus*, which includes the correspondence of Charlemagne and his predecessors with Rome.[80] Inevitably, this preoccupation fostered acts of reform, and to paraphrase Rosamond McKitterick, patronage was inextricably bound up with the themes of *correctio* and *emendatio* which were so fundamental a part of the cultural and religious achievement scholars have labelled the 'Carolingian Renaissance'.[81]

There is little place for doubt that Charlemagne did indeed made a genuine effort to reform the Frankish Church and to improve the morals of the Frankish people. Furthermore, Charlemagne, like his father or his Merovingian predecessors, showed some sincere interest in liturgical reforms. But, should we understand Charlemagne's legislation regarding the liturgical practice of his kingdom as an attempt to create liturgical uniformity or to Romanise the Frankish rite? I would argue that we should not.

Although, as Theodulf of Orléans wrote in his *Libri Carolini*, 'among all other churches, the Holy Roman Church is held in special veneration

concerning matters of the faith',[82] the attempts at Romanising the Frankish liturgy under Charlemagne were rather limited. Indeed, Charlemagne introduced several Roman liturgical practices into the Frankish rite.[83] He even asked Pope Hadrian for an authoritative Roman sacramentary, allegedly composed by Pope Gregory the Great. However, throughout Charlemagne's legislation and the Carolingian conciliar decrees, it is only with reference to the chant that the Roman practice is specifically mentioned and ordered to be followed.[84] In this respect, Charlemagne has done no more than follow the lead of his father who, as we have already seen, made an attempt to import and disseminate the Roman chant in his kingdom.[85] But even within the domain of liturgical chant, the reception of the Roman practice was a matter of adaptation through a slow process of criticism and experiment.[86] None of these steps, then, should be taken to imply that Charlemagne made an attempt to Romanise the entire Frankish rite. Moreover, given the fact that no evidence for the imposition of the *Hadrianum* over the entire Frankish Church exists, it is time for scholars to abandon the idea that a programmatic and intentional Romanisation of the Frankish rite was at stake.

Similarly, there is no evidence that Charlemagne and his advisers made any straightforward attempt to impose uniformity of practice upon the Frankish Church. Although they may seem to call for uniformity, Charlemagne's capitularies and conciliar decrees had a different primary purpose. When Theodulf of Orléans described Pippin III's predilections for the Roman chant, he wrote that the Frankish Church 'had always maintained a unity of holy religion with [the Roman Church] and differed from it but little – not as touching the faith, that is, merely in the

---

[78] See above, pp. 72–4.

[79] On the *Libri Carolini*, see *Libri Carolini* (ed. Freeman), pp. 1–67. See also W. Schmandt, *Studien zu den Libri Carolini* (Mainz, 1966); A. Freeman, 'Theodulf of Orléans and the *Libri Carolini*', *Speculum* 32 (1957), pp. 663–705; eadem, 'Further studies in the *Libri Carolini* I–II', *Speculum* 40 (1965), pp. 203–89; eadem, 'Further studies in the *Libri Carolini* III: the marginal notes in *Vaticanus latinus* 7027', *Speculum* 46 (1971), pp. 597–612; eadem, 'Carolingian orthodoxy and the fate of *Libri Carolini*', *Viator* 16 (1985), pp. 65–108; eadem, 'Theodulf of Orléans and the psalm citations of the *Libri Carolini*', *Revue bénédictine* 97 (1987), pp. 195–224; P. Meyvaert, 'The authorship of the *Libri Carolini*: observations prompted by a recent book', *Revue bénédictine* 89 (1979), pp. 29–57; G. Arnaldi, 'La questione dei Libri Carolini', in *Culto cristiano politica imperiale Carolingia*, ed. O. Capitani, Convegni del Centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale 18 (Todi, 1979), pp. 61–86; Noble, 'From brigandage to justice', pp. 61–6; idem, 'Tradition and learning in search of ideology'.

[80] On the *Codex Carolinus*, see D.A. Bullough, 'The dating of *Codex Carolinus* nos. 95, 96, 97, Wilchar, and the beginning of the Archbishopric of Sens', *Deutsches Archiv* 18 (1962), pp. 223–30.

[81] McKitterick, 'Royal patronage of culture', p. 117.

[82] *Libri Carolini*, I.5 (ed. Freeman, p. 132): '... qualiter sancta Romana ecclesia inter ceteras ecclesias maxime venerationi habita pro causis fidei sit consulenda' [trans. Noble, 'Tradition and learning in search of ideology', p. 244].

[83] See above, p. 70.

[84] This is also apparent in Leidrad of Lyon's letter to Charlemagne; see A. Coville, *Recherches sur l'histoire de Lyon du Ve au IXe siècle (450–800)* (Paris, 1928), pp. 283–7, especially pp. 283–4. See also O.G. Oexle, *Forschungen zu monastischen und geistlichen Gemeinschaften im westfränkischen Bereich* (Munich, 1978), pp. 134–7.

[85] See above, pp. 46–9. Whether it was also an emulation of the model provided by Josiah, who 'followed all the way of his father', or a mere compliance with the rhetorical *topos* of following the legacy of illustrious ancestors, is impossible to tell.

[86] See, for example, S. Rankin, 'Carolingian Music', in *Carolingian Culture*, ed. McKitterick, pp. 274–316; Morrison, '"Know thyself": music in the Carolingian Renaissance', especially pp. 459–79.

celebration of services'.[87] In the same manner Charlemagne referred in the *Admonitio generalis* to what '. . . our father of blessed memory, King Pippin, strove to bring to pass when he abolished the Gallican chant for the sake of unanimity with the apostolic see and the peaceful harmony of God's holy Church'.[88] These short passages suggest that a clear distinction has to be made here between the unity of faith and doctrine, and the diversity and inconsistency of liturgical practice. When Charlemagne and his advisers referred to *unanimitas apostolicae sedis* and *concordia*, they meant doctrinal conformity with Rome, rather than liturgical uniformity. It is only apposite to recall here Karl Morrison's striking observations on Carolingian music, according to which concord and harmony, not unity or uniformity, were the prevailing categories in Carolingian intellectual thought,[89] and it is in this sense that one should understand the *unanimitas apostolicae sedis* of our Carolingian sources.

The concern with *correctio* on the one hand, and the preoccupation with authority on the other, gave rise to what I would call 'rhetoric of reform' that highlighted, among other things, the reformatory qualities of Charlemagne, and subsequently emphasised correctness, uniformity and compliance with Rome. This 'rhetoric of reform' crops up in a variety of sources all of which originated in the royal court. For example, in a letter that was sent to the Frankish bishops shortly before the council of Frankfurt (794), it is said that a council will be held 'at the behest and presidency of the most pious and glorious lord, King Charles, in order to renew with council of peace the unanimous status of the holy Church of God, and in order to declare the truth of the orthodox faith, in which, by the work of divine grace, lay the beginning and the end of our salvation . . .'.[90] Similarly, to give just one more example, in their letters

---

[87] *Libri Carolini*, I.6 (ed. Freeman, pp. 135–6): 'Quae dum a primis fidei temporibus cum ea perstaret in sacrae religionis unione et ab ea paulo distaret – quod tamen contra fidem non est – in officiorum celebratione' [trans. Bullough, 'Roman books', pp. 7–8].

[88] *Admonitio generalis*, c. 80 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 22, p. 61): '. . . secundum quod beatae memoriae genitor noster Pippinus rex decertavit ut fieret, quando Gallicanum tulit ob unanimitatem apostolicae sedis et sanctae Dei aeclesiae pacificam concordiam' [trans. King, *Charlemagne*, p. 218].

[89] Morrison, '"Know thyself": music in the Carolingian Renaissance', especially pp. 380–91.

[90] *Epistola ad episcoporum Franciae* (ed. Werminghoff, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, I, no. 19(E), p. 143): '. . . congregatis nobis in unum caritatis conventum, praecipiente et praesidente piisimo et gloriosissimo domno nostro Carolo rege, ad renovandum cum consilio pacificae unanimitatis sanctae Dei ecclesiae statum et ad praedicandam orthodoxae fidei veritatem in qua divina operante gratia salutis nostrae initium extat et finis . . .'. On the possible authorship of Alcuin, see Wallach, *Alcuin and Charlemagne*,

---

to King Offa of Mercia and to King Eardwulf of Northumbria, Charlemagne and Alcuin present the king as the *corrector* of his kingdom and of his subjects.[91] Thus, words such as *corrigere*, *emendare*, *renovare*, *reformare* and their synonyms, readily became the instruments for achieving unity,[92] and unity gave the Christian empire of Charlemagne *pax*, *caritas* and *concordia*.[93] This trend of rhetorical thought is already apparent in the *Admonitio generalis*, where Charlemagne enjoins

> That there is to be peace and concord and harmony throughout the whole Christian people, between bishops, abbots, counts, *judices* and all persons everywhere, of greater or lesser degree, for nothing is pleasing to God without peace, not even the offering of the holy sacrifice at the altar.[94]

No doubt this rhetoric was couched in the Carolingian political ideology and the perception of kingship that evolved in the late eighth and the early ninth century, and subsequently it was echoed in each and every description of the king, his duties and the reforms he promulgated.[95] As a result, the royal patronage of liturgy in this context of reforms, whether it was merely implementing changes that were already set in motion by his predecessors (as in the case of the Roman chant), whether it was commissioning a new liturgical book from Rome, or whether it was introducing a few Roman practices to the Frankish rite and calendar, became part and parcel of this rhetorical discourse.[96]

Consequently, liturgical uniformity and standardisation according to

---

pp. 58–65. On the council of Frankfurt, see W. Hartmann, *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im Frankreich und in Italien* (Paderborn, 1989), pp. 105–15.

[91] Alcuin, *Epistolae* 100–101 and 108 (ed. Dümmler, pp. 145–8 and 155).

[92] See P.E. Schramm, *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*, I (Stuttgart, 1968), p. 330; J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *Early Germanic Kingship in England and on the Continent* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 103–5.

[93] These ideas come up time and again in a great variety of sources from the Carolingian period. See, for example, Alcuin, *Epistolae* 41, 121, 129, 136, 219, 257 (ed. Dümmler, pp. 84, 176, 192, 209, 363, 415 respectively); Alcuin, *Disputatio de rhetorica et de virtutibus*, ed. W.S. Howell, Princeton Studies in English 23 (Princeton, 1941); Theodulf of Orléans, *Carmina* 28–9 (ed. Dümmler, pp. 493–520). For further references, see Anton, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos*, passim.

[94] *Admonitio generalis (789)*, c. 62 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 22, p. 58): 'Ut pax sit et concordia et unanimitas cum omni populo christiano inter episcopos, abbates, comites, iudices et omni ubique seu maiores seu minores personas, quia nihil Deo sine pace placet nec munus sanctae oblationis ad altare' [trans. King, *Charlemagne*, p. 214].

[95] See Staubach, '"Cultus divinus" und karolingische Reform', especially pp. 563–73.

[96] This rhetoric was adapted and taken forward by later Carolingian authors, as we shall see later.

---

what was thought to be the Roman practice was consistently put forth by Carolingian scholars as an accomplished reality. 'But the prerogative of the Roman see was observed', writes Walahfrid Strabo, 'and the reasoned consistency of its arrangements persuaded almost all churches of the Latin speaking world to follow its custom and authority.'[97] But the liturgical reality in the Frankish kingdom of Charlemagne was different.[98] As is apparent from Walahfrid's own treatise,[99] and from the overwhelming variety of liturgical texts circulating around the Frankish kingdom,[100] diversity and inconsistency of practice was the norm. Even in the case of liturgical chant, the only thing on which we have some evidence that a supposedly Roman practice was intentionally imposed at the behest of the Frankish king, success was rather limited despite Charlemagne's characterisation of his father's thoroughness in suppressing the Gallican chant.[101]

Thus, despite the prevailing notion of unity and Romanisation which characterises the sources from the late eighth and the early ninth century, the liturgical reforms promulgated by Charlemagne and his advisers were rather limited in their scope. Indeed a few Roman feasts and practices were introduced to the Frankish rite and, like his father before him, Charlemagne gave high priority to liturgical music. Yet, no general Romanisation of the entire Frankish practice was desired, and no outright exchange of an existing liturgical corpus for a wholly different one was aimed at. It appears that Charlemagne's interest in

---

[97] Walahfrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis*, c. 26 (ed. Harting-Corrêa, pp. 166–7): 'Sed privilegio Romanae sedis observato et congruentia rationabili dispositionum apud eam factarum persuadente factum est, ut in omnibus paene Latinorum ecclesiis consuetudo et magisterium eiusdem sedis praevaleret.'

[98] A similar situation is apparent with reference to the political unity of the kingdom. For example, both the coronation of Charlemagne's sons Pippin and Louis as kings of Italy and Aquitaine respectively (781), and the *divisio regnorum* of 806, were concessions to local aspirations and fears of succession, but still Carolingian authors mitigated these concessions and continued to propagate the image of political unity. See G. Eiten, *Das Unterkönigtum im Reiche der Merowinger und Karolinger*, Heidelberger Abhandlungen zur mittleren und neueren Geschichte 18 (Heidelberg, 1907), pp. 18–46; Noble, 'From brigandage to justice', pp. 54–5.

[99] See Walahfrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis*, cc. 4, 12, 19–23, 26–7, 29 (ed. Harting-Corrêa, pp. 56–60, 88–90, 106–48, 154–80, 184–6). See also Amalarius of Metz, *Prologus antiphonarii*, cc. 10–13 (ed. Hanssens, I, pp. 362–3).

[100] See above, pp. 57–64.

[101] See John the Deacon of Monte Cassino, *Vita Gregorii Magni*, II.7–9, PL 75, cols. 90–2; Jonas of Orléans, *Epistolae* 35, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epp. 5 (Berlin, 1899), pp. 359–60; Regino of Prüm, *De harmonica institutione*, cc. 1–2, PL 132, cols. 483–6. See also K. Levy, 'Toledo, Rome, and the legacy of Gaul', *Early Music History* 4 (1984), pp. 49–99 [reprinted in idem, *Gregorian Chant and the Carolingians*, pp. 31–81].

---

reforming the liturgy was mainly aimed at ensuring that the Frankish bishops and priests celebrate the liturgy properly, a concern which penetrated well into the lower levels of the Frankish clerical hierarchy.

Liturgy and propaganda

Reform was only one aspect of the royal patronage exercised by Charlemagne and his advisory entourage. Another aspect was the promotion of liturgical prayers and mass celebrations in honour of the king and for the safety and the welfare of the kingdom. This, of course, was neither new nor unusual in any way. As we have seen in the previous chapters both the Merovingians and Pippin III promoted the liturgy for the king, the kingdom and the royal family in various ways, and Charlemagne merely followed in their footsteps.[102] But as he did in so many matters, Charlemagne operated on a much more grandiose scale.

Prayers for the king and the kingdom occur in the eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentaries, many of which were copied during Charlemagne's regency,[103] and several such masses were added by Benedict of Aniane to the *Hadrianum*, which originally lacked any prayer *pro rege*.[104] Like his father before him, and like his Merovingian predecessors, Charlemagne attached great political, as well as spiritual, significance to prayers on his behalf. The seriousness with which Charlemagne viewed these prayers is clearly revealed in two incidents. First, in a letter to Pope Hadrian dated to 791, Charlemagne expressed his hope that the pope, together with all the ecclesiastical orders, will offer their prayers 'for our [i.e. Charlemagne's] safety and for the stability of the kingdom'.[105] The second incident is the scandal that erupted at the abbey of

---

[102] See McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints*, pp. 159–61.

[103] See, for example, *Liber sacramentorum Gellonensis*, cc. 2624–8 (ed. Dumas and Deshusses, I, pp. 410–11); *Liber sacramentorum Augustodunensis*, cc. 1637–43, ed. O. Heiming, CCSL 159B (Turnhout, 1987), pp. 201–2; *Liber sacramentorum Engolismensis*, cc. 1857–8 and 2311–18, ed. P. Saint-Roch, CCSL 159C (Turnhout, 1987), pp. 278–9 and 359–61. See also Jackson, *Ordines coronationis Franciae*, pp. 51–65.

[104] See *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, cc. 1266–79, 1719–21, 1789 and 2018–55 (ed. Deshusses, I, p. 424–8, 568–9, 598, and II, pp. 73–6 respectively).

[105] See *ChLA* XII.543, p. 74: '. . . ut pro incolomitate nostra atque pro stabilitate regni una cum omni ordine ecclesiastico pio domino sacrificium praecum vestrarum offeratis'. See also E. Munding, *Königsbrief Karls des Großen an Papst Hadrian über Abt-Bischof Waldo von Reichenau-Pavia. Palimpsesturkunde aus Cod. lat. Monacensis 6333*, Texte und Arbeiten I.6 (Beuron, 1920); McCormick, 'The liturgy of war', pp. 5–6.

San Vincenzo al Volturno in central Italy,[106] when Abbot Potho refused to sing the daily office on behalf of the Frankish king.[107] 'If it was not for my monastery and the Beneventan land, I would have treated him [i.e. Charlemagne] like a dog,'[108] he told the king's *missi* at the hearing, which eventually led to his deposition. The political background to this event is obvious, that is, the bitter division between the monks of San Vincenzo, some of whom remained loyal to the Beneventan rulers, while others moved their loyalty to the Carolingians. Nevertheless, Charlemagne's uncompromising actions, as well as the fact that the pope himself, the duke of Beneventum and several other high-ranking officials became involved in this affair, undoubtedly point to the importance attached to those daily prayers *pro rege* by the Frankish king.

Closely related to the prayers *pro rege* are the special, large-scale liturgical processions which Charlemagne took an effort to organise in times of crisis. Indeed, it was Pippin III who first showed some interest in liturgical services on a broader scale,[109] but again Charlemagne outrivalled his father, and one such attempt to organise a litany is particularly well documented. A severe drought in 804 had resulted in a harsh famine in 805, which continued well into 806 and 807, and perhaps even into 808.[110] Such natural disasters were often interpreted as a form of divine punishment for all, but especially for rulers, and therefore Charlemagne ordered three three-day fasts to be held because of it:

---

[106] On San Vincenzo al Volturno, see R. Hodges, *Light in the Dark Ages. The Rise and Fall of San Vincenzo al Volturno* (London, 1997), especially pp. 206–17 on the monastery's Carolingian connections.

[107] See *Codex Carolinus*, no. 66–7 (ed. Gundlach, pp. 593–7). On the daily prayer for kings and rulers that was incorporated into the monastic office, see L. Biehl, *Das liturgische Gebet für Kaiser und Reich: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Verhältnisses von Kirche und Staat* (Paderborn, 1937), pp. 93–102.

[108] *Codex Carolinus*, no. 67 (ed. Gundlach, p. 595): 'Quia, si non mihi fuisset pro monasterio et terra Beneventana, talem eum habuisse sicut unum canem.' On this incident, see G.V.B. West, 'Charlemagne's involvement in central and southern Italy: power and the limits of authority', *Early Medieval Europe* 8 (1999), pp. 341–67, at 351–3.

[109] See above, pp. 55–6.

[110] None of the Carolingian Annals reports on the bitter famine of those years, and we learn about it from references in several capitularies, and from a circular letter addressed to Bishop Gerbald of Liège. See *Capitulare missorum in Theodonis Villa datum secundum (805)*, c. 4 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 44, pp. 122–3); *Capitulare missorum Niumagae datum (806)*, c. 18 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 46, p. 132); *Memoratorium de exercitu in Gallia occidentali praeparando (807)*, preface (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 48, p. 134). Although not referring to the famine explicitly, a capitulary from 808 might suggest that the famine continued into that year; see *Capitulare missorum de exercitu promovendo* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 50, pp. 136–8.

Be it known to your dear selves that, consulting together with our *fideles*, both spiritual and lay, and with their approval no less than council, we deem it necessary, because of certain pressing exigencies which we shall indicate below, that three three-day fasts be observed by all of us, without exception . . . At these fasts it has seemed to all of us, can fittingly be carried out, the Lord granting, by the following arrangements. The first, beginning eleven days after the feast of Saint Andrew, should be observed on 11, 13 and 15 December and in such a way that everyone abstains from wine and meat for these three days and fasts until the ninth hour, unless age or infirmity does not permit this. . . . But at the ninth hour let one and all gather together, with devout mind, at the local church, as they are notified, and, if the light and the location shall permit, go in procession, saying litanies, around some spacious area and then, entering the church singing psalms, hear mass with all devotion. Once this has been completed, let everyone return home and satisfy the body with the permitted fare, but with a view to need and moderation, not desire. . . . And let every priest sing a mass, and likewise let every cleric of a different grade, every monk and every woman consecrated to God who has learned the psalms sing fifty psalms. . . . Two other three-day fasts are also to be observed, in all respect in the same fashion as on these days: one after Epiphany, on 7, 10 and 12 January, the other after Septuagesima, on 12, 14 and 16 February.[111]

---

[111] *Karoli ad Ghaerbaldum episcopum epistula (805)* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 124, p. 245): 'Notum sit dilectioni vestrae, quia nos, cum fidelibus nostris tam spiritualibus quam saecularibus tractantes, cum consensu et pari consilio invenimus necessarium esse propter instantes quasdam necessitates quas subter significaturi sumus, tria triduana ieiunia ab omnibus nobis generaliter esse celebranda . . . Ipsa autem ieiunia, sicut nobis omnibus visum est, hac discretione posse fieri Domino largiente congruenter impleta, scilicet ut primum XI diebus post festivitatem sancti Andreae transactis, id est III Idus et Idus Decembris et XVIII Kalendas Ianuarii tali ratione fiat, ut omnes a vino et carne his III diebus abstineant et usque horam nonam ieiunent, excepto quae (*sic*) aut aetas aut infirmitas non permittit, . . . Hora autem nona omnes generaliter ad ecclesias vicinas, ubi eis denuntiatur, devota mente occurrant et, si aura vel locus permiserit, aliquo spatioso loco letania procedant atque, psallendo ecclesiam intrantes. cum omni devotione missam audiant. Qua peracta, unusquisque domum redeat et statutis cibis corpori satisfaciat, non ad voluntatem sed ad necessitatem ac sobrietatem. . . . Et unusquisque presbyterorum missas cantet, et alterius ordinis clericus vel monachus sive Deo sacrata, qui psalmos didicit, L psalmos similiter cantet. . . . Duo quoque cetera triduana his diebus pari ratione per omnia erunt celebranda: unum post theophaniam VII Idus et IIII Idus et II Idus Ianuarii, aliud vero post septuagesimam II Idus Februarii et XV Kalendas Martii et IIII Kalendas Martii' [trans. King, *Charlemagne*, pp. 245–6, with minor alterations]. This letter survives in the small collection of letters and official documents prepared by Bishop Gerbald in 806.

These promulgations were shortly followed by Charlemagne's last reform capitulary, that is the double capitulary of Thionville,[112] where he refers to the famine, and where he orders the people not to wait for a royal decree in order to pray for God's mercy in times of famine and pestilence.[113]

Similar concerted efforts were also made by Charlemagne and his royal entourage in order to arrange litanies, and aimed at obtaining and celebrating military victory.[114] These efforts reached their peak in the decade immediately preceding the imperial coronation of Charlemagne, and they are clearly reflected in the sources, both narrative and liturgical.[115] Indeed, under Charlemagne the development of services of supplication and thanksgiving on behalf of the Frankish king, his army and his kingdom seems remarkable. But, as pointed out by Michael McCormick, 'they must be viewed as part of a broader pattern of development, in which Frankish kings sought to use the liturgy to strengthen their links with their subjects and harness the spiritual forces of the latter to their own undertaking in times of crisis'.[116] It is, then, no mere coincidence that approximately at the same time the so-called *laudes regiae* made their first appearance in Francia.[117] These *laudes*, containing acclamations for the pope (*Adriano summo pontifice et universale papae*), the king (*Karolo excellentissimo et Deo coronato, magno et pacifico rege Francorum et Langobardorum ac patricio Romanorum*), his family (*Pipino et Karolo*; *Pipino rege Langobardorum*; *Chlodovio rege Aquitaniorum*; *Fastrada regina*), the Frankish nobility (*omnibus*

iudicibus vel cuncto exercitui Francorum) and the Frankish Church,[118] were probably sung on special occasions, such as royal welcome rituals (*adventus*), major liturgical feasts at the court, or royal visits to churches throughout the Frankish kingdom. As it had been already noted by scholars, the *laudes*' list of invocations and its emphasis on military victory are paralleled in royal blessings, such as the ones transmitted by the Benedictionals of Freising,[119] and in the verse panegyrics which became quite popular among Carolingian intellectuals.[120] Thus, these *laudes* reflect Carolingian realities of consensus politics and ideas of peace and solidarity within the kingdom that were to become the prevailing characteristics of the Carolingian political ideology under Louis the Pious and his successors.[121]

It seems, therefore, that Charlemagne and his advisers used the patronage of liturgy as a political machinery of royal propaganda. Through the prayers on behalf of the king and the kingdom Charlemagne disseminated political messages of consensus, solidarity, peace and victory to his subjects, and through these prayers the king made his presence felt throughout the kingdom. Moreover, the prayers for the king and the kingdom in times of crisis made each and every subject personally responsible for the welfare of the ruler and of the kingdom as a whole. Hence, these prayers helped to sustain 'Frankish unity' by creating what Janet Nelson would term 'Frankish self-identification'.[122]

'After the decadence and the final deposition of the last long-haired

---

[112] *Capitulare missorum in Theodonis Villa datum secundum (805)* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 44, pp. 122–6); On this capitulary, see F.L. Ganshof, *Recherches sur les Capitulaires* (Paris, 1958), pp. 28–9 and 73–4.

[113] *Capitulare missorum in Theodonis Villa datum secundum (805)*, c. 4 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 44, pp. 122–3).

[114] See, for example, *Codex Carolinus*, no. 76 and 79 (ed. Gundlach, p. 607–8 and 611); *Epistolae variorum Carolo Magno regnante scriptae*, no. 20, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epp. 4 (Berlin, 1895), pp. 528–9.

[115] The evidence is discussed by McCormick, 'The liturgy of war', especially pp. 8–15; idem, *Eternal Victory*, pp. 342–77.

[116] McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, p. 358.

[117] On the *laudes regiae*, see Kantorowicz, *Laudes regiae*, especially pp. 13–111. The earliest manuscript containing the *laudes regiae* is Montpellier, Bibliothèque Universitaire (Médecine) 409, fol. 433 (?Mondsee, 788–94); *CLA* VI.795; *CLLA* 1611. On this manuscript, see McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word*, pp. 252–5; Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken*, II, pp. 16–18. See also P. Lauer, 'La psautier carolingien du Président Bouhier, Montpellier Univ. H 409', in *Mélanges d'histoire du Moyen Age offerts à Ferdinand Lot par ses amis et ses élèves* (Paris, 1925), pp. 359–83.

[118] I cite the invocations as they appear in Montpellier, Bibliothèque Universitaire (Médecine) 409, fol. 433, edited as *Litania Karolina*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH SRG 25 (Hannover, 1911), pp. 46–7. See also Kantorowicz, *Laudes regiae*, pp. 15–16, where the *laudes* from the so-called Charlemagne's Psalter (Paris, BNF lat. 13159, fols. 163 (?Belgium/E. France; 795–800); *CLA* V.652; *CLLA* 1619) are printed.

[119] Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 6430 (Freising; s. ix); *CLLA* 280. For an edition, see *The Benedictionals of Freising (Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek codex lat. 6430)*, no. 454–72, ed. R. Amiet, HBS 88 (Maidstone, 1974), p. 100–102. See also, Jackson, *Ordines coronationis Franciae*, pp. 69–72.

[120] See Nelson, 'The Lord's anointed and the people's choice', pp. 153–4; McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, pp. 374–5; Godman, *Poets and Emperors*, pp. 38–92.

[121] See, for example, J.L. Nelson, 'Kingship, law and liturgy in the political thought of Hincmar of Rheims', *English Historical Review* 92 (1977), 241–79 [reprinted in eadem, *Politics and Ritual*, pp. 133–71]; eadem, 'Legislation and consensus in the reign of Charles the Bald', pp. 202–27; K.F. Morrison, *The Mimetic Tradition of Reform in the West* (Princeton, 1982), pp. 136–61; idem, '"Unum ex multis": Hincmar of Rheims' medical and aesthetic rationales of unification', in *Nascita dell'Europa ed Europa Carolingia: un'equazione de verificale*, Settimane 27 (Spoleto, 1981), pp. 583–712.

[122] See Nelson, 'The Lord's anointed and the people's choice', pp. 147–9. See also Garrison, 'The Franks as the new Israel?', pp. 140–6.

king,' writes McCormick, 'the royal institution itself was badly in need of new prestige.'[123] The patronage of liturgy, it appears, provided the early Carolingians with an extraordinary opportunity to create, shape and disseminate a new prestige. It is true that the use of liturgy to transmit ideas and form attitudes, even in political matters, was not a new phenomenon.[124] Yet, the Carolingians, and foremost among them Charlemagne, were the first to realise the political power within the liturgy, and to make ample use of it. Thus, with the help of liturgy, the Carolingian political ideology, or at least some aspects of it, infiltrated into every level of Frankish society in an attempt, among other things, to shape 'public opinion'.

It is, then, not at all surprising that the emphasis which dominates the ideas of rulership and government in contemporary and near-contemporary liturgical texts is on the martial image of kingship. It is possible that, as in Merovingian Gaul,[125] this emphasis of the ideal king was elaborated in response to lay expectations, and therefore liturgical sources are sometimes different from other types of source which made a subtle, highly intellectual, play on other models and aspects of ruler-ship, such as justice or piety.[126] What is interesting in this respect is that both images were tied closely by their propagators to the biblical past, and both were based on an appropriation of the biblical past as a tem-plate for the present.

To sum up, the age of Charlemagne has often been regarded as a forma-tive stage in the evolution of western liturgical rites and practices. In many cases this is true, yet one should be extremely careful not to read too much into the sources and not to overemphasise the significance of the liturgical reforms promulgated by the Frankish king and their advisers. Roman books and liturgical practices were undoubtedly intro-duced to the Frankish kingdoms, both voluntarily and by legislation, but the traditional non-Roman rites were neither deliberately suppressed nor lost. Continuity in liturgical celebration is apparent, even when it seems that new practices and prayers were introduced or straightforwardly imposed on the Frankish Church. Furthermore, against the background of the evidence adduced above, it is also highly improbable that

---

[123] McCormick, 'The liturgy of war', p. 22.
[124] See, for example, the activities of Queen Balthild discussed above, pp. 37–41.
[125] See Hen, 'The uses of the Bible', pp. 286–9.
[126] See Anton, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos*; Garrison, 'The Franks as the new Israel?'.

liturgical uniformity was aimed at by the Carolingian court. A great diversity in practice continued to characterise the liturgy throughout the reign of Charlemagne and beyond. Hence, in a scholarly quest of the area in which Charlemagne's contribution to the liturgical development of early medieval Europe was the greatest, it is to the use liturgy as a means of propagating royal ideology that one should look. In this area the competence and ingenuity of Charlemagne and his advisers are revealed at their fullest strength.

4

The Reign of Louis The Pious – Continuity and Change

In 813 Charlemagne summoned his only surviving legitimate son, Louis the Pious, king of Aquitaine since 781, to a large assembly at Aachen. In the words of Einhard (d. 840), writing at a fairly early stage of Louis' reign, after 'all the leading Franks from the entire kingdom had solemnly assembled and had given their opinion, he established Louis as the co-ruler of the entire kingdom and the heir to the imperial title'.[1] On the following Sunday at church, Charlemagne gave his son some fatherly advice, and 'he placed a crown upon his [son's] head and ordered that he should [henceforth] be addressed as emperor and augustus. This decision of his was widely approved by all who were present, for it seems to have been divinely inspired in him for the general good of the kingdom.'[2] On 28 January 814 Charlemagne died, and Louis the Pious inherited his father's empire.

The reign of Louis the Pious has suffered from a bad reputation. In the past it was often depicted as a period of disintegration and decline, not to be compared with the glorious years of his celebrated father. Yet, this view, so masterfully summarised in the title of Nikolaus Staubach's illuminating paper – 'Des großen Kaisers kleiner Sohn',[3] has been gradually

---

[1] Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, c. 30 (ed. Rau, p. 200): '... congregatis sollemniter de toto regno Francorum primoribus, cunctorum concilio consortem sibi totius regni et imperialis nominis heredem constituit ...' [trans. Dutton, p. 35]. On the probable political agenda and bias in Einhard's *Vita Karoli Magni*, see Innes and McKitterick, 'The writing of history', pp. 203–9, and compare with Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, pp. xvi–xxiv.

[2] Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, c. 30 (ed. Rau, pp. 200–202): '... inpositoque capiti eius diademate imperatorem et augustum iussit appellari. Susceptum est hoc eius consilium ab omnibus qui aderant magno cum favore; nam divinitus ei propter regni utilitatem videbatur inspiratum' [trans. Dutton, p. 35].

[3] N. Staubach, '"Des großen Kaisers kleiner Sohn". Zum Bild Ludwigs des Frommen in der älteren deutschen Geschichtsforschungen', in *Charlemagne's Heir*, ed. Godman and Collins, pp. 701–21. Staubach is citing A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 4 vols., 6th ed. (Berlin and Leipzig, 1952), II, p. 180.

---

given way to a fresh and more convincing re-evaluation of Louis the Pious' qualities and achievements.[4] A close examination of the sources reveals that in many respects the accession of Louis the Pious to the Frankish throne brought no significant change, and that continuity, rather than new beginnings, was the case.[5] Evidence for continuity is abundant and can be observed in various domains, such as government policy and military affairs,[6] political thought,[7] or patronage of culture.[8] Continuity was also the most notable feature of Louis the Pious' reform policy.

Louis and his advisers sought to clarify, enhance and complete the work left unfinished by Charlemagne.[9] When compared with Charlemagne's *Admonitio generalis* or with the reform councils of 813, however, Louis' reform councils of 816–19,[10] as well as the *Admonitio ad omnes regni ordines* of 823–5,[11] seem no more than an elaborate

---

[4] See P. Depreux, 'Louis le Pieux reconsideré? À propos des travaux récentes consacrés à "l'héritier de Charlemagne" et à son règne', *Francia* 21 (1994), pp. 181–212. An important precursor in this respect is F.L. Ganshof, 'Louis the Pious reconsidered', *History* 42 (1957), pp. 171–80 [reprinted in idem, *The Carolingians and the Frankish Monarchy*, pp. 261–72]. See also Noble, 'Louis the Pious and his piety re-considered', pp. 297–8 with reference to Ganshof's contribution.

[5] For a general account of Louis' reign, see Boshof, *Ludwig der Fromme*. See also McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms*, pp. 106–39; Riché, *Les Carolingiens*, pp. 149–61; Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 226–41; Nelson, 'The Frankish Kingdom, 814–898', pp. 110–20.

[6] See, for example, Werner, '*Hludovicus Augustus*', especially pp. 69–92; G. Schmitz, 'The capitulary legislation of Louis the Pious', in *Charlemagne's Heir*, ed. Godman and Collins, pp. 425–36; T.F.X. Noble, 'Louis the Pious and the frontiers of the Frankish realm', in *Charlemagne's Heir*, ed. Godman and Collins, pp. 333–47.

[7] See Anton, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos*, pp. 132–247; J. Semmler, '*Renovatio regni Francorum*'.

[8] See, for example, McKitterick, 'Royal patronage of culture', p. 118; Godman, *Poets and Emperors*, pp. 93–148; F. Mütherich, 'Book illumination at the court of Louis the Pious', in *Charlemagne's Heir*, ed. Godman and Collins, pp. 593–604.

[9] See Boshof, *Ludwig der Fromme*, pp. 108–28; Werner, '*Hludovicus Augustus*', especially pp. 69–82; McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms*, pp. 112–24; Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 263–8.

[10] For the decrees of Louis' reform councils, see *Synodi primae Aquisgranensis decreta authentica (816)* (ed. Semmler, *Legislatio Aquisgranensis*, pp. 457–68); *Synodi secunda Aquisgranensis decreta authentica (817)* (ed. Semmler, *Legislatio Aquisgranensis*, pp. 473–81); *Capitulare ecclesiasticum (818–819)* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 138, pp. 275–8); *Capitulare missorum (819)* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 141, pp. 288–91). See also Hartmann, *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit*, pp. 156–64; J. Semmler, 'Die Beschlusse des Aachener Konzils im Jahre 816', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 74 (1963), pp. 15–82.

[11] *Admonitio ad omnes regni ordines (823–825)* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 150, pp. 303–7). On this capitulary, see O. Guillot, 'Une *ordinatio* méconnue: Le Capitulaire de 823–825', in *Charlemagne's Heir*, ed. Godman and Collins,

variation on the very same themes. Moreover, the continuity is apparent not only on the ideological–legislative level, but also on the practical–executive level, as several *capitula episcoporum* and diocesan synods imply.[12] Yet, although the connection with the reform policy promulgated by Charlemagne and his advisors is obvious, Louis' reign constitutes a crucial new phase in the history of the Carolingian period. Continuity does not necessarily mean stagnation.

The opening years of Louis' reign were filled with institutional and religious reforms, which were the result of a more complex reform ideology, based on the newly evolved political concept of the Christian empire. Louis' vision was fundamentally unitary in all respects: one God, one faith, one Church, one emperor and one empire. Furthermore, Louis and his advisers tended to regard the Frankish people as a *populus Christianus*, rather than as an assemblage of various ethnic communities, and consequently the concept of unity was no longer directed inwards, towards the *regnum Francorum*, but outwards, towards the world-wide Christian *amicitia*.[13] This shift in emphasis is apparent in a variety of sources; let us cite just one example. In his letter to Louis the Pious, Archbishop Agobard of Lyons wrote:

'And they went forth and proclaimed everywhere that the Lord worked with them' [Mark xvi.20], and it was announced by them to all the creatures, that is, to all the nations of the world, that one faith was laid by God, one hope was spread by the Holy Spirit in the hearts of the believers, one love was born in everyone, one burning wish was desired, one reason was consigned, so that each and everyone of the different people, the different strata, the nobility, the honourable, the different serfs, may say together . . . : 'O our father, who is in the sky, blessed be your name,' as if

pp. 455–86; Boshof, *Ludwig der Fromme*, pp. 148–50. On the date of the *Admonitio*, see also Werner, '*Hludovicus Augustus*', p. 87, n. 320.
[12] See Waltcaud of Liège, *Capitula episcoporum* (ed. Brommer, *Capitula episcoporum*, I, pp. 45–49), with A. Dierkens, 'La christianisation de campagne de l'empire de Louis le Pioux: l'example du diocèse de Liège de Waltcaud (*c.* 809–*c.* 831)', in *Charlemagne's Heir*, ed. Godman and Collins, pp. 309–29; *Capitula Parisiensia* (ed. Pokorny, *Capitula episcoporum*, III, pp. 16–35); *Capitula Franciae occidentalis* (ed. Pokorny, *Capitula episcoporum*, III, pp. 36–47); *Capitula Neustrica I–IV* (ed. Pokorny, *Capitula episcoporum*, III, pp. 48–73); W. Hartmann, 'Neue Texte zur bischöflichen Reformgesetzgebung aus den Jahren 829/831. Vier Diözesansynoden Halitgars von Cambrai', *Deutsches Archiv* 35 (1979), pp. 368–94.
[13] Hence the considerable importance which Louis and his advisers attached to foreign policy. See McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms*, pp. 123–34; Fried, 'Ludwig der Fromme', pp. 246–7; Semmler, '*Renovatio regni Francorum*', pp. 126–9.

invoking one father, thus seeking one sanctification, postulating one kingdom, one fulfilment of his wish, as if he is in the sky, wishing that one bread will be given every day to those who pray, and to everyone who was dismissed because of duty.[14]

Agobard undoubtedly cherished the idea of *unitas*. This unity, however, was not crystallised around Rome, but around the empire, the Christian empire, over which Louis the Pious ruled. One can clearly identify here the 'rhetoric of reform' which characterised Charlemagne's reign. Yet, Agobard's rhetoric was not a mere emulation of Charlemagne's. Rome, for Agobard, had no unificatory role, and the concept of unity which he promoted was more clearly stated as Christian and universal – *una fides, una sanctificatio, unum regnum*.[15] No wonder, then, that from the very beginning Louis the Pious adopted an exclusively imperial title – *Imperator Augustus* – while omitting the various 'local' or 'ethnic' epithets used by his father.[16]

These conceptual transformations had some significant implications as far as the perception of reform and the role of the emperor are concerned. Louis, like his father before him, attempted to realise the *renovatio* and the unity of his empire on both the secular–administrative level and on the ecclesiastical–monastic level. Yet, the *renovatio regni Francorum* and, by implication, its inherent concept of unity received under Louis the Pious a new interpretation, which had no place for Rome.[17] Louis and his advisers parted from the well-defined route paved

[14] Agobard of Lyons, *Adversus legem Gundobadi (ad Ludovicum)*, c. 2, ed. L. Van Acker, CCCM 52 (Turnhout, 1981), pp. 17–28, at 19–20: '"Illi autem profecti predicaverunt ubique Domino cooperante", annuntiataque est ab eis omni creaturae, id est cunctis nationibus mundi, una fides indita per Deum, una spes diffusa per Spiritum sanctum in cordibus credentium, una caritas nata in omnibus, una voluntas, accensum unum desiderium, tradita una ratio, ut omnes omnino ex diversis gentibus, diversis conditionibus, diverso sexu, nobilitate, honestate, diversa servitute, simul dicant uni Deo a patri omnium: "Pater noster, qui es in caelis, sanctificetur nomen tuum", sicut unum patrem invocantes, ita unam sanctificationem quaerentes, unum regnum postulantes, unam adimpletionem voluntatis eius, sicut fit in caelo, optantes unum sibi panem quotidianum dari precantes, et omnibus dimitti debita.' On Agobard of Lyons, see Boshof, *Erzbischof Agobard von Lyon*; CSL I, pp. 69–90.
[15] Fried, 'Ludwig der Fromme', pp. 244–5. See also Boshof, *Erzbischof Agobard von Lyon*, pp. 97–9.
[16] See H. Wolfram, 'Lateinische Herrschertitel im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert', in idem, *Intitulatio*, II: *Lateinische Königs- und Fürstentitel bis zum im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert*, Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 24 (Vienna, 1973), pp. 19–178.
[17] Fried, 'Ludwig der Fromme', pp. 241–7.

by their Carolingian ancestors, for whom reforms were inextricably tied to Rome and its authority, and centred their programme of reforms around Christian ideals. For them Christian concord and unity were to buttress the ideals of imperial unity, peace and justice.

Like his father, Louis the Pious desired to lead his people to salvation, and the comprehensive social, legal and religious reforms he promulgated were perceived by him as an essential step towards the fulfilment of that desire. Thus, Louis understood the imperial duty as a *munus divinum* – a *ministerium*. In the *Admonitio ad omnes regni ordines* of 823–5, for example, he clearly stated that divine providence had instituted him as a ruler 'so that he would care for His holy Church and for this kingdom'.[18] As a result of an ideologically more-refined and sophisticated view both of the empire and of the nature of the imperial office, Louis' perception of his own responsibilities was more profound than Charlemagne's.[19]

The council of Paris (829) clearly stated that 'the royal ministry is particularly to govern the people of God, to rule with equity and justice and to strive that they may have peace and harmony'.[20] Thus, the emperor's role was perceived as a Christian ministry, whose essential mission was to ensure the triumph of Christianity, peace and concord. However, the burden of securing these goals was to be shared between Louis himself, his sons and his magnates. 'Although it seems that the whole of this ministry rests in our person alone,' wrote Louis in his *Admonitio ad omnes regni ordines*, 'still it is known to be divided into parts by both divine authority and human arrangement, in such a way that each of you in his place and his *ordo* has a share in our ministry; hence it appears that I must be the adviser of all of you, and all of you

[18] *Admonitio ad omnes regni ordines (823–825)*, c. 2 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 150, p. 303): '. . . ut sanctae suae ecclesiae et regni huius curam gereremus . . .'. See also ibid, cc. 3 and 8 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 150, pp. 303–4)

[19] See J. Semmler, 'Traditio und Königsschutze. Studien zur Geschichte der Königlichen Monasteria', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, kanonistische Abteilung* 45 (1959), pp. 1–33; idem, 'Reichsidee und kirchliche Gesetzgebung bei Ludwig dem Frommen', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 71 (1966), pp. 37–65; idem, '*Renovatio regni Francorum*'. See also Staubach, '"Cultus divinus" und karolingische Reform', pp. 557–60; Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter*, pp. 301–2.

[20] Concilium Parisiense, III.2 (ed. Werminghoff, *Concilia aevi Karolini*, II, no. 50, p. 651): 'Regale ministerium specialiter est populum dei gubernare et regere cum equitate et iustitia et, ut pacem et concordiam habeant, studere.' See also *Admonitio ad omnes regni ordines (823–825)*, c. 2 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 150, p. 303).

---

must be our helpers.'[21] In other words, Louis clearly extended his *ministerium* to all *ordines* of his realm, so that all would be *adiutores* to all, and as already noted by Nelson, Louis' programme may be summed up as 'the securing of *communis utilitas*'.[22]

The Frankish liturgy under Louis the Pious

Deeply religious and highly affected by monastic ideals, Louis the Pious had a remarkable predilection for ecclesiastical reforms.[23] Both Ermoldus Nigellus (d.c. 835) and the so-called Astronomer praise Louis' efforts to promote religious life in Aquitaine even before 814,[24] while various other sources record the massive support and encouragement he offered Benedict of Aniane and his monastic reform movement.[25] On Louis' accession to the imperial throne, the monastic reforms inaugurated by Benedict of Aniane in Aquitaine were extended to the entire Frankish kingdom. Benedict became Louis' chief adviser on ecclesiastical and monastic matters, and the monastery of Inden (Kornelimünster) near

[21] *Admonitio ad omnes regni ordines (823–825)*, c. 3 (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 150, p. 303): 'Sed quamquam summa huius ministerii in nostra persona consistere videatur, tamen et divina auctoritate et humana ordinatione ita per partes divisum esse cognoscitur, ut unusquisque vestrum in suo loco et ordine partem nostri ministerii habere cognoscatur; unde apparet, quod ego omnium vestrum admonitor esse debeo, et omnes vos nostri adiutores esse debitis.'

[22] Nelson, 'Kingship and royal government', p. 426.

[23] See Noble, 'The monastic ideas as a model for empire'; idem, 'Louis the pious and his piety re-considered'. See also P.P. McKeon, 'The empire of Louis the Pious: faith, politics and personality', *Revue bénédictine* 90 (1980), pp. 50–62.

[24] Ermoldus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludovici*, I, lines 76–101 and 224–301 (ed. Faral, pp. 8–10 and 22–6); Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici*, c. 9 (ed. Tremp, p. 308). On Ermoldus Nigellus and his poem in honour of Louis the Pious, see Godman, *Poets and Emperors*, pp. 111–30; idem, 'Louis "the Pious" and his poets', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 19 (1985), pp. 239–89. See also P. Depreux, 'La *pietas* comme principe de gouvernement d'après le *Poème sur Louis le Pieux* d'Ermold le Noir', in *The Community, the Family and the Saint. Patterns of Power in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. J. Hill and M. Swan, International Medieval Research 4 (Turnhout, 1998), pp. 201–24; CSL I, pp. 373–7. On the Astronomer and his biography of Louis the Pious, see E. Tremp, *Die Überlieferung der Vita Hludowici imperatoris des Astronomus*, MGH Studien und Texte 1 (Hannover, 1991); idem, 'Thegan und Astronomer'; CSL I, pp. 193–5.

[25] See, for example, Ardo, *Vita Benedicti abbatis Anianensis*, cc. 29–34 (ed. Waitz, pp. 211–15). See also J. Semmler, 'Benedictus II: una regula – una consuetudo', in *Benedictine Culture, 750–1050*, ed. L. Lourdaux and D. Verhelst, Mediaevalia Lovaniensia 1 (Leuven, 1983), pp. 1–49. For a general account of Benedict and his writings, see CSL I, pp. 210–32.

Aachen was founded especially for him, so that he would be closer to the court.[26] Louis' close relations with Benedict of Aniane and his own attraction to monastic values lent a peculiar religious, or more precisely monastic, tint to the reforms which together they strove to promote.[27]

The monastic reforms engineered by Benedict of Aniane and passionately supported by Louis the Pious were bound to have some liturgical implications. And yet, in the reform councils of 816 and 817, held at Aachen under the auspices of Louis the Pious, liturgical matters were only briefly touched upon. In 816 the bishops who convened at Aachen instructed that 'the office should be celebrated according to what the Rule of St Benedict prescribes'.[28] Such a prescription, however, could hardly have been implemented.[29] Not only was the liturgy prescribed by the Rule of St Benedict designed for a sixth-century monastic community and therefore ill-suited for the liturgical observance prevailing in Gaul, but the Frankish monasteries had also already developed their own liturgical traditions and were quite reluctant to relinquish them.[30] It seems, therefore, that not much thought had been devoted by the reform's designers to liturgical matters. Indeed, some innovations were introduced by the councils of 816 and 817, such as the ban on singing the *Alleluia* from *Septuagesima* till Easter,[31] as well as the permission to sing special psalms for almsgivers and for the dead.[32] But these were minor changes, which even if implemented within monastic

practice, had little influence on the entire liturgical scene of the Frankish kingdom.[33]

Louis the Pious' 'real interest', as Wallace-Hadrill puts it, was theology, and the court scholars he gathered around him were mainly theologians.[34] Nevertheless, Louis' theological interest must not be taken to imply that no liturgical development took place during his reign, nor is it an indication that the royal patronage of liturgy disappeared altogether. In fact, some of the most notable liturgists of the Carolingian period operated under Louis the Pious and benefited immensely from the emperor's generous patronage. As we have already seen, Benedict of Aniane, who composed at the beginning of the ninth century a monumental supplement to the *Hadrianum*,[35] was Louis' closest adviser and most celebrated protégé. At approximately the same time, Helisacher (d. 836), Louis' chancellor, rewrote the night office sung at Aachen after finding corruptions and discrepancies in it.[36] A new Hymnary was in the process of formation, probably at Aachen,[37] and the Frankish Antiphonary was amended and corrected by Amalarius of Metz.[38]

Hrabanus Maurus, Alcuin's favourite pupil and a devoted supporter of Louis the Pious,[39] composed a basic handbook for priests, entitled *De*

---

[26] Ardo, *Vita Benedicti abbatis Anianensis*, cc. 35–6 (ed. Waitz, pp. 215–16).

[27] See Noble, 'The monastic ideal as a model for empire'; Werner, '*Hludovicus Augustus*', pp. 69–82; Boshof, *Ludwig der Fromme*, pp. 120–6.

[28] *Synodi primae Aquisgranensis decreta authentica (816)*, c. 3 (ed. Semmler, *Legislatio Aquisgranensis*, p. 458): 'Ut officium iuxta quod in regula sancti Benedicti continentur celebrent.'

[29] One should note that Abbot Theodemar of Monte Cassino, who sent Charlemagne a copy of the Rule of St Benedict, was already sceptical about the possibility of implementing the liturgical precepts of the Rule in the Frankish monasteries. See *Epistolae variorum Carolo Magno regnante scriptae*, no. 13, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epp. IV (Berlin, 1895), pp. 509–14.

[30] See, for example, Robertson, *The Service-Books of the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis*, pp. 34–6.

[31] *Synodi primae Aquisgranensis decreta authentica (816)*, c. 28 (ed. Semmler, *Legislatio Aquisgranensis*, p. 465): 'Ut Alleluia in Septuagesima dimittatur.'

[32] *Synodi secunda Aquisgranensis decreta authentica (817)*, c. 12 (ed. Semmler, *Legislatio Aquisgranensis*, p. 475): 'Ut praetermissis partitionibus psalerii psalmi speciales pro elemonisariis et defunctis canentur.' On this particular rule, see C. Treffort, *L'église carolingienne et la mort. Christianisme, rites funéraires et pratique commémoratives* (Lyons, 1996), pp. 101–3; Paxton, *Christianizing Death*, p. 135.

[33] See P. Schmitz, 'L'influence de saint Benoît d'Aniane dans l'histoire de l'ordre de saint Benoît', *Il monachesimo nell'alto medioevo e la formazione della civilà occidentale*, Settimane 4 (Spoleto, 1957), pp. 405–15.

[34] See Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 228–9.

[35] On Benedict of Aniane's supplement, see above, pp. 76–8.

[36] See Amalarius of Metz's prologue to his now-lost Antiphonary (ed. Hanssens, I, pp. 361–3) and Helisacher's own letter to Bishop Nibridius of Narbonne, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epp. 5 (Berlin, 1899), 307–9. See also E. Bishop, 'A letter of Abbat (*sic*) Helisacher', in idem, *Liturgica Historica*, pp. 333–48; Huglo, 'Les remaniements de l'antiphonaire'; idem, 'Trois livres manuscrits présentés par Hélisacher', *Revue bénédictine* 99 (1989), pp. 229–72; K. Levy, 'Abbot Helisacher's Antiphoner', *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 48 (1995), pp. 171–84 [parts of which are reprinted in idem, *Gregorian Chants and the Carolingians*, pp. 178–86]; Bernard, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien*, pp. 739–45.

[37] See the important paper by Bullough and Harting-Corrêa, 'Texts, chant, and the chapel of Louis the Pious'.

[38] On Amalarius' revised and now-lost Antiphonary, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 365–6; Huglo, 'Les remaniements de l'antiphonaire'; R.J. Hesbert, 'L'Antiphonaire d'Amalaire', *Ephemerides liturgicae* 94 (1980), pp. 176–94; Bernard, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien*, pp. 753–5.

[39] On Hrabanus Maurus, see the papers collected in *Hrabanus Maurus. Lehrer, Abt und Bischof*, ed. R. Kottje and H. Zimmermann, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, geist- und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse, Einzelveröffentlichungen 4 (Mainz, 1982). See also *Rabanus Maurus in seiner Zeit, 780–1980*, ed. W. Weber (Mainz, 1980).

institutione clericorum, in which liturgical practices bulk large.[40] This treatise, the first of the ninth-century commentaries on the mass and the liturgy, was based on Augustine's *De doctrina christiana* as well as on Isidore of Seville's *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, and in it Hrabanus describes the hierarchical division within society, outlining the role and the liturgical duties of the clergy – the *ordo clericorum*. Hrabanus, however, was primarily a theologian and a biblical scholar, and his references to the liturgy are more in the form of classifications and explanation, rather than innovations and change. His main concern was to provide the clergy with the correct form of celebrating the Christian rite, and although laying much weight on the divine–human terms of relationship, and on the renunciation of the Devil during baptism, Hrabanus' treatise had little that was new.

Walahfrid Strabo, to cite just one more example, was summoned in 829 by Louis' wife, Judith, to be the tutor of her son, Charles the Bald.[41] In 838, shortly after Abbot Erlebald of Reichenau had resigned and after nine years of sojourn at the Aachen court as the little prince's tutor, Walahfrid was appointed by Louis the Pious to the abbacy of Reichenau, a position which he held until his death in 849, with the exception of two years in exile (840–2). While in exile at Speyer, Walahfrid composed the most influential liturgical composition of the Carolingian period, the so-called *De exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum*.[42] This work is basically a liturgical exposition from an historical perspective, and like Hrabanus Maurus' *De institutione clericorum*, the essence of Walahfrid's treatise was mainly explanatory and descriptive. Walahfrid sought to describe the liturgical practices of Frankish Gaul and the way in which they evolved, rather than to change them or to promote any kind of liturgical uniformity. It is impossible to

ascertain the influence of Louis and his court on these activities, but the possibility of royal impetus is not unlikely.

Looking at the liturgical activity carried out by eminent scholars of Louis' reign, it seems that the aim of their work was not innovation or reform, but clarification and explanation, addressed to the clergy and aimed at preserving and disseminating the 'correct' rite. This trend of liturgical activity reflects a more general shift of interest among the scholars of Louis' age, a shift towards the theoretical and the explanatory which came to full fruition in works such as Hrabanus Maurus' admirable exegetical compositions,[43] Agobard of Lyons' discussion of the Antiphonary,[44] or the various *expositiones missae*. In this respect, Amalarius' highly controversial work of allegorical interpretation was a unique exception.[45]

Notwithstanding the prolific liturgical activity of Carolingian scholars, such as Hrabanus Maurus, Walahfrid Strabo or even Amalarius of Metz, the broader picture of the liturgical scene reveals a situation in which continuity and, by implication, diversity were still the most prevailing features of Frankish practice under Louis the Pious. This continuity is clearly apparent in the liturgical books copied and used throughout Louis' realm.

By the time of Louis' accession to the imperial throne, the *Hadrianum* was by and large the most widely disseminated sacramentary throughout the Frankish kingdom, though older Gallican sacramentaries and various *libelli missarum* were still available. As we have already noted, however, the *Hadrianum* was ill-suited for the liturgical needs of the Frankish Church, and Benedict of Aniane's consequent supplement had only gradually been disseminated and adopted.[46] At first it enjoyed some use in Aquitaine, the stronghold of Benedict's reform movement and where his influence was most notable. It is, then, no mere

[40] See Hrabanus Maurus, *De institutione clericorum libri III* (ed. Knoepfler). See also Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 318–21. The composition of this treatise is dated to 819; see D.J. Sheerin, 'The church dedication "ordo" used at Fulda, 1 Nov. 819', *Revue bénédictine* 92 (1982), pp. 304–16.

[41] On Walahfrid's life and career, see Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 322–6; Walahfrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis* (ed. Harting-Corrêa), pp. 6–12. See also B. Bischoff, 'Eine Sammelhandschrift Walahfrid Strabo', in *Aus der Welt des Buches. Festschrift Georg Leyh* (Leipzig, 1950), pp. 30–48 [reprinted in idem, *Mittelalterliche Studien*, II, pp. 34–51].

[42] On this treatise, see Walahfrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis* (ed. Harting-Corrêa), pp. 12–36. The treatise is already listed by Regimbert's 835–842 catalogue of the Reichenau's library; see *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, ed. P. Lehmann, 4 vols. (Munich, 1918–79), I, p. 262.

[43] For Hrabanus' exegetical work, see PL 107–112.

[44] See Agobard of Lyons, *De antiphonario* (ed. Van Acker, pp. 337–51).

[45] Amalarius' liturgical innovations and allegorical interpretations led to a clash with the traditional and very conservative clergy of Lyons; a clash which eventually led to his deposition only three years after being nominated with royal approval to the vacant see of Lyons. On Amalarius and his critics, see McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 148–53; Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 326–9; A. Kopling, 'Amalar von Metz und Florus von Lyon', *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 73 (1951), pp. 424–64; Cabaniss, *Amalarius of Metz*, pp. 79–93; Boshof, *Erzbischof Agobard von Lyon*, pp. 267–300; CSL I, pp. 114–37.

[46] See *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, pp. 63–70, and III, pp. 66–75; J. Deshusses, 'Le Sacramentaire de Gellone dans son contexte historique', *Ephemerides liturgicae* 75 (1961), pp. 193–210, especially pp. 219–20.

coincidence that the earliest and best examples of Benedict's supplemented *Hadrianum* come from either Marmoutier, not far from the abbey of Cormery which was founded by Benedict of Aniane and which was close to his heart, or from Lyons, whose bishop, Leidrad (d. 816), re-founded the abbey on the so-called Ile-Barbe with much help from Benedict of Aniane.[47] Only at a later stage does a considerable dissemination of Benedict's *Supplementum* in the north and the east of the Frankish realm appear to have begun. A survey of the existing liturgical manuscripts from the time of Louis the Pious suggests that up until the later part of Louis' reign, the circulation of the supplemented *Hadrianum* was rather limited.[48] In fact, most of the surviving manuscripts of Benedict's supplemented version were produced during the reign of Charles the Bald.[49]

The manuscript evidence further confirms that a remarkable diversity was still the main characteristic of liturgical usage under Louis the Pious. Indeed, it took time for Benedict's supplement to strike roots as the standard companion to the *Hadrianum*. Even places which already possessed a copy of the revised *Hadrianum* did not necessarily regard it as the utmost authoritative or suitable sacramentary. When sometime between 825 and 830 someone in the diocese of Salzburg decided to produce a new sacramentary, for example, he did not simply copy the supplemented *Hadrianum* which lay in front of him, but compiled a new sacramentary, using a seventh-century Gregorian sacramentary, an eighth-century Gelasian sacramentary, and a version of the *Hadrianum* with Benedict of Aniane's supplement. This particular sacramentary, known as the Sacramentary of Trent,[50] reflects more than anything else

the continued diversity of the liturgical practice and the freedom enjoyed by the Frankish liturgists under Louis the Pious. The same impression also emerges from the fact that the version of the *Hadrianum* in use at Reichenau, St Gallen and possibly even at Aachen itself, incorporated only one part of the first section of the *Hadrianum*'s supplement.[51]

This diversity clearly supports the assertion that no effort was made by Louis and his advisers to force a single sacramentary on the Frankish Church, and that no uniformity or any compliance with the liturgical practice of Rome was aimed at. It further accords with the rising importance of local liturgical practices in the eyes of Carolingian churchmen under Louis the Pious. Walahfrid Strabo, for example, found no fault with liturgical variety, which became a dominant theme in his *De exordiis et incrementis*,[52] and Agobard of Lyons, who argued quite strongly against conformity with Rome, was a great defender of regional *consuetudines*.[53] Although he stressed in his writings the idea of unity, this unity had nothing to do with liturgical uniformity according to the Roman practice. It seems that whereas scholars in the service of Charlemagne muted their disapproval of the Roman practice and their dislike for the idea of liturgical uniformity, those who wrote at the time of Louis the Pious clearly stated their point of view and felt it unnecessary to veil it under a rhetoric of reform. Walahfrid Strabo even doubted the Gregorian authorship of the material in the so-called Roman Antiphonary.[54] Whether this was a mere manifestation of a more general trend of alienation from Roman elements, is impossible to ascertain.[55]

---

[47] See Ardo, *Vita Benedicti abbatis Anianensis*, c. 24 (ed. Waitz, pp. 209–10). The manuscripts are Autun, BM 19bis (Marmoutier, *c.* 845), *CLLA* 741; Paris, BNF lat. 2812 (Lyons, s. ix[1]), *CLLA* 744; Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 337 (Lyons, s. ix[1]), *CLLA* 730. On all these manuscripts, see *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, pp. 35, 40, 42, and III, pp. 28–30. On Autun, BM 19bis, see also J. Décréaux, *Le sacramentaire de Marmoutier (Autun 19bis) dans l'histoire des sacramentaires carolingiens de IXe siècle*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1985).

[48] See *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, p. 70, and III, pp. 74–5.

[49] See the list of manuscripts in *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, pp. 35–47.

[50] Trent, Castel del Buon Consiglio, no number (olim codex Vindobonensis 700) (Salzburg; s. ix); *CLLA* 724. On this sacramentary, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 97–102; *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, pp. 71–2, and III, pp. 83–8; J. Deshusses, 'Le sacramentaire grégorien de Trente', *Revue bénédictine* 78 (1968), pp. 261–82; A. Chavasse, 'L'organisation générale des sacramentaires dits grégoriens. L'apport du sacramentaire conservé à Trente', *Revue des sciences religieuses* 56 (1982), pp. 179–200, 253–73 and 57 (1983), pp. 50–6. See also *Sacramentarium Tridentinum*, ed.

F. Dell'Oro, in *Monumenta liturgica ecclesiae Tridentinae saeculo XIII antiquiora*, vol. 2A: *Fontes liturgici, libri sacramentorum*, ed. F. Dell'Oro and H. Rogger (Trento, 1985), pp. 65–416; Bernard, 'Benoît d'Aniane', pp. 107–8.

[51] See Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, lat. 1815 (Reichenau, s. ix[med]), *CLLA* 736; Donaueschingen, Hofbibliothek 191 (Reichenau/Saint-Gall, s. ix[3/4]), *CLLA* 738; Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. D I.20 (Saint-Gall, s. ix[2]), *CLLA* 735. On all these manuscripts, see *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, pp. 36, 39, 43, and III, pp. 22–4.

[52] See Walahfrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis* (ed. Harting-Corrêa), p. 5 with n. 25.

[53] Fried, 'Ludwig der Fromme', pp. 244–5; Boshof, *Erzbischof Agobard von Lyon*, pp. 97–100.

[54] See Walahfrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis*, c. 26 (ed. Harting-Corrêa, p. 165). On this Antiphonary and the problems it has caused modern scholars, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 357–9, and see there p. 398, n. 195 for further bibliography; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 92–3.

[55] Johannes Fried interestingly suggested that this liturgical tendency was a direct consequence of the lesser role played by Rome in Louis' and his advisers' political thought.

The uses of liturgy at Louis' court

The patronage of liturgy, as we have seen in the previous chapters, was used by the Frankish kings, and foremost among them by Charlemagne, as a means to propagate political ideas of peace and solidarity, as well as to reflect realities of consensus and co-operation. This use of liturgy for political purposes and royal image-building continued well into the reign of Louis the Pious. Various large-scale litanies and celebrations of military victories were staged at the behest of Louis, and they all provided him with an extraordinary opportunity to disseminate his prestige and his new political ideals.[56] Louis attached great importance to these liturgical celebrations, as can be gathered from the events immediately following the capture of Barcelona:

> After the city was surrendered and thrown open, the king sent his guards to it on the first day, but he himself delayed his entry until he had settled how he might dedicate to God's name such a long desired and [finally] attained victory with fitting thanksgiving. On the following day, then, with the priests and clergy preceding him and his army, he entered the city-gate with solemn pomp and singing of hymns of praise, and proceeded to the church of the Holy and most victorious Cross to give thanks to God for the victory divinely bestowed upon him.[57]

Much thought was dedicated by Louis the Pious and his advisers to the celebration of the king's triumphal *adventus* in the city of Barcelona.

See Fried, 'Ludwig der Fromme', especially pp. 241–7. Fried's assertion, however, does not fit in with the so-called *Pactum Ludovicianum* of 816 and the *Constitutio Romana* of 824, on which see Noble, *The Republic of St. Peter*, pp. 299–322. For some criticism of Fried's assertion, see Boshof, *Ludwig der Fromme*, pp. 135–40; P. Depreux, 'Empereur, empereur associé et pape au temps de Louis le Pieux', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 70 (1992), pp. 893–906.

[56] See McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, pp. 362–84.

[57] Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici*, c. 13 (ed. Tremp, pp. 318–20): 'Tradita ergo et patefacta civitate, primo quidem die custodes ibidem rex destinavit, ipse autem ab eius ingressu abstinuit, donec ordinaret, qualiter cum digna Deo gratiarum actione cupitam atque susceptam victoriam eius nomini consecraret. Antecedentibus ergo eum in crastinum et exercitum eius sacerdotibus et clero, cum sollempni apparatu et laudibus hymnidicis portam civitatis ingressus et ad ecclesiam sanctae et victoriosissimae crucis, pro victoria sibi divinitus conlata gratiarum actiones Deo acturus est progressus' [trans. King, *Charlemagne*, p. 174, with some changes]. See also Ermoldus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludovici*, I, lines 566–9 (ed. Faral, p. 46). On the triumphal entry to Barcelona, see McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, pp. 374–5.

Such an event, it appears, was conscientiously and very carefully orchestrated – the proper *laudes hymnidicae* had to be chosen, the form of the procession had to be fixed, and the stage had to be prepared to fit this solemn event. The king, who clearly realised the effect of such a procession on public opinion, even delayed his entry until all the necessary arrangements were made and a satisfactory service was forged. 'The cumulative effects of these circumstances,' as pointed out by Michael McCormick, 'was to transform the Frankish triumphal entry into a liturgical procession of litanic quality.'[58] Yet, it was also an extraordinary opportunity to propagate Frankish rule to both people and magnates.[59]

The use of liturgy for purposes of royal propaganda under Louis the Pious was, then, a direct continuation of the use of liturgy made by Charlemagne. Like his father, Louis used liturgical processions and prayers to inculcate new ideals and norms, to shape public opinion, and to buttress his position. However, unlike his father, Louis made extensive use of liturgical pomp at court, and thus not only directed his efforts towards a specific and very selective audience, but also turned royal liturgical celebrations into a court ritual.

As already noted by Jinty Nelson, we know very little about the royal rituals at the court of Charlemagne.[60] This accords extremely well with Einhard's image of Charlemagne as a modest person, who loathed any form of excess or pomposity.[61] Yet, in 813 Charlemagne, we are told, staged a solemn ritual at Aachen for the coronation of his sole surviving son and heir, Louis the Pious. This royal ritual, the first to be described in detail by our sources, is a major turning point in the Carolingian patronage of liturgy, and it clearly set the tone and precedent for many of the liturgical celebrations at the court of Louis the Pious.

When Charlemagne summoned a general assembly in 813, his main aim was to secure the peaceful succession to the Frankish throne. Louis' biographer, the so-called Astronomer, relates that 'Emperor Charles, realising that he was rapidly ebbing into the depths of old age,

[58] McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, p. 375.

[59] Similar services were probably held after the swift victory over the Bretons in 818. See Ermoldus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludovici*, III, lines 1750–2 (ed. Faral, p. 132). On this campaign, see J.M.H. Smith, *Province and Empire. Brittany and the Carolingians* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 64–6.

[60] Nelson, 'The Lord's anointed and the people's choice', pp. 149–59; eadem, 'Inauguration rituals', pp. 50–71.

[61] See Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, cc. 22–3 (ed. Rau, pp. 192–4). See also Nelson, 'The Lord's anointed and the people's choice', pp. 154–7.

and fearing that when he had withdrawn from human affairs the kingdom would be left bewildered . . . sent and summoned his son from Aquitaine lest it be plagued by tumult without or disquieted by schisms within.'[62] It was not the first time that Charlemagne betrayed worries about the succession to his throne. Seven years earlier, in February 806, he issued the so-called *divisio regnorum*, which divided the empire among his three sons, Charles, Pippin and Louis.[63] Charlemagne's anxiety and uncertainty on the issue of succession, straightforwardly expressed in the preface of this document,[64] were echoed in the above cited words of the Astronomer. Like the *divisio regnorum* of 806, the assembly at Aachen in 813 was a way to secure Carolingian succession and to eliminate any danger which might occur in the short period of interregnum following Charlemagne's death.[65] However, in 813 Charlemagne chose to render this primarily political event a distinctive liturgical quality, as described in detail by Thegan (d.c. 844), the auxiliary bishop of Trier and one of Louis' biographers:

> . . . on the following Sunday Charles donned royal dress and put his crown upon his head. He walked, outfitted and adorned with distinctions, just as it was fitting. He came to the church which he himself had built from its foundations and went to the altar, which had been built in a higher place than the other altars and consecrated in honour of our lord Jesus Christ. He ordered that a golden crown, another than the one which he wore on his head, be placed

on the altar. For a long time they prayed, his son and himself. He spoke to his son in the presence of the whole multitude of his bishops and nobles . . . Then his father ordered him to pick up the crown, which was on the altar, with his own hands and to put it on his head so that Louis might remember all the precepts his father taught him. So Louis executed his father's orders. That done, and having heard a solemn mass, they went to the palace.[66]

The political agenda in Thegan's biography of Louis the Pious is obvious. Writing in 836, in the aftermath of the revolt of Louis' sons, Thegan sought to present Louis as a true emperor by divine grace, and perhaps to promote a rapprochement between the newly restored emperor and his son, Louis the German.[67] Thegan's bold criticism of Archbishop Ebbo of Rheims, the mastermind behind Louis' deposition in 833, and his fervent support for Louis the Pious clearly indicate that this biography had a political rationale as a public text, and hence the particularity in describing the events of 813.[68]

Indeed, according to Thegan, Charlemagne staged a masterfully designed spectacle at church, with a series of liturgical elements culminating in the celebration of a solemn mass. Every single act in this prolonged ceremony was meant to secure Louis' accession to the Frankish throne, and the location (that is, the palace chapel), the prayers before the

---

[62] Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici*, c. 20 (ed. Tremp, p. 342): '. . . imperator Karolus considerans suum in senectute adclinem devexum, et verens ne forte subtractus rebus humanis confusum relinqueret regnum, . . . scilicet ne aut externis quateretur procellis aut intestinis vexaretur scissionibus, misit, filiumque ab Aquitania evocavit' [trans. Cabaniss, *Son of Charlemagne*, pp. 52–3].

[63] *Divisio regnorum (806)* (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 45, pp. 126–30). On the *divisio regnorum*, see H. Beumann, 'Nomen imperatoris'. Studien zur Kaiseridee Karls des Großen', *Historische Zeitschrift* 185 (1958), pp. 515–49; W. Schlesinger, 'Kaisertum und Reichsteilung. Zur *Divisio regnorum* von 806', in *Forschungen zur Staat und Verfassung. Festgabe für F. Hartung* (Berlin, 1958), pp. 9–52 [reprinted in *Beiträge zur deutschen Verfassungsgeschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (Göttingen, 1963), pp. 193–232]; P. Classen, 'Karl der Große und die Thronfolge im Frankenreich', in *Festschrift für H. Heimpel*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1972), pp. 109–34. The concern over the succession is also depicted in a poem by Theodulf of Orléans, *Carmina*, 34 (ed. E. Dümmler, p. 526), and see also Godman, *Poets and Emperors*, pp. 97–9.

[64] *Divisio regnorum (806)*, preface (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 45, pp. 126–7).

[65] On this event, see W. Wendling, 'Die Erhebung Ludwigs d. Fr. zum Mitkaiser im Jahre 813', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 19 (1985), pp. 201–38; J. Fried, 'Elite und Ideologie oder die Nachfolgeordnung Karls des Großen vom Jahre 813', in *La royauté et les élites*, ed. Le Jan, pp. 71–109.

[66] Thegan, *Gesta Hludowici imperatoris*, c. 6 (ed. Tremp, p. 182–4): '. . . in proxima die dominica ornavit se cultu regio et coronam capiti suo imposuit, incedebat clare decoratus et ornatus, sicut ei decuerat. Perrexit ad aecclesiam quam ipse a fundamento construxerat, pervenit ante altare, quod erat in eminentiori loco constructum caeteris altaribus et consecratum in honore Domini nostri Iesu Christi; super quod coronam auream, aliam quam ille gestaret in capite, iussit inponi. Postquam diu oraverunt ipse et filius eius, locutus est ad filium suum coram omni multitudine pontificum et optimatum suorum, . . . Tunc iussit ei pater, ut propriis manibus elevasset coronam, quae erat super altare, et capiti suo inponeret ob recordationem omnium praeceptorum, quae mandaverat ei pater. At ille iussionem patris implevit. Quod factum, audientes missarum sollemnia, ibant ad palatium' [trans. Dutton, *Carolingian Civilization*, p. 142, with minor changes].

[67] On Thegan and his composition, see E. Tremp, *Studien zu den Gesta Hludowici imperatoris des Trierer Chorbischofs Thegan*, Schriften der MGH 32 (Hannover, 1988); idem, 'Thegan und Astronomer'; Innes and McKitterick, 'The writing of history', pp. 209–10.

[68] This could also explain the short and rather laconic description of these events given by the Astronomer. A high-ranking palace official under Louis the Pious, the Astronomer composed his biography shortly after Louis' death in 840, in order to promote the position of Charles the Bald. On Astronomer and his composition, see E. Tremp, *Die Überlieferung der Vita Hludowici imperatoris des Astronomus*, MGH Studien und Texte 1 (Hannover, 1991); idem, 'Thegan und Astronomer'; Innes and McKitterick, 'The writing of history', pp. 209–10.

coronation and the concluding mass presumably stamped Louis' desig-
nation as Charlemagne's heir with a divine seal of approval. Further-
more, watching the moving scene of 'the son supporting his father both
in going and returning',[69] Charlemagne's bishops and magnates could
not fail to realise whom the Frankish king had chosen to succeed him.

Louis' coronation of 813 was attended by 'all the army, the bishops,
the abbots, the dukes, the counts and their deputies', who convened
in Aachen at the order of Charlemagne.[70] It was not a mere passing
audience, but rather a select group of people whose consensus and
co-operation Louis needed in order to govern the Frankish empire. The
gathering and the ceremony on the following Sunday were intended to
secure their approval for Louis' accession, and the liturgy was used by
Charlemagne in order to endorse it. It was one of the rare incidents we
know of liturgy being used in such a way in the Frankish kingdom, but it
was certainly not the last time. Louis the Pious, who stood in the centre
of the occasion in 813, used the liturgy fully to bolster his position in the
eyes of his magnates, and his reign was punctuated by solemn liturgical
celebrations which were associated with political events and addressed
to an elite audience.

In 816 Louis organised in Rheims his own re-coronation as emperor
by Pope Stephen IV (d. 817). Thegan describes how on the Sunday
which immediately followed the pope's arrival at Louis' court, 'in
church before solemn mass, Stephen consecrated Louis in the presence
of the clergy and all the people, and anointed him emperor. He placed
on his head an extremely beautiful golden crown, ornamented with
precious gems, which he had carried with him. And he called Queen
Ermengard empress and put a golden crown on her head.'[71] A year

[69] Thegan, *Gesta Hludowici imperatoris*, c. 6 (ed. Tremp, p. 184): 'Sustinuit enim filius
patrem eundo et redeundo . . .' [trans. Dutton, *Carolingian Civilization*, p. 142].
[70] Thegan, *Gesta Hludowici imperatoris*, c. 6 (ed. Tremp, p. 180): '. . . vocavit filium
suum Hludouuicum ad se cum omni exercitu, episcopis, abbatibus, ducibus, comitibus,
locopositis'.
[71] Thegan, *Gesta Hludowici imperatoris*, c. 17 (ed. Tremp, p. 198): '. . . in aecclesia ante
missarum sollempnia coram clero et omni populo consecravit eum et uncxit ad imperatorem,
et coronam auream mire pulchritudinis cum preciosissimis gemmis ornatam, quam secum
adportaverat, posuit super caput eius. Et Irmingardam reginam appelavit augustam, et posuit
coronam auream super caput eius' [trans. Dutton, *Carolingian Civilization*, p. 145]. See also
Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici*, c. 26 (ed. Tremp, p. 368) who indicates that the coronation was
'inter missarum celebrationem'; *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a. 816 (ed. Rau, p. 110),
according to which the coronation took place 'celebratis ex more missarum sollemniis'. On
this event, see Fritze, *Papst und Frankenkönig*, pp. 15–45; P. Depreux, 'Saint Remi et la
royauté carolingienne', *Revue historique* 285 (1991), pp. 235–60.

later Louis arranged a solemn liturgical celebration before issuing the
so-called *Ordinatio imperii*. 'We thought it necessary,' he wrote at the
very beginning of this document, 'that, with fasting and prayer and
almsgiving, we should obtain from Him the answer which we in our
weakness did not presume to give. After three days of such solemn cele-
bration, and, we believe, at the command of almighty God, it was
accomplished that we and all our people together voted to elect our
beloved eldest son Lothar.'[72]

In 822 Louis held a public penance ceremony at Attigny. The author
of the *Royal Frankish Annals* relates that 'after talking it over with his
bishops and magnates, the Lord Emperor was reconciled to his brothers
whom he had ordered to be tonsured against their will. He made a public
confession and did penance for this as well as for what he had done to
his nephew Bernard of Italy [d. 818], and to his father's cousins
Adalhard [d. 825] and Wala [d. 836]. He did this at the assembly which
he held in the presence of the whole people at Attigny in August of the
same year. At this assembly he also tried with great humility to make up
for any similar acts committed by him or his father.'[73] Thus Louis
appeared as a new Theodosius, who had performed penance for a politi-
cal massacre. In the following year, the imperial coronation of Lothar
(d. 855) by Pope Paschal I (d. 824) took place in Rome.[74]

The Danish king Harald visited the Frankish court in 826, and Louis
seized the opportunity to orchestrate a sumptuous ceremony for the

[72] *Ordinatio imperii*, preface (ed. Boretius, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, I, no. 136,
p. 271): 'Idcirco necessarium duximus, ut ieiuniis et orationibus et elemosinarum largitioni-
bus apud illum obtineremus quod nostra infirmitas non praesumebat. Quibus rite per
triduum celebratis, nutu omnipotentis Dei, ut credimus, actum est, ut et nostra et totius
populi nostri in dilecti primogeniti nostri Hlutharii electione vota concurrerent' [trans.
Dutton, *Carolingian Civilization*, p. 176]. On the *Ordinatio imperii*, see Boshof, *Ludwig
der Fromme*, pp. 129–34.
[73] *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a. 822 (ed. Rau, p. 128): 'Domnus imperator consilio
cum episcopis et optimatibus suis habito fratribus suis, quos invitos tondere iussit,
reconciliatus est et tam de hoc facto quam et de his, quae erga Bernhardum filium fratris
suis Pippini necnon et his, quae circa Adalhardum abbatem et fratrem eius Walahum gesta
sunt, publicam confessionem fecit et paenitentiam egit. Quod tamen in eo conventu, quem
eodem anno mense Augusto Attiniaci habuit, in praesentia totius populi sui peregit; in quo,
quicquid similium rerum vel a se vel a patre suo factum invenire potuit, summa devotione
emendare curavit' [trans. Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles*, p. 111]. On Louis' public
penance at Attigny, see Werner, '*Hludovicus Augustus*', pp. 58–60; De Jong, 'Power and
humility', pp. 31–2.
[74] Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici*, c. 36 (ed. Tremp, p. 414).

baptism of Harald and his wife.[75] Whether this event took place in the royal palace at Ingelheim (as reported by Ermoldus Nigellus and Thegan),[76] in St Alban of Mainz (as reported by the *Royal Frankish Annals* and the Astronomer),[77] or in both St Alban and Ingelheim (as suggested more recently by Donald Bullough and Alice Harting-Corrêa),[78] it is obvious that the baptism, the mass and the banquet which followed it were held in the presence of the Frankish magnates, as well as the Danes who accompanied their king. It is also quite clear that Louis, who 'elevated [Harald] from the sacred baptismal font', and his wife Judith, who 'elevated Harald's wife from the font',[79] stood with the Danish king and queen at the centre of this solemn event.

The various events adduced above (and one must stress that this is emphatically not an exhaustive list in which liturgy and other forms of court rituals were intimately interwoven) suggest that an elaborate repertoire of court rituals was established during the first decades of the ninth century. Furthermore, it seems that the most dramatic developments in the evolution of Carolingian court rituals were concentrated in the reign of Louis the Pious. The most striking aspect of this evolution is the liturgical content and character attached to predominantly political ceremonies and events. These ceremonies, which generated a sense of co-operation, solidarity and consensus,[80] were part of a more general exercise in image-making (one may say, anachronistically, an exercise in public relations), and the liturgical components endowed these rites

---

[75] See Angenendt, *Kaiserherrschaft und Königstaufe*, pp. 215–23; K. Hauck, 'Der Missionsauftrag Christi und das Kaisertum Ludwigs des Frommen', in *Charlemagne's Heir*, ed. Godman and Collins, pp. 275–96, at 289–94; Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, pp. 77–9; S. Coupland, 'From poachers to gamekeepers: Scandinavian warlords and Carolingian kings', *Early Medieval Europe* 7 (1998), pp. 85–114, especially 89–93.

[76] Ermoldus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludovici*, IV, lines 2280–337 (ed. Faral, pp. 174–8); Thegan, *Gesta Hludowici imperatoris*, c. 33 (ed. Tremp, p. 220).

[77] *Annales regni Francorum*, s.a. 826 (ed. Rau, p. 144); Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici*, c. 40 (ed. Tremp, pp. 430–2). This view is accepted by Angenendt, *Kaiserherrschaft und Königstaufe*, pp. 216–19; Fried, 'Ludwig der Fromme', p. 265.

[78] Bullough and Harting-Corrêa, 'Texts, chant, and the chapel of Louis the Pious', p. 258, n. 2.

[79] Thegan, *Gesta Hludowici imperatoris*, c. 33 (ed. Tremp, p. 220): '... quem domnus imperator elevavit de sacro fonte baptismatis, et uxorem elevavit de fonte domna Iudith augusta'.

[80] The royal hunt can be understood in a similar way; see Nelson, 'The last years of Louis the Pious', p. 154; J. Verdon, 'Recherches sur la chasse en occident durant le haut Moyen Age', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 56 (1978), pp. 805–29; J. Jarnut, 'Die frühmittelalterlich Jagd unter rechts- und sozialgeschichtlichen Aspekten', *L'uomo di fronte al mondo animale nell'alto medioevo*, Settimane 31 (Spoleto, 1985), pp. 765–808.

---

and the image they engendered with a sacral and divinely ordained significance.

Grand ceremonial liturgy at court and in front of the Frankish elite, ecclesiastical as well as secular, became an integral part of Louis the Pious' imperial image-building policy. Furthermore, it seems that by the time Harald visited Louis' court, an elaborate and well-organised courtly apparatus stood behind these liturgical ceremonies. Ermoldus Nigellus' description of the ceremony in 826 confirms this assertion:

> ... everything was now ready for the celebration of the mass, and according to the custom the ring of a bell summoned the people to the holy edifice. The building, already occupied by the various [orders of the] glittering clergy, was shining, and the pleasant house was flourishing with the wonderful arrangement [of the ceremony]. The multitude of priests was grouped under the command of Clemens, the pious Levites were indeed gleaming in their [proper] order. Theuto arranged the choir of chanters; Adhallvitus, holding a stick in his hand, struck and cleared a way through the crowd for the Caesar and the nobles – his wife and sons. The triumphant Caesar, always assiduous in the holy office, processed through the wide [palace] halls into the room. . . . Hilduin stood on his right and Helisacher on his left; Gerung, the master of the doorkeepers, walked in front of him and, as was customary, carrying a sceptre whose head was covered with a golden crown. . . . Immediately after entering the church in this honourable way, the Caesar, as was his custom, prayed to God. Then Theuto's trumpet duly gave a clear sign, which was immediately followed by the clergy and the choir.[81]

Such a ceremony was not a mere improvisation. It was a well-organised event according to what appears to be an already established and well-defined protocol, with fixed ceremonial roles, such as a supervisor

---

[81] Ermoldus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludovici*, IV, lines 2280–317 (ed. Faral, pp. 174–8): 'Interea missarum aderant jam sacra parata, / More vocat signum ad culmina sacra homines. / Tecta nitent vario clero repleta corusco, / Ordine mirifico vernat amoena domus; / Turba sacerdotum Clementis dogmate constat / Levitaeque micant ordine namque pii. / Theuto chorum cleri disponit rite canentum, / Adhallvitus adest fertque manu ferulam, / Percutit instantesque viam componit honore / Caesaris et procerum, conjugis et sobolis. / Atria Caesar ovans per lata petebat in aulam / Sedulus officiis adfore saepe sacris; / . . . / Hilduinus habet dextram, Helisacharque sinistram / Sustentat; Gerung pergit at ipse prior, / Virgam more gerit, servans vestigia regis, / Aurea cujus habet quippe corona caput. / . . . / Caesar, ut ecclesiam gressu pervenit honesto, / Exposcit votis more suo Dominum. / Mox tuba Theutonis clare dat rite boatum, / Quam sequitur clerus protinus atque chori.'

of the clergy, a choirmaster, an usher and a master of the doorkeepers.

The increasing use of liturgy in court rituals and the image-making it involved can be closely liked with the political circumstances of Louis the Pious' reign. Louis the Pious, like all members of the Carolingian family, realised that in order to rule the Frankish kingdom he would need aristocratic support, and indeed he never tried to do without it. Although, as Karl Brunner has demonstrated, the aristocracy could and did form a counter-force to the Carolingian rule, and a very threatening one,[82] consensus and co-operation were the name of the game throughout Louis' reign and beyond. The relations between the king and his aristocracy were based on reciprocity – noble families did well from royal patronage, just as the Carolingians did well out of their support.[83] Hence, a scenario of an aristocratic coup, which would replace the Carolingian dynasty with a different family, was very unlikely and by the time Louis inherited his father's throne the worry was rather of the possibility of one faction becoming discontented and rebelling under the leadership of a disinherited Carolingian.[84]

A certain fear had emerged during the years immediately following the death of Charlemagne. The so-called Astronomer, writing a quarter of a century later, clearly betrays the worries which preoccupied Louis, who not only feared that someone might plot against him and thus threaten his succession to the Frankish throne, but also had some grave doubts regarding the loyalty and allegiance of his fathers' advisers and courtiers.[85] Consequently, Louis' first action after arriving at Aachen was to remove his relatives and his father's guard from any position of power and patronage at court.[86] His sisters were sent to convents, Charlemagne's cousins Adalhard and Wala were sent to Corbie and

---

[82] See K. Brunner, *Oppositionelle Gruppen im Karolingerreich* (Vienna, Cologne and Graz, 1979).

[83] On the relations between kings and aristocrats, see Le Jan, *Famille et pouvoire*, especially pp. 99–153; J. Hanning, *Consensus fidelium. Frühfeudale Interpretationen des Verhältnisses von Königtum und Adel am Beispiel des Frankenreiches*, Monographien des Mittelalters 27 (Stuttgart, 1982). See also Nelson, 'Legislation and consensus in the reign of Charles the Bald'.

[84] Interestingly, the coup of 785/6 was the last time that aristocrats staged an anti-Carolingian revolt by themselves. In every subsequent revolt, the rebellious aristocrats got an alternative Carolingian to lead them against a particular ruler they were unhappy with.

[85] Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici*, cc. 21–2 (ed. Tremp, pp. 346–50).

[86] On these actions, see Nelson, 'The Frankish kingdoms', pp. 111–12; Boshof, *Ludwig der Fromme*, pp. 91–4; Innes, 'Charlemagne's will', pp. 845–6. See also E. Tremp, 'Zwischen *stabilitas* und *mutatio regni*. Herrschafts- und Staatsauffassungen im Umkreis Ludwigs des Frommen', in *La royauté et les élites*, ed. Le Jan, pp. 111–27.

Noirmoutier respectively, and nearly all Charlemagne's advisers were replaced with Louis' own men.[87] The next step was to present the regularity of his succession and his legitimacy to the Frankish magnates. The aristocracy, although unable to impose strong limits on royal power, had assumed a prominent position within the political structure of the Carolingian empire, and the possibility that these aristocrats would unite behind a member of the Carolingian family and jeopardise the legitimate succession to the Frankish throne is what made Louis most anxious. This, I would argue, is the impetus behind the development of court rituals under Louis the Pious, a development which was closely linked with the patronage of liturgy at the royal court.

To clarify this point, one needs to refer to the question of audience. What was the possible audience for the court rituals staged by Louis and his entourage? The answer is quite clear. Such rituals, with their heavy liturgical content, were aimed at the ruling magnates of the Frankish kingdom, clerical or lay, and were conceived, designed and performed with the Frankish nobility in mind. The agenda for rulership implicit in these ceremonies, as well as their stress on co-operation, consensus and the king's divine protection, constituted a justificatory dossier for the legitimacy and the supreme position of Louis as ruler. It is well justified, therefore, to describe these court rituals and the patronage of liturgy they engendered as a pro-Carolingian means of propaganda, aimed at the nobles, in order to sell Carolingian unchallenged supremacy to the magnates, and to remind them of their supposed complete dependence on the Carolingian ruler and his favour.

Political circumstances and difficulties, as well as an urgent need for imperial image-building, cultivated the development of heavily liturgical court rituals in the Carolingian period, and it was above all during the reign of Louis the Pious that court rituals played such a crucial role in deliberately enhancing the public and political image of the ruler. It is in such a context of political complications and imperial image-building that the patronage of liturgy under Louis the Pious should be understood. The use of liturgy and court rituals was, however, only one part of a larger effort made on the part of the Carolingians, and

---

[87] Einhard was an exception. See Walahfrid Strabo's prologue to Einhard's *Vita Karoli Magni*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH SRG 25 (Hannover, 1911), pp. xxviii–xxix; Ermoldus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludovici*, II, lines 682–5 (ed. Faral, p. 54).

foremost among them Louis the Pious, to propagate and secure his legitimate position. The very same circumstances, for example, sustained the writing of court historiography in the Carolingian period. Compositions such as the *Annales regni Francorum* or Einhard's *Vita Karoli Magni*, whose main interest was political polemic and history, were composed not as a mere narrative account of contemporary or nearly contemporary events, but rather as a series of interpretative judgements.[88] Thus, their expected audience in the Carolingian period was the political and ecclesiastical elite, which was associated with the royal court and which was closely involved in the events described.[89]

The patronage of liturgy and its intimate association with court rituals was of vital importance to Louis and it gave him a very public opportunity to demonstrate his succession and legitimacy. However, such a use of liturgy and ritual was a two-edged sword. In 833 Lothar, Pippin I of Aquitaine (d. 838) and Louis the German (d. 876), Louis the Pious' three elder sons, joined forces against their father and deposed him from his imperial office. In a public liturgical ceremony led by Lothar and orchestrated by Archbishop Ebbo of Rheims (d. 845), Louis the Pious was forced to do public penance in the presence of the Frankish magnates and the ecclesiastical elite. Lying prostrate in front of the main altar, Louis confessed his alleged crimes, all listed in a *cartula* which was prepared well in advance, and asked for a public penance. 'They harassed him for so long that they forced him to lay aside his weapons and change his garb to that of a penitent, driving him into the gates of [the] church [of Saint-Médard in Soissons] so that no one would dare to speak to him except those who specially deputed for that purpose.'[90]

[88] Innes and McKitterick, 'The writing of history', pp. 203–9; J.L. Nelson, 'History-writing at the courts of Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald', in *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Scharer and Scheibelreiter, pp. 435–42; Innes, 'Charlemagne's will'.

[89] See also McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the Written Word*, pp. 236–41; eadem, 'The audience for Latin historiography in the early Middle Ages: text transmission and manuscript dissemination', in *Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter*, ed. Scharer and Scheibelreiter, pp. 96–114; Nelson, 'Public *Histories* and private history', pp. 251–95.

[90] *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 833 (ed. Rau, p. 20): 'Et tam diu illum vexaverunt, quousque arma deponere habitumque mutare cogentes, liminibus ecclesiae pepulerunt, ita ut nullus cum eo loqui auderat nisi illi qui ad hoc fuerant deputati' [trans. Nelson, *The Annals of Saint-Bertin*, pp. 27–8]. See also Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici*, cc. 48–9 (ed. Tremp, pp. 472–84); *Episcoporum de poenitentia quam Hludowicus imperator professus est, relatio Compendiensis (833)* (ed. Krause, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, II, no. 197, pp. 51–5); Agobard of Lyons, *Capitula de poenitentia ab imperatore acta* (ed. Krause, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, II, no. 198, pp. 56–7). For a superb analysis of this incident, see De Jong, 'Power and humility'. See also Fried, 'Ludwig der Fromme', pp. 266–70; Boshof, *Ludwig der Fromme*, pp. 195–203.

Thus, in order to humiliate Louis and deprive him of his legitimate imperial office, Louis' sons used the very same methods deployed in the past by their father in order to defend his own position and consolidate the allegiance of his magnates.

This, as we all know, was not the end of the story. A year later, after regaining power, Louis was duly reinstated in a liturgically staged ritual first at Saint-Denis,[91] and a year later in the church of Saint-Stephen at Metz. 'The emperor, the bishops and all the people of that assembly came into the city of Metz, and amid the celebration of masses seven archbishops intoned over him the seven collects of ecclesiastical reconciliation.'[92] Furthermore, '. . . the holy and venerable bishops lifted from the most holy altar the crown, symbol of rulership, and with their own hands restored it to his head, to the utmost joy of everyone'.[93] Once again liturgical context and content were used to rebuild consensus and to enhance Louis' imperial image. Against this background, it is hardly surprising that a substantial part of the conflict between Louis the Pious and his sons took the form of 'ritual confrontations'[94] – a true war of propaganda aimed at gaining the support of the Frankish aristocracy.

Both Louis and his sons understood the great potential power of the liturgy, especially when combined with court rituals, and each attached great spiritual as well as political importance to these ceremonies. Liturgy and ritual, moreover, had infiltrated the Frankish public understanding to such an extent that the Frankish secular and ecclesiastical dignitaries, who formed their audience, came to expect the performance of such liturgical acts. As the Astronomer reports with reference to Louis' restitution at Metz in 835, 'witnessing this, all the people gave

[91] *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 834 (ed. Rau, p. 22); Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici*, c. 50 (ed. Tremp, p. 484).

[92] Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici*, c. 54 (ed. Tremp, p. 502): '. . . domnus imperator, sed et episcopi necnon et populus universalis illius conventus venit, et inter missarum celebrationem septem archiepiscopi septem reconciliationis ecclesiasticae orationes super eum cecinerunt' [trans. Cabannis, *Son of Charlemagne*, p. 106].

[93] *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 835 (ed. Rau, p. 28): '. . . coronam, insigne imperii, a sacrosancto altario sublevatam sacri ac venerandi antistites eius capiti cum maximo omnium gaudio propriis manibus restituerunt' [trans. Nelson, *The Annals of Saint-Bertin*, p. 32]. On Louis' restitution, see also Nelson, 'The last years of Louis the Pious', especially pp. 154–5; Boshof, *Ludwig der Fromme*, pp. 203–10.

[94] I borrow the term from Nelson, 'The Frankish kingdoms', p. 118.

thanks to God for the emperor's plenary restoration'.[95] It seems, therefore, that in the eyes of the honourable audience that gathered at church, only such a solemn liturgical rite could complete Louis' restitution. Unfortunately we do not know what prayers were sung at church for these occasions, but it is quite safe to speculate that they were not significantly different from the masses *pro rege* or *pro pace* included in Benedict of Aniane's supplement to the *Hadrianum*.[96]

Using the patronage of liturgy as a political machinery of royal propaganda was not a new phenomenon in the early medieval West. As we have already seen in the previous chapters, both the Merovingians and the early Carolingians had used liturgy to enhance their position and to propagate new norm and ideals. It is impossible to gauge how much of it was thanks to Byzantine inspiration, as Schubert thought,[97] and how much originated in local Frankish customs, as Riché argued.[98] Yet what is important to our discussion is the fact that royal patronage of liturgy continued well into the ninth century, and that under Louis the Pious it became an integral part of any court ritual.

---

[95] Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici*, c. 54 (ed. Tremp, p. 502): '. . . atque omnes populi hoc viso pro plenaria restituione imperatoris multas Deo gratias reddiderunt' [trans. Cabannis, *Son of Charlemagne*, p. 106].

[96] See *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, cc. 1266–9 (Missa pro regibus), 1270–2 (Missa cotidiana pro rege), 1273–9 (Orationes ad missam tempore synodi pro rege dicendas) and 1343–5 (Missa pro pace) (ed. Deshusses, *Le sacramentaire grégorien*, I, pp. 424–8, 444).

[97] See D. Schubert, *Kaiserliche Liturgie. Die Einbeziehung von Musikinstrumenten, insbesondere der Orgel, in dem frühmittelalterlichen Gottesdienst*, Veröffentlichungen der evangelischen Gesellschaft für Liturgieforschung 17 (Göttingen, 1968), pp. 114–26.

[98] See P. Riché, 'Les représentations du palais dans les textes littéraires du haut Moyen Age', *Francia* 4 (1976), pp. 166–71. See also Nelson, 'The Lord's anointed and the people's choice', pp. 149–59.

5

Louis' Heirs

Louis the Pious died on 20 June 840 and the fight among his heirs over the Frankish empire began. For the next three years Louis' sons were preoccupied with asserting their claims for a portion of their father's realm and it was only in July 843, after a long period of negotiations and after an up-to-date survey of the royal resources in the heartland was carried out, that the Treaty of Verdun was agreed among the three brothers. Charles the Bald, Louis the Pious' younger son, received the western kingdom, including Aquitaine; Louis the German was to rule the territories east of the Rhine as well as the regions of Speyer, Mainz and Worms west of the Rhine; and Lothar, Louis the Pious' elder son, was confined to the middle kingdom, from Frisia through the Saône and the Rhône valley and into Italy. He was also to keep the title of Emperor.[1]

Although a settlement was achieved, the Treaty of Verdun was never accepted by the three contenders as final. Throughout the years 845–8 Lothar made persistent efforts to subvert his brothers' kingdoms, and the rivalries and conflicts between the newly enthroned Carolingian monarchs continued well into the second half of the ninth century. Nevertheless, the Treaty of Verdun marks an important turning point in the history of the Frankish kingdom, after which one cannot simply speak of the *regnum Francorum* as a whole, but rather of a series of different *regna*. This, of course, had some significant implications as far as the cultural and religious history of the Frankish kingdoms is

---

[1] On the course of events after Louis' death, see Nithard, *Historiarum libri* (ed. Rau). See also McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms*, pp. 172–6; Riché, *Les Carolingiens*, pp. 162–70; J.L. Nelson, 'The Frankish Kingdoms, 814–898', pp. 119–27; eadem, *Charles the Bald*, pp. 105–31; J. Fried, 'The Frankish kingdoms, 817–911: the east and middle kingdoms', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, II, ed. McKitterick, pp. 142–68, at 143–7. On Nithard and his *Historiarum libri*, see Nelson, 'Public *Histories* and private history'.

concerned. Differences between the various regions of the Frankish kingdoms existed even before the Treaty of Verdun, but once the overarching political structure of a unified kingdom, an empire, was removed and the local differences were, in a way, couched within new geo-political divisions, then each of the regions developed its own peculiarities, not the least because different languages were spoken in those newly established Carolingian kingdoms.[2] As far as the patronage of liturgy is concerned, although parallel lines of development may be observed, there is no reason to assume that a unified course of action characterised the three Carolingian kings after 843. Unfortunately, though, there is not enough evidence on the nature and the development of the royal patronage of liturgy in the kingdoms of Lothar and Louis the German to allow any significant comparison and analysis. Charles the Bald's concern for and use of liturgy, however, are well documented, and his case provides an exceptionally advantageous opportunity to study the last phase of the royal patronage of liturgy with which this book is concerned. Let us, then, concentrate on the liturgical activity in the Frankish kingdom of Charles the Bald.[3]

The power of tradition

Of all the early Carolingians, Charles the Bald was the most educated king, 'not only sharing the interest of ecclesiastical contemporaries in theology and political ideas, but learned enough to pose convincingly as a philosopher-ruler and knowledgeable enough about Roman law to attempt self-conscious emulation of Theodosius and Justinian in his capitularies'.[4] This may well have been a result of his mother's personal

---

[2] On the question of language, see R. Wright, *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France* (Liverpool, 1982); M. Banniard, *Viva Voce. Communication écrite et communication orale du IVe au IXe siècle en Occident latin* (Paris, 1992). See also the various papers in *Latin and the Romance Languages in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. R. Wright (London, 1991), and M. Banniard, 'Language and communication in Carolingian Europe', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, II, ed. McKitterick, pp. 695–708. For a short survey, see R. Wright's review of Banniard's *Viva Voce* in *Journal of Medieval Latin* 3 (1993), pp. 78–94.

[3] Whenever necessary and appropriate, parallel developments in the kingdoms of Lothar and Louis the German will be mentioned as well.

[4] Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, p. 17. See also Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 241–57; idem, 'A Carolingian renaissance prince', pp. 155–84; J.L. Nelson, 'Translating images of authority: the Christian Roman emperors in the Carolingian World', in *Images of Authority. Papers Presented to Joyce Reynolds on the Occasion of her 70th*

---

concern.[5] She took an unusual interest in the education of her son and in 829, through the recommendation of Hilduin, Louis the Pious' arch-chaplain, she summoned Walahfrid Strabo to take the position of the young prince's tutor.[6] Neither his brothers nor any of his Carolingian kinsmen received such a high-standard education. The nine formative years (from the age of six to fifteen) that Charles spent under the tutelage of Walahfrid Strabo had certainly left their mark on the young prince's mind. Charles turned out to be 'a true intellectual', and his strong taste for ritual was undoubtedly shaped both by the special personal interests of his remarkable tutor, and by his own experience at court.

From a fairly early stage Charles was an eye witness of and an active participant in many majestic liturgical celebrations at his father's court. In 826, for example, the three-year-old Charles made his first public appearance at the solemn baptism of the Danish king, Harald. 'Ahead of his father,' writes Ermoldus Nigellus, 'the lovely boy Charles, resplendent in gold merrily goes, pattering with his feet across the marble floor.'[7] Such great liturgical events punctuated the life at the court of Louis the Pious and, as already noted by Janet Nelson, these events could hardly have failed to make a strong impact on the young prince's mind.[8]

Liturgy, moreover, was also close to Walahfrid Strabo's heart. At the beginning of his *Libellus de exordiis et incrementis*, Walahfrid clearly states that he investigated the matter by careful examination.[9] This little treatise on the liturgy, described by Bernhard Bischoff as 'the first

---

Birthday, ed. M.M. Mackenzie and C. Roueché (Cambridge, 1989), pp. 194–205 [reprinted in Nelson, *The Frankish World*, pp. 89–98]; eadem, 'Charles le Chauve et les utilisations du savoir', in *L'école carolingienne d'Auxerre de Murethach à Remi, 830–908*, ed. D. Iogna-Prat, C. Jeudy and G. Lobrischon (Paris, 1991), pp. 37–54.

[5] On Empress Judith, Charles the Bald's mother, see E. Ward, 'Caesar's wife. The career of the Empress Judith, 819–829', in *Charlemagne's Heir*, ed. Godman and Collins, pp. 205–27.

[6] On the education of Charles the Bald, see Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, pp. 82–5.

[7] Ermoldus Nigellus, *In honorem Hludovici*, IV, lines 2300–1 (ed. Faral, p. 176): 'Ante patrem pulcher Carolus puer inclitus auro / Laetus abit, plantis marmora pulsat ovans' [trans. Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, p. 78]. On this event, see Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, pp. 78–80.

[8] Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, p. 82.

[9] Walahfrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis*, preface (ed. Harting-Corrêa, p. 48). The full title of this work is *Libellus de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum*, that is, 'The Book about the Origins and the Developments of some Aspects of the Liturgy'.

handbook of liturgical history',[10] was written sometime between 840 and 842, while Walahfrid was in exile at Speyer.[11] From an analysis of the sources used by Walahfrid in this short liturgical handbook,[12] and given the fact that it was completed only four years after he was given the abbacy of Reichenau,[13] it seems that some of the research for this handbook was done during the years he spent at Louis' court as Charles the Bald's tutor.[14] Whether Walahfrid's interest in liturgy was inspired by what he saw at court or by the curiosity of his pupil is impossible to gauge. Yet, the fact that while acting as Charles' tutor Walahfrid Strabo was possibly deeply absorbed in liturgical research is not insignificant.

A psychological analysis of the ways in which the above-mentioned factors could have contributed to the shaping of Charles' personality is far beyond the scope of this study. Yet the results of this process are quite evident. Charles the Bald had a strong interest in liturgy, and he made far more use of liturgy and liturgical elements than any of his predecessors. The ritualisation of court ceremonies which took place during the reign of Louis the Pious was a development with its own momentum. Charles the Bald continued his father's policy in this matter, and like his father and many of his predecessors used liturgy in order to promote his position and to propagate ideas. He clearly operated within a traditional framework as far as the patronage of liturgy was concerned, but under his rule the royal patronage of liturgy and the use of liturgical elements came to its fullest fruition in the Carolingian world.

Let us take for example the liturgy of war and victory. By the time Charles the Bald and his brothers succeeded their father, prayers and fasts on the eve of a battle became part and parcel of Carolingian military practice.[15] In 841, for example, after Lothar rejected the peace offered by Louis the German and Charles the Bald, the two brothers

prepared their joint army for battle and, as Nithard relates, 'they first invoked God with fasting and prayers'.[16] Similarly, a year later, when Charles the Bald and his army met Louis the German and his son, Carloman, with their armies at Koblenz, 'they immediately proceeded to Saint-Castor's for prayer' and only then embarked on a ship and crossed the Moselle in order to fight Lothar and his supporters.[17] Liturgy and war were inextricably bound together during the reigns of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious, and this bond continued well into the second half of the ninth century. In 876, for instance, just before the battle of Andernach, Louis the Younger and his counts 'sought mercy from the Lord with fasting and litanies'.[18]

But Charles the Bald, with his 'strong visual sense and a taste for ritual',[19] was not satisfied. He wanted something more concrete and loaded with religious and liturgical significance, and therefore adopted the practice of leading the army into battle behind insignia in the shape of a cross which, as suggested by Michael McCormick, may have contained some relics as well.[20] Consequently, each military expedition was turned into an intense moment of liturgical life, a solemn supplication, very much like a litany. Such a practice had some biblical, Byzantine and Visigothic antecedents,[21] but it should be understood as part of a broader pattern of development, in which Frankish kings sought to encourage their troops and to ensure their victory with something more visible and tangible than prayers. This development in the liturgy of war could also explain the horrific scene which took place before the battle of Andernach at the camp of Louis the Younger. After asking for God's mercy with fasting and litanies, 'Louis the son of Louis then set up a Judgement of God before all his troops: ten men were put to the ordeal of hot water, ten men to the ordeal of hot iron and ten men to the ordeal

[10] See B. Bischoff, 'Eine Sammelhandschrift Walahfrid Strabo', in idem, *Mittelalterliche Studien*, II, pp. 34–51 [originally published in *Aus der Welt des Buches. Festschrift Georg Leyh* (Leipzig, 1950), pp. 30–48]. I do not accept Philippe Bernard's criticism of Walahfrid's treatise. See his review of Harting-Corrêa's edition in *Francia* 25 (1998), pp. 319–22.

[11] See the introduction to Walahfrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis* (ed. Harting-Corrêa), pp. 21–2.

[12] Ibid., pp. 22–31 and 39–41.

[13] On Walahfrid's appointment to the abbacy of Reichenau, see *Annales Augienses*, s.a. 838, ed. G. Pertz, MGH SS I (Hannover, 1926), p. 78; *Monumenta Moguntina*, ed. P. Jaffé, Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum III (Berlin, 1966), p. 703.

[14] See the introduction to Walahfrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis* (ed. Harting-Corrêa), p. 23.

[15] See McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, especially pp. 354–8.

[16] Nithard, *Historiarum libri*, II.10 (ed. Rau, p. 424): 'Et primum quidem ieiuniis ac votis Deum invocent.'

[17] Nithard, *Historiarum libri*, III.7 (ed. Rau, p. 444): '. . . protinusque ad Sanctum Castorem orationis causa pergunt, missam audiunt ac deinde idem reges armati naves conscendunt et Mosellam otius traiciunt'.

[18] *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 876 (ed. Rau, p. 246): 'Tunc ipse ac comites eius ieiuniis et laetaniis Domini misericordiam petierunt' [trans. Nelson, *The Annals of Saint-Bertin*, p. 196]. See also E.J. Goldberg, '"More devoted to the equipment of battle than the splendor of banquets". Frontier kingship, martial rituals, and early knighthood at the court of Louis the German', *Viator* 30 (1999), pp. 41–78.

[19] Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, p. 17.

[20] Nithard, *Historiarum libri*, II.6 (ed. Rau, p. 414). See also McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, p. 358 with n. 132.

[21] McCormick, *Eternal Victory*, especially pp. 248–9 and 308–11.

of cold water. Then everyone prayed God to declare in this Judgement if it was more right that Louis should have the share of the realm left to him by his father . . .'[22] Prayers and fasting were not enough any more, and something more concrete like a cruciform ensign or an ordeal, was needed to convince the army that divine providence was still there.

Charles the Bald's strong taste for rituals, in which liturgy played a major role, is also apparent in many of his public appearances. An illuminating case in point is recorded by Hincmar of Rheims while describing the chain of events at the council of Ponthion (876):

> On 20 June, in the ninth Indiction, the Lord Emperor Charles, in a gilded robe and clad in Frankish costume, came with legates of the apostolic see into the synod where the bishops and other clergy were all clothed in their ecclesiastical vestments. The whole interior of the building and the seats were covered in fine cloths, and in the very heart of the synod in full view of the imperial throne the Holy Gospels were placed on a lectern. The chanters sang the antiphon 'Hear us O Lord' with the verses and 'Gloria', and after the 'Kyrie eleison' and a prayer said by John bishop of Toscanella, the Lord Emperor took his seat in the synod'.[23]

About a month later, on 16 July 876, the bishops were assembled again:

> That morning about the ninth hour the emperor entered, clad in the Greek fashion and wearing a crown, led by the papal legates clad in Roman fashion and by the bishops wearing their ecclesiastical vestments, with everything arranged as it had been on the first day when the synod began. Again, as on that earlier occasion, the antiphon 'Hear us Lord' was sung, with the verse and the 'Gloria'

following the 'Kyrie eleison', and after Bishop Leo had said the prayer, everyone was seated.[24]

Nothing was new or unusual in Charles' behaviour. Both his father and his grandfather, as we have already seen, used such public events to demonstrate their position and authority, and both mingled liturgy with court rituals. From Hincmar's description of Charles' ceremonial entrance, it appears that the pomposity of court rituals which characterised Louis the Pious' reign continued well into the later part of the ninth century. Thus, in acting as he did at Ponthion, Charles the Bald merely followed in his father's footsteps.

This, however, was not the end of the story. The closing ceremony of the council, we are told, was even more liturgically oriented and unusually concentrated around the king and his family:

> After these Peter bishop of Fossombrone and John of Toscanella went into the emperor's private apartments and brought out before the synod the Empress Richildis wearing the crown. As she stood beside the emperor, everyone rose to his feet, each standing in position according to his rank. Then Bishop Leo and Bishop John of Toscanella began the *Laudes*, and when these had been duly performed for the lord pope and the lord emperor and the empress and all the rest, according to the custom, Bishop Leo of Sabina said a prayer, and the synod was finally dissolved.[25]

Once again, we see Charles the Bald following in his father's footsteps, but going far beyond him. Nothing was new in singing the *Laudes regiae* in the presence of the queen at such a solemn celebration. However, on this occasion we get a clear demonstration of Charles'

[22] *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 876 (ed. Rau, p. 246): 'Hludowicus, Hludowici regis filius, decem homines aqua calida et decem ferro calido et decem aqua frigida ad iudicium misit coram eis qui cum illo erant, petentibus omnibus, ut Deus in illo iudicio declararet, si plus per rectum ille habere deberent portionem de regno quam pater suus illi dimisit ex ea parte . . .' [trans. Nelson, *The Annals of Saint-Bertin*, p. 196]. On this event, see J.L. Nelson, 'Violence in the Carolingian world and the ritualization of ninth-century warfare', in *Violence and Society in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. G. Halsall (Woodbridge, 1998), pp. 90–107, at 98–104.
[23] *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 876 (ed. Rau, p. 238): 'Undecimo Kalendas Iulii, indictione IX, episcopis ceterisque clericis vestibus ecclesiasticis indutis, et domo ac sedilibus palliis protensis, atque in gremio synodi et prospectu imperialis sedis lectorio superpositis sacrosanctis evangeliis, venit domnus imperator Karolus in vestitu deaurato, habitu Francico, cum legatis apostolicae sedis in synodum. Et cantoribus antiphonam "Exaudi nos Domine" cum versibus et Gloria cantantibus, post Kyrieleison, et data oratione a Iohanne Tuscanense episcopo, resedit domnus imperator in synodo' [trans. Nelson, *The Annals of Saint-Bertin*, pp. 190–1].

[24] *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 876 (ed. Rau, p. 244): '. . . mane circa horam nonam venit imperator Grecisco more paratus et coronatus, deducentibus eum apostolici legatis more Romano vestitis ac episcopis aecclesiasticis vestimentis indutis, et ceteris secundum modum primae diei, quando inchoata est synodus, praeparatis. Et ut prius, cantata antiphona "Exaudi nos Domine" cum versibus et Gloria post Kyrieleison, data oratione a Leone episcopo, resederunt omnes' [trans. Nelson, *The Annals of Saint-Bertin*, p. 194]. Charles the Bald's adoption of the Greek fashion won him some acerbic remarks from the Fulda annalist; see *Annales Fuldenses*, s.a. 876 (ed. Rau, pp. 102–4).
[25] *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 876 (ed. Rau, p. 244): 'Post haec perrexit Petrus episcopus Foro-Simpronii et Iohannes Tuscanensis ad cubiculum imperatoris, et adduxerunt Richildem imperatricem coronatam in synodum; et stante illa iuxta imperatorem, surrexerunt omnes, stantes quique in gradu suo. Tunc incoeperunt laudes Leo episcopus et Iohannes Tuscanensis episcopus, et post laudes peractas in domnum apostolicum et domnum imperatorem ac imperatricem et ceteros iuxta morem, data oratione a Leone Gavinense episcopo, soluta est synodus' [trans. Nelson, *The Annals of Saint-Bertin*, pp. 194–5].

unusual talent to mobilise liturgical resources and traditions for his own use. This tendency is also apparent in Charles the Bald's lavish endowments to monasteries in return for prayers and other liturgical commemorations on behalf of himself and his family.

Prayers for the king and the well-being of the kingdom were an old practice in the Frankish kingdoms. As we have already seen, from the time of Dagobert onwards Frankish kings and queens patronised liturgy in this way,[26] and Charles the Bald was no different.[27] In a charter from 867 to the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, to give just one example, Charles the Bald clearly states that he donated the *villa* of Voulpaix near Laon to the abbey, so that the monks 'may beseech God's mercy with continuous prayer for us, our wife and offspring, and for the state of the entire kingdom'.[28] Similar clauses were incorporated in many of Charles the Bald's charters, and they all reflect the king's use of traditional manners to patronise liturgy. By that time, it became axiomatic that prayers on behalf of the king, his family and his kingdom were given in return for landed property and other privileges – *do ut des* – and an illuminating case in point is to be found in the letters of Lupus, the abbot of Ferrières.

The cell of Saint-Josse near Quentovic was granted by Louis the Pious to the abbey of Ferrières, but later was confiscated by Lothar and given to one of his followers. The loss of Saint-Josse probably meant a loss of a substantial income for the monks of Ferrières, and soon after his accession to the abbacy Lupus embarked on a determined mission to secure the return of Saint-Josse to Ferrières.[29] He wrote more than fifteen letters on the matter to several influential friends and colleagues and even to the king himself,[30] and in many of these letters the monks'

duty to pray for the king and the kingdom was raised. In one of his letters to Charles the Bald (dated to 845), Lupus wrote:

> Louis, our deeply religious emperor, Your Highness's father, at the request of your mother of honoured memory, the empress Judith, presented the cell of Saint-Josse to the monastery of Ferrières. He confirmed this gift with an order that the monks should serve God in the monastery free from want, that with godly fear they should show hospitality to pilgrims in that cell, and that they should pray joyfully to God for the salvation and success of both of them.[31]

Thus Lupus clearly associates the monks' duty to pray for the king and his kingdom with the mundane benefits they should receive from the wealthy cell of Saint-Josse. This association is even more apparent in an earlier letter written by Lupus, this time to the Emperor Lothar (dated to 840):

> When we recall . . . that we have prayed and are praying faithfully for you and we realised that you have promised us your assistance, we do not despair of obtaining what we request. . . . We therefore ask that you examine your father's edict and out of respect for Saint Peter, Saint Mary, and Saint Paul, in whose name we beseech our common Lord for you, that you will please settle this matter in such a way that the usurper of that cell [i.e. Saint-Josse] not only be brought to justice now but will also have no opportunity in the future to accuse us falsely.[32]

---

[26] See above, pp. 33–41 and 55–7.

[27] See especially Ewig, 'Remarques sur la stipulation'. See also Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, pp. 248–9; idem, 'A Carolingian renaissance prince', pp. 165–6; Nelson, 'The Lord's anointed and the people's choice', pp. 172–5.

[28] *Recueil des actes de Charles II*, no. 302 (ed. Tessier, II, p. 167): '. . . et pro nobis, conjuge ac prole totiusque regni statu Dei misericordiam continuis precibus exorent'. For further references, see Ewig, 'Remarques sur la stipulation', pp. 224–5.

[29] On the case of Saint-Josse, see McKitterick, *The Frankish Kingdoms*, pp. 181–2; T.F.X. Noble, 'Lupus of Ferrières in his Carolingian context', in *After Rome's Fall. Narrators and Sources of Early Medieval History. Essays presented to Walter Goffart*, ed. A.C. Murray (Toronto, Buffalo and London, 1998), pp. 232–50, at 237–41.

[30] See Lupus of Ferrières, *Epistolae* 19, 32, 36, 42–3, 45, 47–50, 60, 62, 65, 82, 84 and 86–7 (ed. Levillain, I, pp. 102–4, 146–50, 158–60, 174–84, 186–92, 196–208, 230–2, 234–6, 238–42; II, pp. 66, 70–2, 74–80). A new edition of Lupus' letters was published by P. Marshall, *Servati Lupi epistulae* (Leipzig, 1984). Since Levillain arranged the letters in

chronological order (which in this case seems to me more appropriate), and Marshall favoured the manuscript order, the enumeration of the letters in the two editions is completely different. Thus, in order to avoid any confusion, Lupus' letters cited in this chapter are from Levillain's edition, which is the edition used by most scholars.

[31] Lupus of Ferrières, *Epistola* 42 (ed. Levillain, I, p. 176): 'Religiosissimus imperator Hludovicus, vestrae nobilitatis auctor, ad petitionem gloriosissimae memoriae Judith Augustae, matris vestrae, cellam sancti Judoci monasterio Ferrariensi contulit et suum donum praecepto firmavit, ut et monachi absque inopia in monasterio Deo servirent et in praefata cella hospitalitatem juxta Dei timorem peregrinis impenderent atque pro utriusque salute et prosperitate Deum delectabiliter exorarent' [trans. Regenos, *The Letters of Lupus of Ferrières*, p. 58].

[32] Lupus of Ferrières, *Epistola* 19 (ed. Levillain, I, pp. 102–4): '. . . recordantes quia pro vobis fideliter oravimus et oramus et promissionem adjutorii vestri tenentes, non desperamus nos impetraturos quod petimus. . . . Unde petimus ut, inspecto edicto patris vestri, pro reverentia beati Petri et beatae Mariae et Pauli, apud quos communem Dominum pro vobis exoramus, sic hoc negotium terminare dignemini, et non solum invasor cellae illius in praesenti juste redarguatur, verum etiam posteris calumniandi nobis occasio auferatur' [trans. Regenos, *The Letters of Lupus of Ferrières*, pp. 34–5].

And in another letter to Charles the Bald, Lupus moans:

[The monks of Ferrièrs] came to me from their own free will and choice, and although they have devoted themselves unceasingly to your welfare and success while you were involved in various things, they have suffered a shortage of clothing, vegetables, and fish on account of the confiscation of their facilities [i.e. the income from Saint-Josse].[33]

All these passages, together with the straightforward requests for prayers in many of Charles the Bald's charters, demonstrate how widespread the practice of prayers on behalf of the king in return for land and privileges became. But they also reflect the great importance attached by Charles the Bald and his contemporaries to those prayers on behalf of the king and the kingdom. Otherwise, Lupus would not have mentioned it in every letter he wrote to either Lothar or Charles the Bald, and he certainly would not have allowed himself to be so blunt in addressing the king:

On behalf of your salvation and well being, I admonish you and humbly beg you to deliver yourself from danger and to free me your most devoted servant from a very heavy burden, just as you have often promised. . . . That you may even know the very words they [i.e. the monks of Ferrières] use, this is what they are saying: that it is not right that they should suffer hunger and cold on account of you, since they are obliged to pray unceasingly for your temporal welfare and eternal salvation. They also claim that you will never attain the happiness you desire until you return into favour with our little poor St Peter.[34]

With these words Lupus expressed the common conviction, with the conditional notion of *do ut des* which it entailed, that the king's

well-being in this life and his salvation in the afterlife are dependent on the monks' prayers. Charles the Bald undoubtedly shared this notion, and the cell of Saint-Josse was restored to Lupus and his monks a few years later.[35]

Indeed, Charles the Bald walked in the long-trodden path of liturgical patronage paved for him by his predecessors, but he was not the kind of person to be satisfied with just tradition. He had to add something of his own, something that would strengthen the message of authority and power he wanted to deliver by those prayers on his behalf. Thus, in various charters Charles instructed the monks to pray not only for himself, his family and his kingdom, but also for his parents and grandparents. In a charter from 867, for example, Charles clarifies that the various donations mentioned in the charter were made, 'so that [the monks] should not cease to shower continuous prayers to the omnipotent God for the absolution of the lord our father Louis the most serene Augustus, and for the absolution of our mother Judith, the most pious Augusta, as well as for the absolution of us, of our royal spouse and of both our noble children'.[36] In another charter, given to the monastery of Saint-Martin of Autun, Charles the Bald even added to this illustrious list of people one of his men, and asked the monks to pray for the salvation of '. . . our father Louis, the most pious Augustus, and our mother Judith, the Augusta, as well as ourselves, our dead wife Ermentrude and our present wife Richildis, . . . and our Duke Boso, at whose most vigorous request I have ordered this charter to be drawn up'.[37]

Charles the Bald, however, did not use this technique of patronising liturgy merely to enlarge the group of people on whose behalf prayers

---

[33] Lupus of Ferrières, *Epistola* 49 (ed. Levillain, I, p. 204): '. . . quos ad eorum votum electionemque mihi commisisti, quique indesinenter, vobis in diversa occupatis, pro salute ac prosperitate vestra excubant, propter abstractas facultates patiuntur incredibilem vestimentorum, leguminum, ac piscium indigentiam . . .' [trans. Regenos, *The Letters of Lupus of Ferrières*, p. 67].

[34] Lupus of Ferrières, *Epistola* 57 (ed. Levillain, I, p. 222): 'Pro vestra salute et prosperitate vos admoneo et supplex flagito ut vosmetipsos liberetis periculo meque devotissimum vobis famulum secundum frequentes vestras promissiones asperrimo subleretis labore. . . . Ut ipsa etiam eorum verba sciatis, dicunt injustum esse ut a vobis fame torqueantur et frigore, cum assidue pro vestra temporali et perpetua salute cogantur orare, nec vos omnino consecuturos felicitatem quam desideretis, donec cum parvulo nostro sancto Petro in gratiam amicitiae redeatis' [trans. Regenos, *The Letters of Lupus of Ferrières*, p. 73].

[35] Lupus of Ferrières, *Epistolae* 86–7 (ed. Levillain, II, pp. 74–80).

[36] *Recueil des actes de Charles II*, no. 300 (ed. Tessier, II, p. 161): '. . . ut pro absolutione domni et geneitoris nostri Hludowici serenissimi augusti atque genetricis nostrae Judith piisisimae augustae, nostrae etiam consortisque regni nostri ac nobilissime utriusque prolis, omnipotenti Deo continuas preces fundere non desistant'.

[37] *Recueil des actes de Charles II*, no. 444 (ed. Tessier, II, pp. 498–9): '. . . pro remedio animae genitoris nostri Hludovici piissimi augusti et genitrice nostrae Judit augusta necnon pro nobis et conjuge nostra Hirmentrudi quae decessit et Richildi quae superest, . . . nobis Bosone duce, ad cujus saluberrimam deprecationem fieri hoc praeceptum jussimus'. For other examples of Charles' *fideles* mentioned in those lists, see *Recueil des actes de Charles II*, no. 325, 379 and 441 (ed. Tessier, II, pp. 214–17, 347–50 and 488–90).

should be said. He also used it to institute new liturgical commemorations.[38] In a charter from 872 Charles the Bald bids Angelwinus, the bishop of Paris, to hold prayers on the occasion of

> ... the anniversary of the death of our father, the most excellent Emperor Louis, which is 20 June, and of our mother, the most glorious Empress Judith, which is 20 March, as well as the anniversary of our birthday, 13 June, and the anniversary of our unction by God's permission (which after our death should be transferred to the celebration of that day [i.e. the anniversary of our death]), also the birthday of our most beloved wife, Queen Richildis, 1 August, and our marriage according to God's wish, as well as the birth of our children ...[39]

Charles also promised in return to grant Angelwinus and his monks an annual feast (*refectio*) on the anniversary of his children's birthday.[40] In a charter to Saint-Denis, to give just one more example, Charles lists the following days on which prayers should be held in return for an annual feast:

> ... 13 June, when God wanted me to be born to this world, and 8 July, when the Saint of saints consecrated me as king by his honour, and also 15 January, when the King of kings restored me to the kingdom, after those who were fighting against us were driven away and destroyed in face of the divine power (and after our death this commemoration should be changed to the day of our death, when the Lord will order me to follow the way of all flesh), as well as 13 December, when God coupled me in a marriage bond with my beloved wife Ermentrude, and also 27 September, when our most beloved wife was born (and on her death

this commemoration should be changed to the day in which by divine vocation she shall depart from this world). ...[41]

Thus, as already noted by Wallace-Hadrill, Charles the Bald revived 'the earlier practice of *Natale Caesarum*, that is, official commemoration of his anniversaries and those of his consort by chant and prayer, in return for which a feast was granted'.[42] This step may have been inspired by the list of commemorations in the Calendar of 354, as suggested by Kantorowicz,[43] by an episcopal calendar similar to the calendar of Alderic, bishop of Le Mans, where the anniversary of his ordination is listed,[44] or by both. Yet it was Charles the Bald who introduced those commemorations of himself, his family and his friends to the liturgical cycle of the Frankish kingdom, and he did it through an elaborate and well-devised network of liturgical patronage.[45]

Such acts of liturgical patronage had some propagandistic value. They present Charles the Bald as the sole legitimate and worthy successor of his illustrious ancestors, and they disseminated an image of Charles as an ideal *rex christianus*, who protects and promotes ecclesiastical

---

[38] See Wallace-Hadrill, 'A Carolingian renaissance prince', p. 166; Ewig, 'Remarques sur la stipulation', pp. 225–6.

[39] *Recueil des actes de Charles II*, no. 364 (ed. Tessier, II, pp. 314–15): '... diem depositionis patris nostri praecellentissimi imperatoris Hludowici quod est duodecim kalendas maii et matris nostrae gloriosissimae imperatricis Judith quod est tertio decimo kalendas aprilis, diem quoque nativitatis nostrae idus junii, necnon et diem a Deo concessae nobis unctionis qui post obitum in diem ipsum in celebrando transfundetur, nativitatem praeterea amabillimae conjugis nostrae Richildis reginae kalendis augusti et copulam secundum Dei voluntatem nostrae conjunctionis, insuper et ortum prolis nostrae ...'.

[40] On these feasts, see M. Rouche, 'Les repas de fête à l'époque carolingienne', in *Manger et boire au Moyen Age*, ed. D. Menjot, 2 vols. (Nice, 1984), I, pp. 265–96.

[41] *Recueil des actes de Charles II*, no. 246 (ed. Tessier, II, p. 55): '... idibus mensis junii, quando Deus me nasci in mundo voluit, et octavo idus julii, quando Sanctus sanctorum ungi in regem sua dignatione disposuit, sed et octavo decimo kalendas februarii, quando me Rex regum, fugatis atque contritis ante faciem divinae potentiae nobiscum agente, in regnum restituit, quae commemoratio post obitum nostrum in depositionis die, cum me Dominus viam universae carnis ingredi jusserit, convertatur, necnon et in idibus decembris, quando Deus me dilectam conjugem Yrmintrudem uxoreo vinculo copulavit, verum et quinto kalend. octobris, qundo ipsa dilectissima nobis conjunx nata fuit, quae commemoratio convertatur in depositionis ejus diem, quando divina vocatione ab hac mortalitate migravit ...'.

[42] Wallace-Hadrill, 'A Carolingian renaissance prince', p. 166.

[43] Kantorowicz, *Laudes regiae*, p. 67. On the Calendar of 354, see M.R. Salzman, *On Roman Time. The Codex-Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford, 1990).

[44] See P. Le Maître, 'L'œuvre d'Aldaric du Mans et sa signification', *Francia* 8 (1981), pp. 34–64.

[45] Alain Stoclet argues that the commemoration of the king's inauguration was instituted by Charlemagne, and therefore Charles the Bald merely followed an already established tradition. I agree with Stoclet that the commemoration of the king's inauguration was, most probably, a feature in the liturgical calendar of the royal chapel. However, the fact that several charters were drawn up on behalf of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious and their advisers on those specific day, does not necessarily imply that the commemoration of the king's inauguration was instituted. In fact, none of these documents speak specifically of these commemorations, and the first time these are mentioned is in a charter by Charles the Bald of 21 May 854. See *Recueil des actes de Charles II*, no. 162 (ed. Tessier, I, pp. 427–9). For Stoclet's views, see A.J. Stoclet, 'Dies unctionis. A note on the anniversaries of royal inaugurations in the Carolingian period', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 20 (1986), pp. 541–8, and compare with McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints*, pp. 161–3.

interests.[46] Moreover, the political ideal which emerged from all the commemorations listed by Charles in his charters, is that of royal government as a familial co-operation. Hence, the liturgical commemorations of Charles the Bald, his ancestors, his wife and his children, displayed a common trend in contemporary political thought,[47] which is also apparent in Hincmar of Rheims' short treatise on the government of the palace (*De ordine palatii*), written for the young Carloman shortly after Charles the Bald's death.[48]

Yet the most obvious impetus behind such acts of liturgical patronage, I would argue, was a form of political necessity. From the available sources on the reign of Charles the Bald, and foremost among them the *Annals of Saint-Bertin* and Nithard's history of the quarrel between the sons of Louis the Pious, it is clear how central a role the Church had played in determining the course of events. Charles the Bald, like his brothers, had to secure the loyalty and obedience of the religious institutions in his realm, and this was achieved by lavish endowments to monasteries and cathedral churches. In this respect, securing the loyalty of the Church was not at all different from securing the loyalty of a lay magnate, and in both cases it had to be bought with land, honours and benefices. By fixing a whole new calendar of liturgical commemorations in return for land and other favours, Charles, it seems, strove to create a closer and more personal alliance between the ecclesiastical institutions of his realm and himself; an alliance which secured their allegiance to the king and his cause.

Notwithstanding the clear political background to Charles the Bald's donation policy and liturgical patronage, one has to remember that there was a deep religious element in these acts as well. Charles was a devoted Christian, who clearly believed in the efficacy of liturgical rites, and therefore had no doubt that those prayers on behalf of himself, his family and his kingdom are crucial for his success in this world, and his

salvation in the next. This is quite apparent in Charles' attempts to regularise his own funerary cult at Saint-Denis. As we have already seen, he ordered that after his death the liturgical commemoration of his coronation should be replaced with the commemoration of his death.[49] Furthermore, he also instructed the abbot of Saint-Denis on how to celebrate the daily office on his behalf (five daily psalms sung by the brothers immediately after Prime and a daily mass celebrated by a priest), and he even pointed out where he would like his tomb to be built, 'in front of the altar which is called Gazofilacium [i.e. the Treasury]', above which an oil-lamp should burn constantly.[50] If no real importance was attached by Charles and his contemporaries to these liturgical observances, he would not have bothered to make them. Obviously Charles the Bald sincerely believed that these prayers had the power to secure his salvation.

Systematising traditions

As we have already noticed in the liturgy of war, in the various commemoration days listed in the charters, and in the efforts to regularise the royal funerary cult at Saint-Denis, the patronage of liturgy under Charles the Bald was marked by a fair amount of inventiveness and craving for systematisation. These are most apparent in the evolution of court rituals, and more particularly in the royal and imperial coronation ceremonies.

Like the reign of his father, the reign of Charles the Bald was also punctuated by ritual observances, in which coronations and unctions bulked large. In 838 at Quierzy, shortly after reaching the age of fifteen, Charles the Bald was invested with a sword-belt and a crown, and given the region of Neustria.[51] Ten years later 'at Orléans nearly all the high

[46] On the image of Charles the Bald as *rex christianus*, see Staubach, *Das Herrscherbild Karls des Kahlen*; idem, *Rex christianus*.

[47] See R. Schieffer, 'Väter und Söhne im Karolingerhause', in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Regnum Francorum*, ed. R. Schieffer, Beihefte der Francia 22 (Sigmaringen, 1990), pp. 149–64; Nelson, 'The last years of Louis the Pious', especially 150–1.

[48] See Hincmar of Rheims, *De ordine palatii*, ed. T. Gross and R. Schieffer, MGH Fontes iuris Germanici antiqui 3 (Hannover, 1980), especially cc. IV (13), V (19 and 22), pp. 56–8, 66–8 and 72–4 respectively. On Hincmar of Rheims and his political views, see Nelson, 'Legislation and consensus in the reign of Charles the Bald'; eadem, *Charles the Bald*, pp. 43–50; Staubach, *Das Herrscherbild Karls des Kahlen*, pp. 96–271. See also Anton, *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos*, pp. 281–355.

[49] See, for example, *Recueil des actes de Charles II*, no. 246 and 364 (ed. Tessier, II, p. 55 and 315).

[50] *Recueil des actes de Charles II*, no. 246 (ed. Tessier, II, pp. 55–6). See also *Recueil des actes de Charles II*, no. 379 (ed. Tessier, II, pp. 349–50). On these stipulations, see A. Erlande-Brandenburg, *Le roi est mort. Étude sur les funérailles, les sépultures et les tombeaux des rois de France jusqu'à la fin du XIIIe siècle* (Geneva, 1975), especially pp. 72–3.

[51] Nithard, *Historiarum libri*, I.6 (ed. Rau, pp. 396–8); *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 838 (ed. Rau, p. 36). On this event, see J.L. Nelson, 'Ninth-century knighthood: the evidence of Nithard', in *Studies in Medieval History presented to R. Allen Brown*, ed. C. Harper-Bill, C. Holdsworth and J.L. Nelson (Woodbridge, 1989), pp. 255–66 [reprinted in Nelson, *The Frankish World*, pp. 75–87]; eadem, 'Inauguration rituals', pp. 61–2.

nobility, along with the bishops and abbots, elected Charles as their king and then solemnly consecrated him with an anointing of holy chrism and episcopal dedication'.[52] In 856 Judith, Charles the Bald's daughter, was married to Æthelwulf, king of Wessex, and the Franks celebrated her marriage and coronation at Verberie on 1 October.[53] It was Hincmar of Rheims, a firm supporter and a close friend of Charles the Bald, who composed the *ordo* for the occasion, and it was probably he who conducted the entire ceremony.[54] On 25 August 866, at his own request, Charles' wife Ermentrude was anointed and consecrated at Soissons.[55] The *ordo* for that occasion was also composed by Hincmar of Rheims.[56] In 869 Hincmar was recruited once again to compose an *ordo* and to orchestrate the coronation of Charles the Bald as king of Lotharingia.[57]

Finally, on Christmas day 875, 'after making an offering of many precious gifts to St Peter, he [i.e. Charles] was anointed and crowned emperor and was accorded the title of Emperor of the Romans'.[58]

'The earlier Carolingians', as pointed out by Wallace-Hadrill, 'were comparatively unimpressed by anointing. Then the situation changes; unctions become more frequent and more charged with political meaning. They almost look like a belated catching-up on what had been implicit in a century's exposition of Old Testament kingship.'[59] Similar conclusions were also drawn by Janet Nelson in what is, to my mind, the most perceptive study of Carolingian royal rituals:

> If any conclusion can be drawn from this brief survey it is that the nature of Carolingian politics, as reflected in such ritual, did not change fundamentally as between the eighth and the ninth centuries. The rituals of Louis the Pious and Charles the Bald are more elaborate (and not just better documented) than those of Pippin and Charlemagne. But they convey the same perceptions of the nature of royal power and of political relationships. They express and at the same time reinforce that power and those relationships. The king ruled because God had chosen him to lead the New Israel. But the Franks as the New Israel were also a chosen people. Just as Carolingian law-making was the business of 'the king, the bishops and all the noble Franks', so royal ritual evolved the Frankish Church, the Frankish aristocracy, and, by implication, all the members of the Frankish gens that believed itself noble by definition.[60]

There is no doubt that Charles the Bald's reign brought Carolingian royal rituals to a new peak, with an unrivalled degree of inventiveness and systematisation. Hincmar of Rheims' elaborate *ordo* for the coronation of 869 is the best evidence for the liturgification process under Charles the Bald, and although 'Hincmar's liturgical inventiveness lay behind the formal proceedings, the substantial impetus surely came

[52] *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 848 (ed. Rau, p. 72): '. . . atque in urbe Aurelianorum omnes pene nobiliores cum episcopis et abbatibus in regem eligunt, sacroque crismate delibutum et benedictione episcopali sollemniter consecrant' [trans. Nelson, *The Annals of Saint-Bertin*, p. 66]. On this event, see Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, pp. 154–6; eadem, 'The Lord's anointed and the people's choice', pp. 162–3. On the possible *ordo* for this occasion, see G. Lanoë, 'L'*ordo* de couronnement de Charles le Chauve à Sainte-Croix d'Orléans (6 juin 848)', in *Kings and Kingship in Medieval Europe*, ed. A.J. Duggan, King's College London Medieval Studies 10 (London, 1993), pp. 41–69.

[53] *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 856 (ed. Rau, p. 92). On Judith's marriage and coronation, see P. Stafford, 'Charles the Bald, Judith and England', in *Charles the Bald*, ed. Gibson and Nelson, pp. 139–53.

[54] For Hincmar's *ordo*, see *Coronatio Iudithae Karoli II filiae (856)* (ed. Krause, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, II, no. 296, pp. 425–7). See also Jackson, *Ordines coronationis Franciae*, pp. 73–9. On this *ordo*, see Nelson, 'The earliest surviving royal *ordo*'; eadem, 'Early medieval rites of queen-making', pp. 306–8.; Smith, 'The earliest queen-making rites', pp. 22–7. On Hincmar's authorship, see Jackson, 'Who wrote Hincmar's ordines?', especially p. 34.

[55] *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 866 (ed. Rau, p. 158). On Ermentrude's consecration, see P. Hyam, 'Ermentrude and Richildis', in *Charles the Bald*, ed. Gibson and Nelson, pp. 154–68, at 158–9.

[56] For Hincmar's *ordo*, see *Coronatio Hermintrudis reginae (866)* (ed. Krause, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, II, no. 301, pp. 453–5). See also Jackson, *Ordines coronationis Franciae*, pp. 80–6. On this *ordo*, see Nelson, 'Early medieval rites of queen-making', especially pp. 308–10; Smith, 'The earliest queen-making rites', pp. 27–32. On Hincmar's authorship, see Jackson, 'Who wrote Hincmar's ordines?', especially pp. 34–6.

[57] For the *ordo* of Charles the Bald's coronation, see *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 869 (ed. Rau, pp. 192–200); *Electionis Karoli capitula in regno Hlotharii factae (869)* (ed. Krause, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, II, no. 276, pp. 337–41); *Ordo coronationis Karoli II in regno Hlotharii II factae (869)* (ed. Krause, *Capitularia regum Francorum*, II, no. 302, pp. 456–8). See also Jackson, *Ordines coronationis Franciae*, pp. 87–109. On this coronation, see Staubach, *Das Herrscherbild Karls des Kahlen*, pp. 239–71; R.-H. Bautier, 'Sacres et couronnements sous les Carolingiens et les premiers Capétiens. Recherches sur la genèse du sacre royal français', *Annuaire-Bulletin de la société de l'histoire de France*, anné 1987 (1989), pp. 7–56, at 33–43; Nelson, 'The Lord's anointed and the people's choice', pp. 163–4; eadem, 'Hincmar of Rheims on king-making: the evidence of the

Annals of Saint-Bertin', in *Coronations: Medieval and Early Modern Monarchic Rituals*, ed. J.M. Bak (Berkeley, Los Angeles and Oxford, 1990), pp. 16–34; Jackson, 'Who wrote Hincmar's ordines?', especially pp. 37–47.

[58] *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 876 (ed. Rau, pp. 236–8): '. . . in die nativitatis Domini beato Petro multa pretiosa munera offerens, in imperatorem unctus et coronatus atque imperator Romanorum appelatus est' [trans. Nelson, *The Annals of Saint-Bertin*, p. 189]. See also *Annales Fuldenses*, s.a. 875 (ed. Rau, p. 98).

[59] Wallace-Hadrill, *Early Medieval Kingship*, p. 133.

[60] Nelson, 'The Lord's anointed and the people's choice', pp. 175–6.

from Charles himself.'[61] After all, neither Lothar nor Louis the German were anointed to their kingdoms, as far as we can tell. Like his father, Charles the Bald used royal rituals for political purposes. These rituals, with the liturgical elements they entailed, were part and parcel of the king's image-building policy, and they all provided the king and his aristocrats alike with the much-needed reassurance that God was with them.[62] Charles' impact, it seems, was so deep, that no Frankish king after him acceded to his throne without being anointed.

Liturgical experimentation

Did Charles the Bald's liturgical policy also promote the importation of non-Frankish liturgical traditions? The answer to this question is not straightforward, first and foremost because of the fact that even before the reign of Charles the Bald the so-called Gallican rite was under a variety of external influences, not only Roman and Mozarabic, but also Irish and Anglo-Saxon. Thus, unless there is a clear evidence for royal involvement, it is impossible to judge whether a common element found its way to the Frankish liturgy as a result of an intentional measures taken by the royal court.

As Nelson has convincingly demonstrated, Hincmar's *ordo* for the marriage and coronation of Judith was largely drawn from the Anglo-Saxon *ordo* in the Leofric Missal.[63] Similarly, some Spanish symptoms and rites can be identified in the Frankish liturgy.[64] Yet, in none of these cases is royal initiative attested. A more complicated case concerns several eastern liturgical practices. In a letter from around 875–7 to the

clergy of Ravenna,[65] Charles the Bald mentions that 'also celebrated in our presence were the holy office of the mass according to the practice of Jerusalem, composed by the Apostle James, and according to the Constantinopolitan practice, composed by Basil'.[66] Wallace-Hadrill, who understood from this passage that masses according to the practice of Jerusalem and Constantinople were performed at Ravenna in the presence of Charles the Bald, concluded that it 'may reveal a royal penchant for liturgical experimentation'.[67] Such a conclusion fits extremely well with the fact that certain cultural interactions between Byzantium and the West took place during the ninth century.[68] Furthermore, it also accords with Charles' Byzantinising aspirations in his last years.[69] Yet, as already pointed out by T.S. Brown, Ravenna is often overestimated by modern scholars as a conduit for Byzantine influence,[70] and therefore one has to be extremely cautious not to read too much into Charles' letter to the clergy of Ravenna. In fact, from the letter itself it is unclear whether the above-mentioned masses were indeed performed at Ravenna.

This, however, must not be taken to imply that no eastern influences are to be found in the Frankish liturgy of the ninth century. There are several cases in which eastern practices were clearly adopted and incorporated into Frankish sacramentaries. For example, a prayer for peace ('Qui es omnium Deus et dominator'), to be said immediately after the *Pax Domini* and before the kiss of peace, was incorporated for the first

[61] Nelson, *Charles the Bald*, p. 155. See also eadem, 'The Lord's anointed and the people's choice', pp. 163–4; eadem, 'Kingship, law and liturgy in the political thought of Hincmar of Rheims', *English Historical Review* 92 (1977), pp. 241–79 [reprinted in eadem, *Politics and Ritual*, pp. 133–72].

[62] See Nelson, 'The Lord's anointed and the people's choice', pp. 159–66.

[63] See Nelson, 'The earliest surviving royal *ordo*'. For the Leofric Missal (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579 [N-E France, shortly before 900]), see *The Leofric Missal*, ed. F.E. Warren (Oxford, 1883). On the Leofric Missal, see R.W. Pfaff, 'Massbooks: sacramentaries and missals', in *The Liturgical Books of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. R.W. Pfaff, Old English Newsletter Subsidia 23 (Kalamazoo, 1995), pp. 7–35, at 11–14.

[64] A good case in point is the *ordo* for the celebration of ecclesiastical councils, see Reynolds, 'The Visigothic liturgy in the realm of Charlemagne', pp. 932–3.

[65] This letter was already mentioned above, p. 47. The date of this letter (if it is indeed a genuine letter) is based solely on the words that introduce the extracts from this letter: 'In epistola Karoli Calvi Imp. ad clerum Ravennatem . . .', which imply that it was written after Charles the Bald's imperial coronation. On the authenticity of this letter and the problem of its transmission, see Jacob, 'Une lettre de Charles le Chauve'.

[66] *Epistola Karoli Calvi Imp. ad clerum Ravennatem*, in Jacob, 'Une lettre de Charles le Chauve', p. 417: 'Celebrata sunt etiam coram nobis sacra missarum officia more Hierosolymitano auctore Iacobo apostolo, et more Constantinopolitano auctore Basilio.'

[67] Wallace-Hadrill, 'A Carolingian renaissance prince', p. 165; idem, *The Frankish Church*, p. 246.

[68] On these interactions, see B. Bischoff, 'Das griechische Element in der abendländischen Bildung des Mittelalters', in idem, *Mittelalterliche Studien*, II, pp. 246–75, especially at pp. 265–8 [originally published in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 44 (1951), pp. 27–55]; see also McCormick, 'Byzantium and the West', pp. 373–9, and see there for further references.

[69] See the acerbic reports in the *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 876 (ed. Rau, p. 244); *Annales Fuldenses*, s.a. 876 (ed. Rau, pp. 102–4). See also Wallace-Hadrill, 'A Carolingian renaissance prince', pp. 164–6.

[70] See T.S. Brown, 'The interplay between Roman and Byzantine traditions and local sentiment in the Exarchate of Ravenna', in *Bisanzio, Roma e l'Italia nell'alto medioevo*, Settimane 34 (Spoleto, 1988), pp. 127–60. See also A. Guillou, *Régionalisme et indépendance dans l'empire byzantin au VIIe siècle* (Rome, 1969), pp. 170–2.

time into a late ninth-century sacramentary from Saint-Amand.[71] This was based on a Greek prayer (ὁ πάντων Θεὸς καὶ δεσπότης) taken from the liturgy of St James,[72] which was introduced to the Frankish kingdom by either Eastern clerics who visited the West, or by Franks who had visited the East. Yet again, as far as we can tell, Charles the Bald and his court had nothing to do with it.

The same situation is revealed when considering the relations between Frankish and Roman practices at the time of Charles the Bald. The last sentence of the extract from the letter to the clergy of Ravenna, is a straightforward declaration made by Charles the Bald: 'But we follow the Roman Church in celebrating the mass.'[73] It is, therefore, appropriate to ask how Roman the Frankish liturgy was under Charles the Bald, and what role did Roman practices play in the formation of the liturgy of his time. A short answer to these questions would be that nothing much had changed since the time of Charlemagne and Louis the Pious. A look at the liturgical manuscripts available will clarify this point.

The most widespread sacramentary in the Carolingian kingdoms of the second half of the ninth century was the supplemented *Hadrianum*. In fact, most of the Frankish manuscripts which preserve the *Hadrianum*, with or without Benedict of Aniane's supplement, were copied after the death of Louis the Pious.[74] However, from the mid-ninth century onwards a strong tendency to fuse the *Hadrianum* and the *Supplementum* into one book took over. The various parts of Benedict of Aniane's supplement were incorporated in their appropriate places within the sacramentary proper, and thus a new age of liturgical experimentation and creativity begun. It was up to the composer and commissioner to decide which parts of the *Supplementum* to include in the new book and which parts to leave out. This gave our editors a wonderful opportunity to re-arrange some parts of the *Hadrianum* itself, and to add several new pieces, most of which were taken from eighth-century

Gelasian sources.[75] It is precisely because of these additions that scholars christened the newly fused type of sacramentaries the 'Gelasianised Gregorians'.[76]

The inevitable result of this development was the proliferation of diversity. Although all the new books were based on the *Hadrianum* and Benedict of Aniane's supplement, each one of them was distinct from the other, and different new prayers were incorporated into different sacramentaries. An excellent example of the creativity which characterised the age of Charles the Bald, is the liturgical activity and experimentation which took place at the famous scriptorium of Saint-Amand.[77]

A group of seven sacramentaries, which were copied at Saint-Amand during the reign of Charles the Bald, survives and it includes the following manuscripts, listed chronologically:[78]

1. Le Mans, BM 77 (Saint-Amand, *c*. 851),[79] composed for the bishop of Le Mans.
2. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, G 57 (Saint-Amand, *c*. 855),[80] composed for the nunnery of Chelles.
3. St Petersburg, Public Library, Q v I 41 (Saint-Amand, *c*. 863),[81] composed for the bishop of Noyon-Tournai.
4. Paris, BNF lat. 2290 (Saint-Amand, *c*. 867),[82] composed for the abbey of Saint-Denis.

---

[71] Paris, BNF lat. 2991, fol. 6r (Saint-Amand, *c*. 875–76); *CLLA* 925. I shall discuss the sacramentaries of Saint-Amand more fully later in this chapter.

[72] See F.E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western. I: Eastern Liturgies* (Oxford, 1896), p. 43; H. Netzer, *L'introduction de la messe romaine en France sous les carolingiens* (Paris, 1910), p. 244.

[73] *Epistola Karoli Calvi Imp. ad clerum Ravennatem*, in Jacob, 'Une lettre de Charles le Chauve', p. 417: 'Sed nos sequendam ducimus Romanam Ecclesiam in Missarum celebratione.'

[74] See *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, pp. 35–47. See also *CLLA* 720–78 and 901–50.

[75] On these sacramentaries, see *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, pp. 72–4; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 92 and 102–5; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 78–9.

[76] This tendency was to intensify during the late ninth and throughout the tenth century, and it brought about the composition of large books, packed with liturgical material which the scribes assembled because of a 'compiling mania'. See E. Bourque, *Études sur les sacramentaires romains*, 2 vols. (Rome 1948–58), II.2, pp. 292–9. For one of the earliest examples of these new sacramentaries, see *The Sacramentary of Echternach* (ed. Hen). For the most outstanding example, see *Sacramentarium Fuldense saeculi X (Cod. theol. 231 der k. Universitätsbibliothek zu Göttingen*, ed. G. Richter and A. Schönfelder (Fulda, 1912) [reprinted as HBS 101 (London, 1977)]. On the sacramentaries of Fulda, see E. Palazzo, *Les sacramentaires de Fulda. Études sur l'iconographie et la liturgie à l'époque ottonienne*, Liturgiewissenschaftliche Quellen und Forschungen 77 (Münster, 1994).

[77] On the scriptorium of Saint-Amand, see McKitterick, 'Carolingian book production', pp. 14–33.

[78] For a detailed analysis of these manuscripts, see Deshusses, 'Chronologie des sacramentaires de Saint-Amand'; idem, 'Encore les sacramentaires de Saint Amand'.

[79] *CLLA* 743; *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, p. 37; III, p. 29.

[80] *CLLA*, p. 356; *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, pp. 38–9; III, pp. 36–8.

[81] *CLLA* 926; *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, p. 46; III, pp. 43–5.

[82] *CLLA* 760; *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, p. 40; III, pp. 30–1.

5. Rheims, BM 213 (Saint-Amand, *c.* 869),[83] composed for the abbey of Saint-Thierry.
6. Paris, BNF lat. 2291 (Saint-Amand, *c.* 875-6),[84] composed for the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés.
7. Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, Holm. A 136 (Saint-Amand, *c.* 876–7),[85] composed for the archbishop of Sens.

To these, one can add two more fragments of sacramentaries from Saint-Amand:

1. San Marino (California), Huntington Library, HM 41785, 2 fols. (Saint-Amand, *c.* 860-80).[86]
2. Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, lat. 958, 8 fols. (Saint-Amand, s. ix²),[87] copied for the diocese of Liège.

Although the basic structure of a fused *Hadrianum* is strictly kept by them all, and although similar prefatory material, such as a calendar, a *computus* or *apologiae*,[88] is added to most of them at the beginning of the codex, immediately before the sacramentary proper, these sacramentaries are not identical. Various differences, some dictated by their specific geographical destination, others as a result of developments in sacramentary-production at Saint-Amand itself, can be observed in them. For example, Le Mans, BM 77, the earliest of this group of sacramentaries, has very little material from the *Supplementum* incorporated into the text of the sacramentary itself (only on fols. 3r–6r), while the bulk of the *Supplementum* is still concentrated at the end. On the other hand, in both Paris, BNF lat. 2291 and Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, Holm. A 136, the two latest sacramentaries of this group, one can clearly see how masterfully the *Supplementum* was incorporated into the text of the *Hadrianum*, and how many votive masses and other material, which were not included in the *Hadrianum* or in the *Supplementum* in their original form, were added. The change, needless to say, was gradual and it is reflected in the wide spectrum offered by the Saint-Amand sacramentaries.[89] Thus, although produced at the same scriptorium, this extraordinary group of sacramentaries gives us a rare glimpse of the liturgical experimentation which took place during the reign of Charles the Bald.

To this, one can add another interesting point which is of importance to Charles the Bald's policy of liturgical patronage. As already noted by Rosamond McKitterick, 'only a large and wealthy abbey and an accomplished scriptorium could have produced splendid books in such quantity for other abbeys as well as providing as fully for the needs of its own school and churches. That Saint-Amand was a royal monastery had everything to do with its success.'[90] From the time of its foundation in the seventh century, Saint-Amand attracted an increasing amount of royal interest and patronage, first from the Merovingians and then from the Carolingians.[91] The close relations between the abbey and the Frankish monarchy culminated in the time of Charles the Bald. Saint-Amand was very close to Charles' heart. He visited the abbey for the first time in 847, and it was at this occasion that he renewed the charter given to the abbey by Louis the Pious.[92] Thereafter gifts were continuously bestowed on Saint-Amand by the Frankish king,[93] who also took an active role in the election of its abbots. In 864 Charles the Bald nominated Adalhard, his sister's brother-in-law, to the abbacy. In 867, Charles' own son, Carloman, succeeded Adalhard as abbot of Saint-Amand, and after his deposition in 870, it was Gozlin, Charles' archchancellor, who received the abbacy.[94] Furthermore, we also know that two sons of Charles were sent to Saint-Amand for their education.[95]

No doubt the royal patronage offered by Charles the Bald to the abbey of Saint-Amand provided for the material resources necessary to support

---

[83] *CLLA* 1385; *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, p. 41; III, pp. 38–9.
[84] *CLLA* 925; *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, p. 46; III, pp. 39–41.
[85] *CLLA* 763; *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, p. 47; III, pp. 41–3.
[86] See Deshusses, 'Encore les sacramentaires de Saint Amand'; *A Guide to Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the Huntington Library*, ed. C.W. Dutschke, 2 vols. (San Marino, CA, 1989), II, p. 723.
[87] *CLLA* 764; F. Unterkircher, *Karolingisches Sakramentar-Fragment, Vienna 958*, Codices selecti phototypice 25 (Graz, 1971).
[88] The *apologiae* are personal avowals of guilt and unworthiness which the celebrant ought to recite.

[89] One can easily compare the content of these sacramentaries by using the tables in *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), III, pp. 29 and 34–45.
[90] McKitterick, 'Charles the Bald and his library', p. 43.
[91] See H. Platelle, 'Le premier cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Amand', *Le Moyen Age* 11 (1956), pp. 301–29. See also McKitterick, 'Charles the Bald and his library', pp. 43–7.
[92] *Recueil des actes de Charles II*, no. 92 (ed. Tessier, II, pp. 247–50).
[93] See, for example, *Recueil des actes de Charles II*, no. 273 (ed. Tessier, II, pp. 112–14).
[94] On Charles' involvement in the election of abbots for Saint-Amand, see McKitterick, 'Charles the Bald and his library', pp. 45–6.
[95] See Milo, *Epitaphium Drogonis et Pippini Caroli Calvi filiorum*, ed. L. Traube, MGH Poetae 3 (Berlin, 1886), pp. 677–8.

a large and flourishing scriptorium, like the one attested by the abundant manuscripts copied at Saint-Amand.[96] But did it also provide the impetus? In a seminal paper from 1977 Jean Deshusses suggested that royal commission stood behind many of the sacramentaries produced at Saint-Amand, and proposed Charles the Bald as the Maecenas.[97] According to him, Le Mans, BM 77 was presented to the bishop of Le Mans at the occasion of Charles' victory over the Bretons; New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, G 57 was presented to Chelles shortly after Queen Ermentrude had taken the title of abbess of Chelles; St Petersburg, Public Library, Q v I 41 was presented to the bishop of Noyon-Tournai who conducted the marriage ceremony of Judith, Charles' daughter, to Count Baldwin of Flanders; Paris, BNF lat. 2290 was given by Charles the Bald to his favourite monastery, Saint-Denis; Rheims, BM 213 was given to Hincmar of Rheims, who was also the abbot of Saint-Thierry, as a reconciliation present; and finally, Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, Holm. A 136 was presented to Bishop Ansegis of Sens, who succeeded Hincmar of Rheims as Charles' favourite bishop. Only Paris, BNF lat. 2291, which was presented to Saint-Germain-des-Prés, was not commissioned by the king, but by Gozlin, the new abbot of Saint-Amand, who was also the abbot of Saint-Germain-des-Prés. This, argues Deshusses, accords extremely well with the modest decoration of Paris, BNF lat. 2291, which is taken to imply that this particular manuscript was not a royal commission.

Deshusses' tempting thesis is jeopardised only by the fact that no direct evidence connects Charles the Bald with the above-mentioned sacramentaries. Nevertheless, some other small pieces of evidence, which point to the liturgical interest of Charles the Bald, may give Deshusses' hypothesis some support. Charles the Bald gathered a group of scribes and artists, the so-called *Hofschule* of Charles the Bald, who produced lavishly decorated manuscripts.[98] Eight of the manuscripts produced by this atelier may be connected directly with Charles the Bald

himself,[99] and among them liturgical manuscripts bulk large. Moreover, it is possible that from among these liturgical manuscripts, two were destined to be presented as gifts. The Sacramentary of Nonantola was, most probably, intended for Saint-Denis, but then given in 876 to John of Arezzo, Pope John VIII's ambassador.[100] The incomplete Sacramentary of Metz, it seems, was intended as a gift to the bishop of Metz in celebration of Charles' coronation as king of Lotharingia in 869. However, it was not finished on time and, therefore, Metz received the so-called Vivian Bible (Paris, BNF lat. 1), which had been presented to Charles in about 846.[101] Once again we see Charles the Bald not only patronising the production of liturgical manuscripts, but also presenting sacramentaries as gifts, whereas his ancestors and contemporaries preferred to present Bibles.

Liturgical productivity and creativity were not confined to the realm of Charles the Bald alone. Although our liturgical evidence from the kingdoms of Lothar and Louis the German are scarce, almost to the point of non-existence, it seems very likely that similar developments took place in Lotharingia and Germany as well. Several splendid copies of the newly fused *Hadrianum*, such as the Sacramentary of Mainz,[102] the Sacramentary of Reichenau,[103] or the Sacramentary of Essen,[104] were copied in those areas, and it is from the *Hofschule* of Emperor Lothar

---

[96] See McKitterick, 'Carolingian book production', pp. 14–33.
[97] Deshusses, 'Chronologie des sacramentaires de Saint-Amand', pp. 233–6.
[98] On the *Hofschule* of Charles the Bald, see McKitterick, 'The palace school of Charles the Bald'; eadem, 'Charles the Bald and his library', pp. 36–43; eadem, 'Royal patronage of culture', pp. 105–8. See also Koehler and Mütherich, *Die Hofschule Karls des Kahlen*.

[99] These manuscripts are Charles' Prayerbook (Munich, Schatzkammer der Residenz), his Psalter (Paris, BNF lat. 1152), the so-called Antiphonary of Compiègne (Paris, BNF lat. 17436), another Psalter (Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, 13), the incomplete Metz Sacramentary (Paris, BNF lat. 1141), the Sacramentary of Nonantola (Paris, BNF 2292), Charles' own Gospel Book (Paris, BNF lat. 323), and the Codex Aureus (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14000). On all these manuscripts, see Koehler and Mütherich, *Die Hofschule Karls des Kahlen*. See also McKitterick, 'The palace school of Charles the Bald', pp. 333–9; eadem, 'Charles the Bald and his library', pp. 37–40; eadem, 'Royal patronage of culture', pp. 105–6.
[100] See Koehler and Mütherich, *Die Hofschule Karls des Kahlen*, pp. 199–204.
[101] On the Vivian Bible, see W. Koehler, *Die Schule von Tours*, Die Karolingische Miniaturen 1, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1930–3), I, pp. 250–5. See also E. Dutton and H. Kessler, *The Poetry and Paintings of the First Bible of Charles the Bald* (Ann Arbor, 1977).
[102] Mainz, Seminarbibliothek 1 (St Alban, Mainz, s. ix^ex); *CLLA* 737. See also *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, p. 38; III, pp. 25–6.
[103] Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, lat. 1815 (Reichenau; s. ix^med); *CLLA* 736. See also *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, p. 43; III, pp. 22–3.
[104] Düsseldorf, Landes- und Stadtbibliothek, D 1 (N-W Germany, s. ix^3/4); *CLLA* 7915. See also *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, p. 36; III, pp. 48–50.

that we have the so-called Sacramentary of Padua.[105] This sacramentary is our sole witness of a Gregorian sacramentary type II, that is, a Gregorian sacramentary that was adapted for presbyterial use sometime between 659 and 681,[106] and the fact that it was copied in the middle of the ninth century at Lothar's court suggests more than anything else that a fair amount of liturgical creativity and experimentation characterised the liturgical activity in Lothar's kingdom as well.[107]

The liturgical policy of Charles the Bald and his contemporaries did not emerge *ex nihilo*. It was deeply rooted in long-established traditions, which evolved gradually throughout the long period of Frankish rule. Charles the Bald, whose patronage of liturgy is far the the best documented, followed his ancestors' footsteps, but he also went far beyond them. His liturgical policy reveals a considerable amount of inventiveness as well as a strong tendency towards systematisation. Yet, no attempt was made by Charles the Bald or any member of his court to impose uniformity on the liturgical practice of his kingdom, nor did he attempt to Romanise the Frankish rite. One may well wonder whether he was even capable or wanted to do so. Moreover, there is no evidence for royal encouragement or involvement in the introduction of foreign liturgical elements into the Frankish liturgy, and thus Charles' statement that 'we follow the Roman Church in celebrating the mass', seems nothing but an echo of the rhetoric which Charlemagne and his advisers had developed and deployed while referring to their liturgical reforms.

The death of Charles the Bald is an appropriate point with which to end this survey of the royal patronage of liturgy in the Frankish

kingdoms. Although at first it seemed that there would be continuity, things were rather different in actuality. Indeed Charles the Bald was succeeded by his son, Louis the Stammerer, but within less than a decade the descent-line of Charles the Bald ceased to exist. After the death of Carloman, Louis the Stammerer's younger son, the entire Carolingian empire was reunited under Charles the Fat, and after Charles' death early in 888 without any legitimate heirs, the Frankish empire was divided for good into several small kingdoms.[108] The brutal faction fighting from within as well as external threats, such as the Viking raids, must have distracted the attention of the new monarchs from the patronage of liturgy. Furthermore, the exuberant sacramentaries of the late ninth century led eventually to the formation of the *missalis plenarius*, which contained everything to be sung or said at the celebration of the mass with the ceremonial directions.[109] This new type of liturgical books gradually took over the liturgical scene, and consequently restrained in a way the prevailing liturgical creativity and ingenuity which characterised Frankish Gaul throughout the early Middle Ages.

---

[105] Padua, Biblioteca Capitolare, D 47 (Lotharingia, s. ix^med); *CLLA* 880. On the *Hofschule* of Lothar, see W. Koehler and F. Mütherich, *Die Hofschule Kaiser Lothars*, Die Karolingische Miniaturen 4 (Berlin, 1971); R. McKitterick, 'Carolingian uncial: a context for the Lothar Psalter', *The British Library Journal* 16 (1990), pp. 1–15; eadem, 'Royal patronage of culture', pp. 104–8.

[106] On the Gregorian sacramentary type II and the Sacramentary of Padua, see Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 92–7; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, p. 77; *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses), I, pp. 39 and 56–7; A. Chavasse, 'Le sacramentaire grégorien: les additions et remaniements introduits dans le témoin P', in *Traditio et Progressio. Studi liturgici in onore del Prof. Adrien Nocent*, Studia Anselmiana 95 (Rome, 1988), pp. 125–48. For an edition of the Sacramentary of Padua, see *Le sacramentaire grégorien* (ed. Deshusses, I, pp. 609–84).

[107] That liturgy gained a central role in the politics of Lothar's kingdom as well, is clearly demonstrated by the refusal of the nuns of Remiremont to pray for King Lothar II because he had rejected his legitimate spouse. See S. Airlie, 'Private bodies and the body politic in the divorce case of Lothar II', *Past and Present* 161 (1998), pp. 3–38, especially pp. 37–8. I owe this point to Mayke de Jong.

[108] See Nelson, 'The Frankish kingdoms', pp. 136–41; eadem, *Charles the Bald*, pp. 254–64.

[109] See Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp. 105–6; Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 124–7.

Conclusion

> Because there is really such great diversity in the liturgy not only in national and linguistic variety but also in just one people and language because of change over the years or the teachers' zealous instruction, if I wish to reveal everything we read now about this profusion, I would be more irksome than productive to those who will listen to me.[1]

With these words Walahfrid Strabo clearly summarised one of the two main characteristics of the Frankish liturgy, that is, the great amount of diversity and creativity enjoyed by the liturgy of Gaul throughout the Frankish period. Note that Walahfrid, a perceptive observer of the Frankish rite, uses the term *gens* in relation to liturgy. This use, I would argue, is not accidental. Walahfrid, it seems, regarded the liturgy as an important element in the creation of ethnic and national identity, and thus, according to him, liturgical practice was yet another 'strategy of distinction'.[2] But he was also well aware of the fact that liturgy is not a straightforward and decisive criterion to distinguish between ethnic groups, since a great diversity characterised the liturgical practice even within 'one people and language'.[3]

The second main characteristic is the use of liturgy made by Frankish rulers and their advisers in order to disseminate political messages. Both characteristics were closely associated with the royal patronage of liturgy exercised by the Merovingians and the Carolingians. While the former was a direct result of the royal interest in and patronage of liturgy, the latter was the rationale and the impetus for investing vast amounts of energy and material resources in patronising liturgy.

As we have seen in the various chapters of this book, the diversity of the Frankish practice is apparent throughout late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages. Yet, notwithstanding this diversity, there are some voices in Frankish Gaul which call for a standardisation of the liturgical rite and which, if taken at face value, might give the false impression that liturgical unity was a burning issue and even the absolute goal of several bishops and Church councils. For example, a straightforward demand for uniformity in a provincial level was already raised by the bishops at the council of Vannes (461–91),[4] and at the beginning of the sixth century the first council of Épaon (517) stated that:

> In celebrating the divine office, the provincial bishops must observe the *ordo* which their metropolitan follows.[5]

Although they may seem to call for uniformity, these conciliar decrees had a different primary purpose in actuality. A clear distinction has been made here between the mass as a series of acts and gestures, and the prayers that were recited during the celebration, a distinction between the ritual and the text. The main aim of these and of similar decrees was to regularise the procedure for celebrating the mass, that is, to ensure that a common basic structure would be followed throughout the kingdom, and that no part of the rite would be neglected or even missed out by the celebrants. They are not concerned with texts and words.

Thus, in referring to unity and diversity in the liturgy of Frankish Gaul, one must distinguish between the actual structure and procedure of celebrating the mass on the one hand, and the content of the prayers themselves on the other. While some efforts to standardise the form of the mass were indeed made by the Frankish Church,[6] the content of the prayers, the benedictions, and the reading passages reflect an apparently unlimited freedom. Each celebrant had to follow strictly the general

---

[1] Walahfrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis*, c. 26 (ed. Harting-Corrêa, pp. 162–5): 'Quia vero tanta est in ipsis diversitas officiis non solum pro varietate gentium ac linguarum, verum etiam in una gente vel lingua pro temporum mutatione vel magistrorum studiosa institutione, ut, si velim cuncta replicare, quae de hac multiplicitate iam legimus, magis onerosus quam profructuosus videar audituris.' I have altered the translation slightly, since I do not believe that 'race' is the appropriate translation for *gens* in this case.

[2] I borrow the expression from Walter Pohl and Helmut Reimitz who, in the title of their book, echo Pierre Bourdieu. See *Strategies of Distinction. The Construction of Ethnic Communities, 300–800*, ed. W. Pohl and H. Reimitz (Leiden, Boston and Cologne, 1998); P. Bourdieu, *La distinction. Critique sociale du jugement* (Paris, 1979).

[3] Very little attention has been paid by historians to liturgical questions in relation to ethnicity and ethnogenesis. A welcome exception is P. Amory, *People and Identity in Ostrogothic Italy, 489–554* (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 247–51.

[4] *Concilium Veneticum*, c. 15, ed. C. Munier, *Concilia Galliae a. 413–506*, CCSL 148 (Turnhout, 1963), p. 155.

[5] *Concilium Epaonense (517)*, c. 27 (ed. Gaudemet and Basdevat, *Les canons des conciles mérovingiens*, I, p. 114): 'Ad celebranda divina officia ordinem, quem metropolitani tenent, provinciales eorum observare debebunt.'

[6] These are clearly apparent in the various *Expositiones missae*, on which see above, pp. 5–8.

pattern of a mass and to ensure that no part of it was omitted or forgotten. But as to the content of these parts, like the three reading passages, the prayer of the deacon for the people, or the collects of the celebrant after the deacon's prayer, the celebrant was free to choose whatever he deemed appropriate for the occasion, and even to compose some prayers of his own if he were capable of doing so.

A similar situation is revealed when the Romanisation of the Frankish liturgy is examined. The standard narrative of the Romanisation witnessed by the Gallican rite goes as follows:

> The Romanisation of the Gallican liturgy [in the eighth century], already well underway, appealed to the religious and political sense of the Frankish kings. A more cohesive liturgy would express not only the unity of faith but by putting greater order into one important aspect of national life help to unite the kingdom. King Pippin (751–768), crowned by Pope Stephen II at Saint-Denis, propagated Roman chant and offices and other aspects of Roman liturgy throughout the kingdom. The 'Eighth-Century Gelasians', which have survived in significant numbers, are monuments to Pippin's initiative and that of Rome-leaning bishops, monks and clerics even before his day. But it was the direct appeal of Charlemagne to Pope Hadrian for a copy of Rome's own sacramentary that signalled the full-scale, official, Romanisation of the Gallican liturgy and the supplanting of the Gallican eucharistic prayers (excepting *contestationes*) by the *prex canonica romana*.[7]

To this narrative of intentional Romanisation many present-day historians and liturgists still subscribe.[8] Yet, as we have already seen, such a narrative is at odds with the evidence. Although Roman elements and Roman books did find their way to Frankish Gaul, neither a full-scale Romanisation nor a rigid uniformity was aimed at by the secular or the ecclesiastical leaders of Francia. Furthermore, the idea of adopting the Roman rite stood in sharp contrast to the practice of liturgical composition in Gaul, and consequently to the prevailing liturgical diversity that had evolved within the Frankish Church.

The concern and preoccupation with authority, orthodoxy and correctness which characterised the later Merovingian and, more particularly,

---

[7] Bouley, *From Freedom to Formula*, p. 193.
[8] See, for example, Palazzo, *Histoire des livres liturgiques*, pp. 73–9; Bernard, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien*, pp. 687–709.

the early Carolingian period gave rise to a 'rhetoric of reform', whose dominant themes were *correctio*, *Romanitas* and *unanimitas*. This rhetoric was adopted and masterfully used by many Carolingian authors, most of whom benefited from Carolingian patronage. Despite the prevailing image of unity and Romanisation which our sources generate, however, the Carolingian period remained characterised by considerable experimentation and diversity. The liturgical reforms promulgated by Charlemagne and his successors were rather limited in their scope, and no general Romanisation or unification of the entire Frankish practice was desired.

It seems, therefore, that the common text-book narrative of the Romanisation and unification of the Frankish liturgy under Charlemagne and his successors belongs to the same category of 'Grand Narratives', such as the 'barbarian invasions' or 'the pagan–barbarian Merovingians'. 'It is a commonplace today that western Europe was not overrun by barbarians in the fifth century, that the barbarian states were freely installed by the Roman government, and that the barbarian groups were not peoples or tribes, but mostly collections of soldiers under the military leadership of a king.'[9] Similarly, the Merovingians seem nowadays less pagan and less barbaric than fifty years ago.[10] Nevertheless, as we are reminded by Mayke de Jong, 'Grand Narratives cannot be made to disappear. At best one can identify and analyse these persistent paradigms, locate them in the ideology in which they originated, and subsequently use them as tools to uncover significant discrepancies.'[11] I hope I have managed to do that with reference to the liturgical reforms of Pippin III, Charlemagne and their successors, by looking at them through the prism of royal patronage.

The patronage of liturgy in Frankish Gaul, as we have already noted, started in the Merovingian period. Yet, it was the Carolingians, and foremost among them Charlemagne, who realised the political power within the patronage of liturgy, and therefore made ample use of it. Carolingian kings from Charlemagne onwards used the liturgy as a

---

[9] Patrick Amory, 'The meaning and purpose of ethnic terminology in the Burgundian laws', *Early Medieval Europe* 2 (1993), pp. 1–28, at p. 1. See also A. Cameron, 'The perception of crisis', in *Morfologie sociali e culturali in Europa fra tarda antichità e alto medioevo*, Settimane 45 (Spoleto, 1998), pp. 9–31.
[10] See Geary, *Before France and Germany*, pp. 221–31; Wood, *The Merovingian Kingdoms*, especially pp. 1–4; Hen, *Culture and Religion*, especially pp. 155–206.
[11] M. de Jong, 'Transformations of public penance, *c.* 400–*c.* 650', in *Rituals of Power from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, ed. F. Theuws and J.L. Nelson (Leiden, Boston and Cologne, 2000), pp. 184–224, especially pp. 184–8.

political means of royal propaganda. Through liturgy they disseminated political messages and ideology in an attempt to shape the 'public opinion', and this is precisely why they invested vast amounts of landed property and privileges in patronising liturgical activity throughout their kingdoms. In that way the Frankish kings and their advisers disseminated ideas of consensus, solidarity, peace and victory to their subjects, and consequently make their subjects personally involved in the welfare of the kingdom and its rulers.

This, however, must not be taken to imply that I am arguing for a cynical use of liturgy by the Frankish kings. Both the Merovingians and the Carolingians truly believed in the power of liturgy. After all, prayers were the only way to communicate with God and to ensure his favour. Thus, although pragmatism can be identified in the royal patronage of liturgy throughout the Frankish period, it was thoroughly motivated by sincere religious feelings and conviction. And to Paul Veyne's question, 'can belief divorced from action be sincere?',[12] one can answer that the royal patronage of liturgy in Frankish Gaul clearly proves that the two were inextricably bound together.

This study of the royal patronage of liturgy in Frankish Gaul is, of course, only the beginning. In a short monograph like this one cannot be exhaustive, and consequently many relevant and related topics were left uncovered. The royal patronage of various cults of saints, especially those of St Martin of Tours and St Denys,[13] the royal interest in Roman martyrs,[14] or the royal patronage of architecture,[15] may have some significant implications as far as the royal patronage of liturgy is concerned. Similarly, one can study the effectiveness of royal acts of patronage on the piety of the people, or look for the evolution of liturgical elements instituted by a Frankish king. Is it possible, to give just one example, that the drinking-guilds mentioned in our tenth-century sources evolved

from the *refectiones* instituted by Charles the Bald?[16] Each of these issues and many other merit a proper investigation.

To sum up, the foregoing examination of the royal patronage of liturgy in the Frankish kingdoms provided a remarkable opportunity to re-examine some of the most prevailing notions regarding the Frankish liturgy. Firstly, the traditional assumption that the liturgy of Frankish Gaul during the Carolingian period was a unified liturgy and, moreover, the product of the unified Frankish Church, is a drastic simplification, not to say a travesty. There is abundant evidence, most notably in a plethora of ninth-century sacramentaries, that no uniformity was adopted across the Carolingian realm. Diversity on top of an underlying unity is a more accurate way of describing the Frankish situation.[17] This diversity does not necessarily mean anarchy. It should be regarded as an eloquent witness to the richness of religious life and culture in the period.

The same conclusion emerges when Romanisation in the context of the liturgical changes and innovations of the eighth and ninth centuries is examined. As we have seen, there is no indisputable and unambiguous evidence of Romanisation in the second half of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century, apart from the arrival of the *Hadrianum*, which created more problems than it solved. Moreover, when the evidence is carefully examined, it appears that most, if not all, our earliest liturgical manuscripts and literary evidence is Frankish. How, then, are we to determine the 'Romanness' of the liturgical development of the eighth and the ninth century?

---

[12] P. Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination*, trans. P. Wissing (Chicago and London, 1988), p. 27.

[13] On the significance of royal patronage in the development of these cults, see Van Dam, *Saints and their Miracles*, especially pp. 11–49; G. Brown, 'Politics and patronage at the abbey of Saint-Denis (814–898): the rise of a royal patron saint' (unpublished D.Phil. dissertation, Oxford University, 1989).

[14] On the royal Frankish interest in the Roman martyrs, see J.M.H. Smith, 'Old saints, new cults: Roman relics in Carolingian Francia', in *Early Medieval Rome and the Christian West*, ed. J.M.H. Smith (Leiden, Boston and Cologne, 2000), pp. 317–39.

[15] For some perceptive remarks, see Bullough, 'The Carolingian liturgical experience'.

[16] On these drinking-guilds, see H. Fichtenau, *Living in the Tenth Century. Mentalities and Social Orders*, trans. P.J. Geary (Chicago and London, 1991), pp. 60–1 and 282–3. See also K. Hauck, 'Rituelle Speisegemeinschaft im 10. und 11. Jahrhundert', *Studium generale* 3 (1950), pp. 611–21.

[17] This impression was also shared by Deacon Bodo (Eleazar), who, as Prudentius relates, was 'ab ipsis paene cunabulis in christiana religione palatinis eruditionisbus divinis humanisque litteris aliquatenus inbutum'; see *Annales Bertiniani*, s.a. 839 (ed. Rau, p. 40). For Bodo's views, see Paul Alvarus, *Epistola* 18, c. 14, PL 121, col. 503, in which he writes to Bodo that 'fumos vero tuae caecitatis adspargens, domorumque caligines, quibus lumen nostrum obcludere cupis dicis te in Francorum regis palatio vidisse quatuordecim viros inter se ipsos cultu diversos'. Unfortunately, Bodo's letter to Paul did not survive. On Bodo and Paul Alvarus, see A. Cabaniss, 'Bodo-Eleazar, a famous Jewish convert', *Jewish Quarterly Review* 43 (1952–3), pp. 313–28; B. Blumenkranz, 'Du nouveau sur Bodo-Eléazar', *Revue des études juives* 113 (1953), pp. 35–42; idem, 'Un pamphlet juif medio-latin de polémique antichrétienne', *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religeuses* 34 (1954), pp. 401–13 [both papers were reprinted in idem, *Juifs et chrétiens: Patristique et Moyen Age* (London, 1977), chapters XI and XII respectively]. See also idem, *Les auteurs chrétiens latins du Moyen Age sur les juifs et le judaïsme* (Paris and The Hague, 1963), pp. 144–217.

If we abandon the attempt to find unity and Romanisation, the liturgy of early medieval Francia suddenly becomes extremely lively and inventive. Throughout the Merovingian and the Carolingian periods early medieval Gaul was a prolific centre of liturgical activity and innovation, independent of Rome. Hence, the Frankish liturgy of the eighth and the ninth centuries is an important indicator of the cultural creativity and social development which characterised early medieval Francia at many levels. This liturgy was not merely cultural borrowing, as used to be thought.

Appendix

THE ORDER OF THE MASS ACCORDING TO THE *EXPOSITIO*, WALAHFRID STRABO AND AMALARIUS OF METZ

Expositio[1]	Walahfrid Strabo[2]	Amalarius of Metz[3]
1. ANTIPHONA AD PRAELEGENDUM	ANTIPHONA AD INTROITUM	I (1). INTROITUS MISSAE
2. SILENTIUM (The deacon calls for silence)		
3. BENEDICTIO (The celebrant blesses the congregation with the words: *Dominus sit semper vobiscum*; to which the congregation responds: *Et cum spiritu tuo*)		
4. SANCTUS		
5. KYRIE ELEISON	KYRIE ELEISON	II (2). KYRIE ELEISON
	GLORIA	III (3). GLORIA
	COLLECTA	IV (4). COLLECTA / ORATIO
6. CANTICUM ZACAHARIE (Luke I.68–79)		
7a. PROPHETIA (A Reading from the prophets)		

[1] *Expositio*, I.1–28 (ed. Ratcriff, pp. 3–17). The numbers correspond to the chapters of the *Expositio*.
[2] Walahfrid Strabo, *Liber de exordiis et incrementis*, c. 23 (ed. Harting-Corrêa, pp. 126–49, with p. 319).
[3] Amalarius of Metz, *Ordinis totius missae expositio prior* (ed. Hanssens, III, pp. 297–315); idem, *Ordinis totius missae expositio altera* (ed. Hanssens, III, pp. 317–21). The Roman numbers refer to the former, while the numbers in brackets refer to the latter.

7b. APOSTOLUM (A reading from the Epistles)	APOSTOLUM (A reading from the Epistles)	V (5). EPISTOLA (A reading from the Epistles)
8. HYMNUM (Dan. III.52–90)		
9. RESPONSORIUM	RESPONSORIUM	VI (6). RESPONSORIUM
	ALLELUIA	VII (6). ALLELUIA
10. SANCTUS[4]		
11. EVANGELIUM (A reading from the Gospels)	EVANGELIUM (A reading from the Gospels)	VIII (7). EVANGELIUM
	SYMBOLUM (The recitation of the Creed)	IX. CREDO
12. SANCTUS		
13. HOMELIA		
14. PREX (The deacons chant a prayer for the people)		
15. CATICUMINUM (The deacon orders the Catechumens, the penitents and the excommunicated to withdraw)		
16. SILENTIUM (The deacon calls for silence)		
17. SONUM (A hymn)	ANTIPHONA AD OFFERTORIUM	
18. OFFERTORIUM	OFFERTORIUM	X (9). OFFERTORIUM
	SECRETA / SUPER OBLATA	XI (11). SUPER OBLATA / SECRETA
	PRAEFATIO ACTIONIS	12. PRAEFATIO

[4] On the assertion that the *trecanum* which is mentioned in c. 28a is, in fact, a description of the *sanctus* in c. 10, see P. Bernard, 'Le "trecanum": un fantôme dans la liturgie gallicane?', *Francia* 23 (1996), pp. 95–8.

	SANCTUS	XII (12). ANGELICUS YMNUS
	CANON (Prayers of the Canon)	XIII (13). TE IGITUR (Prayers of the Canon)
20. LAUDES / ALLELUIA		
21. NOMINA DEFUNCTORUM (The recitation of the names of the dead)		
22. PAX CHRISTI (The kiss of peace)		
23. SURSUM CORDA		
24. CONFRACTIO ET CONMIXTIO		
25. ORATIO DOMINICA	ORATIO DOMINICA	XVII (14). ORATIO DOMINICA
	PAX	XVIII (15). PAX
	AGNUS DEI	XVIII (17). AGNUS DEI
	COMMUNIO + ANTIPHONA AD COMMUNIONEM	XVIII (18). COMMUNIO
	AD COMPLENDUM	XIX (19). POST COMMUNIONEM
26. BENEDICTIO POPULI	BENEDICTIO SACERDOTIS[5]	XIX (19). BENEDICTIO POPULI
		(20). ITE MISSA EST

[5] Walahfrid gives no indication that the *oratio ad complendum* (or *post communionem*) and the *benedictio sacerdoti* were two separate elements.

Select Bibliography
of Frequently Cited Sources

Primary Sources

Alcuin, *Epistolae*, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Epp. 4 (Berlin, 1895) [trans. S. Allott, *Alcuin of York* (York, 1974)]

Amalarius of Metz, *Opera liturgica omnia*, ed. J. Hanssens, 3 vols., Studi e Testi 138–40 (Rome, 1948–50)

Annales Bertiniani, ed. Rau, *Quellen zur karolingischen Reichsgeschichte*, II, pp. 11–287 [trans. J.L. Nelson, *The Annals of Saint-Bertin* (Manchester, 1991)]

Annales Fuldenses, ed. Rau, *Quellen zur karolingischen Reichsgeschichte*, III, pp. 19–177 [trans. T. Reuter, *The Annals of Fulda* (Manchester, 1992)]

Annales regni Francorum, ed. Rau, *Quellen zur karolingischen Reichsgeschichte*, I, pp. 10–155 [trans. B.S. Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles* (Ann Arbor, 1970)]

Ardo, *Vita Benedicti abbatis Anianensis et Indensis*, ed. G. Waitz, MGH SS XV.1 (Hannover, 1887), pp. 198–220 [trans. Dutton, *Carolingian Civilization*, pp. 156–75]

Astronomer, *Vita Hludowici imperatoris*, ed. E. Tremp, MGH SRG 64 (Hannover, 1995) [trans. A. Cabaniss, *Son of Charlemagne. A Contemporary Life of Louis the Pious* (Syracuse, NY, 1961)]

The Bobbio Missal: A Gallican Mass-Book, ed. E.A. Lowe, HBS 58 (London, 1920)

Boniface, *Epistolae*, ed. M. Tangl, *Die Briefe des heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus*, MGH Epistolae Selectae 1 (Berlin, 1916)

Caesarius of Arles, *Sermones*, ed. G. Morin, 2 vols. (Mardesous, 1937–42) [reprinted in CCSL 103–4 (Turnhout, 1953)]

Les canons des conciles mérovingiens (VIe–VIIe), ed. J. Gaudemet and B. Basdevant, 2 vols., SC 353–4 (Paris, 1989)

Capitula episcoporum, ed. P. Brommer, R. Pokorny and M. Stratmann, MGH Capitula episcoporum, 3 vols. (Hannover, 1984–95)

Capitularia regum Francorum, ed. A. Boretius and V. Krause, 2 vols., MGH Legum sectio 2, (Hannover, 1883–97)

The Cartulary of Flavigny, 717–1113, ed. C.B. Bouchard, Medieval Academy Books 99 (Cambridge, MA, 1991)

Chartae latinae antiquiores. Facsimile Edition of the Latin Charters prior to the Ninth Century, ed. A. Bruckner and R. Marichal (Olten and Lausanne, 1954–)

Codex Carolinus, ed. W. Gundlach, MGH Epp. 3 (Berlin, 1892), pp. 469–657

Concilia aevi Karolini (742–842), ed. A. Werminghoff, 2 vols., MGH Concilia 2 (Hannover, 1906–8)

Concilios Visigóticos e Hispano-Romanos, ed. J. Vives, España Cristiana 1 (Barcelona and Madrid, 1963)

Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum, vol. I, *Initia consuetudinis Benedictinae. Consuetudines saeculi octavi et noni*, ed. K. Hallinger (Siegburg, 1963)

Diplomata Pippini, Carlomanni, Caroli Magni, ed. E. Mühlbacher et al., MGH Diplomata Karolinorum 1 (Berlin, 1906)

Dutton, P.E., *Carolingian Civilization. A Reader* (Peterborough, Ontario, 1993)

———, *Charlemagne's Courtier. The Complete Einhard* (Peterborough, Ontario, 1998)

Einhard, *Vita Karoli Magni*, ed. Rau, *Quellen zur karolingischen Reichsgeschichte*, I, pp. 164–211 [trans. Dutton, *Charlemagne's Courtier*, pp. 15–39]

Ermoldus Nigellus, *Poème sur Louis le Pieux et Épitres au Roi Pépin*, ed. E. Faral, Les classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Age 14 (Paris, 1932)

Expositio antiquae liturgiae gallicanae, ed. E.A. Ratcliff, HBS 98 (London, 1971)

Fouracre, P. and Gerberding, R., *Late Merovingian France. History and Hagiography, 640–720* (Manchester and New York, 1996)

Fredegar, *Chronicorum liber quartus cum continuationibus*, ed. and trans. J.M. Wallace-Hadrill (London, 1960)

Gesta abbatum Fontanellensium, ed. S. Löwenfeld, MGH SRG 28 (Hannover, 1892)

Gesta Dagoberti I regis Francorum, ed. B. Krusch, MGH SRM II (Hannover, 1888), pp. 396–425

Gregory of Tours, *Liber vitae patrum*, ed. B. Krusch, MGH SRM I.2 (Hannover, 1885), pp. 211–94 [trans. E. James, *Gregory of Tours: Life of the Fathers* (Liverpool, 1985)]

———, *Libri historiarum X*, ed. B. Krusch and W. Levison, MGH SRM I.1 (Hannover, 1937–51) [trans. L. Thorpe, *Gregory of Tours: History of the Franks* (Harmondsworth, 1974)]

Hillgarth, J.N., *Christianity and Paganism, 350–750. The Conversion of Western Europe*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia, 1986)

Hrabanus Maurus, *De institutione clericorum libri III*, ed. A. Knoepfler, Veröffentlichungen aus dem Kirchenhistorischen Seminar München 5 (Munich, 1900)

Hugo of Flavigny, *Chronicon*, ed. G.H. Pertz, MGH SS VIII (Stuttgart, 1848), pp. 285–502

Hymni latini antiquiores LXXV psalmi III, ed. W. Bulst (Heidelberg, 1956)

Isidore of Seville, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, ed. C.M. Lawson, CCSL 113 (Turnhout, 1989)

———, *Etymologiae*, ed. W.M. Lindsay, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1911)

Jackson, R.A., *Ordines coronationis Franciae. Texts and Ordines for the Coronation of Frankish and French Kings and Queens in the Middle Ages*, I (Philadelphia, 1995)

King, P.D., *Charlemagne: Translated Sources* (Kendal, 1987)

Le lectionnaire de Luxeuil, ed. P. Salmon, Collectanea Biblica Latina 7 (Rome, 1944)

Legislatio Aquisgranensis, ed. J. Semmler, in *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum*, I, ed. Hallinger, pp. 423–582

Liber pontificalis, ed. L. Duchesne, 2 vols. (Paris, 1886–92) [reprinted with vol. III by C. Vogel (Paris, 1955–7)]

Liber sacramentorum excarpsus (Cod. Bruxellensis 10127–10144, saec. viii–ix), ed. C. Coebergh and P. de Puniet, CCCM 47 (Turnhout, 1977), pp. 81–110

Liber sacramentorum Gellonensis, ed. A. Dumas and J. Deshusses, 2 vols., CCSL 159–159A (Turnhout, 1981)

Liber sacramentorum Romanae aecclesiae ordinis anni circuli (Sacramentarium Gelasianum), ed. L.C. Mohlberg, L. Eizenhöfer and P. Siffrin, Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta. Series maior 4 (Rome, 1960)

Libri Carolini see *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum*

Lupus of Ferrières, *Correspondance*, ed. L. Levillain, 2 vols., Les classiques de l'histoire de France au Moyen Age 10 and 16 (Paris, 1927–35) [trans. G.W. Regenos, *The Letters of Lupus of Ferrières* (The Hague, 1966)]

Missale Francorum, ed. L.C. Mohlberg, Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta. Series maior 2 (Rome, 1957)

Missale Gallicanum Vetus, ed. L.C. Mohlberg, Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta. Series maior 3 (Rome, 1958)

Missale Gothicum, ed. L.C. Mohlberg, Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta. Series maior 5 (Rome, 1961)

Nithard, *Historiarum libri*, ed. Rau, *Quellen zur karolingischen Reichsgeschichte*, I, pp. 386–461 [trans. B.S. Scholz, *Carolingian Chronicles* (Ann Arbor, 1970)]

Opus Caroli regis contra synodum (Libri Carolini), ed. A. Freeman, MGH Concilia 2, supplement (Hannover, 1998)

Les 'Ordines romani' du haut Moyen Age, ed. M. Andrieu, 5 vols., Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense 11, 23, 24, 28, 29 (Louvain, 1931–61)

Rau, R., *Quellen zur karolingischen Reichsgeschichte*, 3 vols., Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters 5–7 (Darmstadt, 1955–60)

Recueil des actes de Charles II le Chauve, roi de France, ed. G. Tessier, 3 vols. (Paris, 1943–55)

Le sacramentaire grégorien. Ses principales formes d'après les plus anciens manuscrits, ed. J. Deshusses, 3 vols., Spicilegium Friburgense 16, 24 and 18 (Fribourg, 1979–82)

Sacramentarium Gelasianum, see *Liber sacramentorum Romanae aecclesiae ordinis anni circuli*

The Sacramentary of Echternach, ed. Y. Hen, HBS 110 (London, 1997)

Sidonius Apollinaris, *Carmina et epistulae*, ed. W.B. Anderson, The Loeb Classical Library, 2 vols. (Cambridge, MA, and London, 1936–65)

Thegan, *Gesta Hludowici imperatoris*, ed. E. Tremp, MGH SRG 64 (Hannover, 1995) [trans. Dutton, *Carolingian Civilization*, pp. 141–55]

Theodulf of Orléans, *Carmina*, ed. E. Dümmler, MGH Poetae I (Berlin, 1881), pp. 437–581

Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmina*, ed. M. Reydellet (Paris, 1994)

Vita Eligii episcopi Novimagensis, ed. B. Krusche, MGH SRM IV (Hannover, 1902), pp. 663–741

Vita sanctae Balthildis, ed. B. Krusch, MGH SRM II (Hannover, 1888), pp. 475–508

Walahfrid Strabo, *Libellus de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum*, ed. A.L. Harting-Corrêa, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 19 (Leiden, New York and Cologne, 1996)

Secondary Sources

Angenendt, A., 'Missa specialis: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Entstehung der Privatmessen', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 17 (1983), pp. 153–221

————, *Kaiserherrschaft und Königstaufe: Kaiser, Könige und Päpste als geistliche Patrone in der abendländischen Missionsgeschichte*, Arbeiten zur Frühmittelalterforschungen 15 (Berlin and New York, 1984)

Anton, H.H., *Fürstenspiegel und Herrscherethos in der Karolingerzeit*, Bonner Historische Forschungen 32 (Bonn, 1968)

Bernard, P., 'Benoît d'Aniane est-il l'auteur de l'avertissement "Hucusque" et du Supplément au sacramentaire "Hadrianum"?', *Studi Medievali* 39 (1998), pp. 1–120

————, *Du chant romain au chant grégorien (VIe–XIIIe siècle)* (Paris, 1996)

Bischoff, B., *Manuscripts and Libraries in the Age of Charlemagne*, trans. M.M. Gorman (Cambridge, 1994)

————, *Mittelalterliche Studien*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart, 1966–81)

————, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit*, I: *Die Bayerischen Diözesen*, 3rd. ed. (Wiesbaden, 1974); II: *Die vorwiegend Österreichischen Diözesen* (Wiesbaden, 1980)

Bishop, E., 'The liturgical reforms of Charlemagne, their meaning and values', *Downside Review* 38 (1919), pp. 1–16

————, *Liturgica historica. Papers on the Liturgy and Religious Life of the Western Church* (Oxford, 1918)

Bishop, E. and Wilmart, A., 'La réforme liturgique de Charlemagne', *Ephemerides liturgicae* 45 (1931), pp. 186–207

Boshof, E., *Erzbischof Agobard von Lyon. Leben und Werk*, Kölner historische Abhandlungen 17 (Cologne and Vienna, 1969)

————, *Ludwig der Fromme* (Darmstadt, 1996)

Bouley, A., *From Freedom to Formula. The Evolution of the Eucharistic Prayer from Oral Improvisation to Written Text* (Washington, DC, 1981)

Brown, G., 'Introduction: the Carolingian renaissance', in *Carolingian Culture*, ed. McKitterick, pp. 1–51

Buck, T.M., *Admonitio und Praedicatio. Zur religiös-pastoralen Dimention von Kapitularien und kapitulariennahen Texten (507–814)*, Freiburger Beiträge zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte 9 (Frankfurt, 1996)

Bullough, D.A., 'Alcuin and the kingdom of heaven: liturgy, theology and the Carolingian age', in idem, *Carolingian Renewal*, pp. 161–240 [originally published in *Carolingian Essays*, ed. Blumenthal, pp. 1–69]

————, 'The Carolingian liturgical experience', in *Continuity and Change in Christian Worship*, ed. R.N. Swanson, Studies in Church History 35 (Woodbridge, 1999), pp. 29–64

————, 'Roman books and Carolingian *renovatio*', in idem, *Carolingian Culture*, pp. 1–38 [originally published in *Renaissance and Renewal in*

Church History, ed. D. Baker, Studies in Church History 14 (Oxford, 1977), pp. 23–50]

————, *Carolingian Renewal: Sources and Heritage* (Manchester, 1991)

Bullough, D.A. and Harting-Corrêa, A., 'Texts, chant, and the chapel of Louis the Pious', in Bullough, *Carolingian Renewal*, pp. 241–71 [originally published in *Charlemagne's Heir*, ed. Godman and Collins, pp. 489–508]

Cabaniss, A., *Amalarius of Metz* (Amsterdam, 1954)

Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation, ed. R. McKitterick (Cambridge, 1994)

Carolingian Essays. Andrew W. Mellon Lectures in Early Christian Studies, ed. U.-R. Blumenthal (Washington, DC, 1983)

Charlemagne's Heir. New Perspectives on the Reign of Louis the Pious (814–840), ed. P. Godman and R. Collins (Oxford, 1990)

Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom, ed. M.T. Gibson and J.L. Nelson, 2nd ed. (Aldershot, 1990)

La christianisation des pays entre Loire et Rhin (IVe–VIIe siècle), ed. P. Riché (Paris, 1993) [originally published as *Revue d'histoire de l'église de France* 168 (1976)]

The Church at Prayer, ed. A.-G. Martimort, trans. M.J. O'Connell, 4 vols. (London, 1986–7)

Clavis scriptorum latinorum medii aevi, scriptores Galliae 735–987, ed. M.-H. Jullien and F. Perelman (Turnhout, 1994)

Codices latini antiquiores. A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century, 11 vols. with a supplement (Oxford, 1935–71; 2nd ed. of vol. II, 1972)

Codices liturgici latini antiquiores, ed. K. Gamber, 2nd ed., 2 vols., Spicilegii Friburgensis subsidia 1 (Freiburg, 1968); supplemented by B. Baroffio et al., Spicilegii Friburgensis subsidia 1A (Freiburg, 1988)

Columbanus and Merovingian Monasticism, ed. H.B. Clarke and M. Brennan, British Archaeological Reports 113 (Oxford, 1981)

Culto cristiano, politica imperiale Carolingia, ed. O. Capitani, Convegni del Centro di studi sulla spiritualità medievale 18 (Todi, 1979)

De Jong, M., 'Power and humility in Carolingian society: the public penance of Louis the Pious', *Early Medieval Europe* 1 (1992), pp. 29–52

Deshusses, J., 'Chronologie des sacramentaires de Saint-Amand', *Revue bénédictine* 87 (1977), pp. 230–7

————, 'Encore les sacramentaires de Saint Amand', *Revue bénédictine* 89 (1979), pp. 310–12.

————, 'Le sacramentaire grégorien pré-hadrianique', *Revue bénédictine* 80 (1970), pp. 213–37

————, 'Le supplément au sacramentaire grégorien: Alcuin ou Saint Benoît d'Aniane?', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 9 (1965), pp. 48–71

Dix, G., *The Shape of Liturgy*, 2nd ed. (London, 1945)

Ewig, E., 'Das Privileg des Bischofs Berthefrid von Amiens für Corbie von 664 und die Klosterpolitik der Königin Balthild', *Francia* 1 (1973), pp. 63–114 [reprinted in idem, *Spätantikes und fränkisches Gallien*, II, pp. 538–83]

————, 'Remarques sur la stipulation de la prière dans les chartes de Charles le Chauve', in *Clio et son regard. Mélanges d'histoire, d'histoire de l'art et*

d'archéologie offerts à Jacques Stiennon, ed. R. Lejeune and J. Deckers (Liège, 1982), pp. 221–33

——, 'Zum christlichen Köningsgedanken im Frühmittelalter', in *Das Königtum. Seine geistigen und rechtlichen Grundlagen*, ed. T. Mayer, Vorträge und Forschungen 3 (Sigmaringen, 1954), pp. 7–73 [reprinted in Ewig, *Spätantikes und fränkisches Gallien*, I, pp. 3–71]

——, *Spätantikes und fränkisches Gallien. Gesammelte Schriften (1952–1973)*, ed. H. Atsma, 2 vols., Beihefte der Francia 3 (Munich, 1979)

Fouracre, P., 'Frankish Gaul to 814', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, II, ed. McKitterick, pp. 85–109

Fried, J., 'Ludwig der Fromme, das Papsttum und die fränkische Kirche', in *Charlemagne's Heir*, ed. Godman and Collins, pp. 231–73

Fritze, W.H., *Papst und Frankenkönig. Studien zu den päpstlich-fränkischen Rechtsbeziehungen von 754 bis 824*, Vorträge und Forschungen 10 (Sigmaringen, 1973)

Ganz, D., 'The Merovingian library of Corbie', in *Columbanus and Merovingian Monasticism*, ed. Clarke and Brennan, pp. 153–72

Garrison, M., 'The Franks as the new Israel? Education for an identity from Pippin to Charlemagne', in *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Y. Hen and M. Innes (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 114–61

Geary, P.J., *Before France and Germany. The Creation and Transformation of the Merovingian World* (New York and Oxford, 1988)

The Gentle Voices of Teachers. Aspects of Learning in the Carolingian Age, ed. R.E. Sullivan (Columbus, OH, 1995)

Gerberding, R.A., *The Rise of the Carolingians and the Liber historiae Francorum* (Oxford, 1987)

Godman, P., *Poets and Emperors. Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry* (Oxford, 1987)

Grégoire, R., *Les homéliaires du moyen âge. Inventaire et analyse des manuscrits*, Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta. Series maior, fontes 4 (Rome, 1966)

——, *Homéliaires liturgiques médiévaux*, Biblioteca degli Studi Medievali 12 (Spoleto, 1980)

Hartmann, W., *Die Synoden der Karolingerzeit im Frankenreich und Italien* (Paderborn, Munich, Vienna and Zurich, 1989)

Hen, Y., 'A liturgical handbook for the use of a rural priest (Brussels, BR 10127–10144)', in *Organising the Written Word: Scripts, Manuscripts and Texts*, ed. M. Mostert (Turnhout, in press)

——, 'Unity in diversity: the liturgy of Frankish Gaul before the Carolingians', in *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, ed. R.N. Swanson, Studies in Church History 32 (Oxford, 1996), pp. 19–30

——, 'The uses of the Bible and the perception of kingship in Merovingian Gaul', *Early Medieval Europe* 7 (1998), pp. 277–89

——, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul, A.D. 481–751* (Leiden, New York and Cologne, 1995)

Historiographie im frühen Mittelalter, ed. A. Scharer and G. Scheibelreiter, Veröffentlichungen des Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 32 (Vienna and Munich, 1994)

Hope, D.M. and Woolfenden, G., 'Liturgical Books', in *The Study of Liturgy*, ed. Jones et al., pp. 96–101

Huglo, M., 'Les remaniements de l'antiphonaire grégorien au IXe siècle: Hélisacher, Agobard, Amalaire', in *Culto cristiano, politica imperiale Carolingia*, ed. Capitani, pp. 89–119

Innes, M., 'Charlemagne's will: piety, politics and the imperial succession', *English Historical Review* 112 (1997), pp. 833–55.

Innes, M. and McKitterick, R., 'The writing of history', in *Carolingian Culture*, ed. McKitterick, pp. 193–220

Jackson, R.A., 'Who wrote Hincmar's ordines?', *Viator* 25 (1994), pp. 31–52

Jacob, A., 'Une lettre de Charles le Chauve au clergé de Ravenne?', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 67 (1972), pp. 409–22

Kantorowicz, E., *Laudes regiae. A Study in Liturgical Acclamation and Medieval Ruler Worship* (Berkeley, 1946)

Karl der Große, Lebenswerk und Nachleben, ed. W. Braunfels, 5 vols. (Düsseldorf, 1965)

Karl Martel in seiner Zeit, ed. J. Jarnut et al., Beihefte der Francia 37 (Sigmaringen, 1994)

Koehler, W. and Mütherich, F., *Die Hofschule Karls des Kahlen*, Karolingische Miniaturen 5 (Berlin, 1982)

Kottje, R., 'Einheit und Vielfalt des kirchlichen Lebens in der Karolingerzeit', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 76 (1965), pp. 323–42

Le Jan, R., *Famille et pouvoire dans le monde franc (VIIe–Xe siècle). Essai d'anthropologie sociale* (Paris, 1995)

Levison, W., *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford, 1946)

Levy, K., *Gregorian Chant and the Carolingians* (Princeton, 1998)

Martimort, A.G., *Les lectures liturgiques et leurs livres*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Age Occidental 64 (Turnhout, 1992)

——, *Les 'ordines', les ordinaires et les cérémoniaux*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Age Occidental 56 (Turnhout, 1991)

Matthisen, R.W., *Roman Aristocrats in Barbarian Gaul: Strategies for Survival in an Age of Transition* (Austin, TX, 1993)

Mayr-Harting, H., *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd ed. (London, 1991)

McCormick, M., 'Byzantium and the West, 700–900', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, II, ed. McKitterick, pp. 349–80

——, 'The liturgy of war in the early Middle Ages: crisis, litanies, and Carolingian monarchy', *Viator* 15 (1984), pp. 1–23

——, *Eternal Victory. Triumphal Rulership in Late Antiquity, Byzantium and the Early Medieval West* (Cambridge, 1986)

McDonald, W.C. and Goebel, U., *German Medieval Literary Patronage from Charlemagne to Maximilian I*, Amsterdamer Publikationen zur Sprache und Literatur 10 (Amsterdam, 1973)

McKitterick, R., 'Carolingian book production: some problems', *The Library* 12 (1990), pp. 1–33 [reprinted in eadem, *Books, Scribes and Learning*, chapter XII]

——, 'Charles the Bald (823–877) and his library: the patronage of learning', *English Historical Review* 95 (1980), pp. 28–47 [reprinted in eadem, *The Frankish Kings and Culture*, chapter V]

————, 'England and the Continent', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, II, ed. McKitterick, pp. 64–84

————, 'Nuns' scriptoria in England and Francia in the eighth century', *Francia* 19 (1992), pp. 1–35 [reprinted in eadem, *Books, Scribes and Learning*, chapter VII]

————, 'The palace school of Charles the Bald', in *Charles the Bald*, ed. Gibson and Nelson, pp. 326–39 [reprinted in McKitterick, *The Frankish Kings and Culture*, chapter VI]

————, '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 [reprinted in eadem, *The Frankish Kings and Culture*, chapter VII]

————, 'Unity and diversity in the Carolingian Church', in *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, ed. R.N. Swanson, Studies in Church History 32 (Oxford, 1996), pp. 59–82

————, *Books, Scribes and Learning in the Frankish Kingdoms, 6th–9th Centuries* (Aldershot, 1994)

————, *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge, 1989)

————, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895* (London, 1977)

————, *The Frankish kingdoms under the Carolingians, 751–987* (London and New York, 1983)

————, *The Frankish Kings and Culture in the Early Middle Ages* (Aldershot, 1994)

McLaughlin, M., *Consorting with Saints. Prayer for the Dead in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca and London, 1994)

Metzger, M., *Les sacramentaires*, Typologie des sources du Moyen Age Occidental 70 (Turnhout, 1994)

Mordek, H., *Kirchenrecht und Reform im Frankenreich: die Collectio Vetus Gallica, die älteste systematische Kanonessammlung des Fränkischen Gallien*, Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters 1 (Berlin and New York, 1975)

Moreton, B., *The Eighth-Century Gelasian Sacramentary. A Study of Tradition* (Oxford, 1976)

Morrison, K.F., '"Know thyself": music in the Carolingian Renaissance', in *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell'alto medioevo occidentale*, Settimane 39 (Spoleto, 1992), pp. 369–479

Nelson, J.L., 'The earliest surviving royal *ordo*: some liturgical and historical aspects', in *Authority and Power. Studies in Medieval Law and Government Presented to Walter Ullmann*, ed. B. Tierney and P. Linehan (Cambridge, 1980), pp. 29–48 [reprinted in Nelson, *Politics and Ritual*, pp. 341–60]

————, 'Early medieval rites of queen-making and the shaping of medieval queenship', in *Queens and Queenship in Medieval Europe*, ed. A.J. Duggan (Woodbridge, 1997), pp. 301–15

————, 'The Frankish kingdoms, 814–898', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, II, ed. McKitterick, pp. 110–41

————, 'Inauguration rituals', in *Early Medieval Kingship*, ed. P.H. Sawyer and I.N. Wood (Leeds, 1977), pp. 50–71 [reprinted in Nelson, *Politics and Ritual*, pp. 283–307]

————, 'Kingship and empire in the Carolingian world', in *Carolingian Culture*, ed. McKitterick, pp. 52–87 [an earlier version was published as 'Kingship and empire', in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought, c.350–c.1450*, ed. J.H. Burns (Cambridge, 1988), pp. 211–51]

————, 'Kingship and royal government', in *The New Cambridge Medieval History*, II, ed. McKitterick, pp. 383–430

————, 'The last years of Louis the Pious', in *Charlemagne's Heir*, ed. Godman and Collins, pp. 147–59 [reprinted in Nelson, *The Frankish World*, pp. 37–50]

————, 'Legislation and consensus in the reign of Charles the Bald', in *Ideal and Reality. Studies in Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Society Presented to J.M. Wallace-Hadrill*, ed. P. Wormald (Oxford, 1983), pp. 202–27 [reprinted in Nelson, *Politics and Ritual*, pp. 91–116]

————, 'The Lord's anointed and the people's choice: Carolingian royal ritual', in *Rituals of Royalty. Power and Ceremonials in Traditional Societies*, ed. D. Cannadine and S. Price (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 137–80 [reprinted in Nelson, *The Frankish World*, pp. 99–131]

————, 'Public *Histories* and private history in the work of Nithard', *Speculum* 60 (1985), pp. 251–95

————, 'Queens as Jezebels: the careers of Brunhild and Balthild in Merovingian history', in *Medieval Women*, ed. D. Baker, Studies in Church History, Subsidia 1 (Oxford, 1978), pp. 31–77 [reprinted in Nelson, *Politics and Ritual*, pp. 1–48]

————, *Charles the Bald* (London and New York, 1992)

————, *The Frankish World, 750–900* (London and Rio Grande, 1996)

————, *Politics and Ritual in Early Medieval Europe* (London, 1986)

La Neustrie: les pays au nord de la Loire de 650 à 850, ed. H. Atsma, 2 vols., Beihefte der Francia 16 (Sigmaringen, 1989)

The New Cambridge Medieval History, II: *c. 700–c. 900*, ed. R. McKitterick (Cambridge, 1995)

Noble, T.F.X., 'From brigandage to justice: Charlemagne, 785–794', in *Literacy, Politics and Artistic Innovation in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. C.M. Chazelle (Lanham, New York and London, 1992), pp. 49–75

————, 'Louis the Pious and his piety re-considered', *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 58 (1980), pp. 297–316

————, 'The monastic ideal as a model for empire: the case of Louis the Pious', *Revue bénédictine* 86 (1976), pp. 235–50

————, 'Tradition and learning in search of ideology: the *Libri Carolini*', in *The Gentle Voices of Teachers*, ed. Sullivan, pp. 227–60

————, *The Republic of St. Peter. The Birth of the Papal State, 680–825* (Philadelphia, 1984)

Palazzo, E., *Histoire des livres liturgiques: le Moyen age, des origines au XIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1993)

Patrologia, IV: *Dal Concilio di Calcedonia (451) a Beda, I Padri Latini*, ed. A. di Berardino (Genova, 1996)

Paxton, F.S, *Christianizing Death. The Creation of a Ritual Process in Early Medieval Europe* (Ithaca and London, 1990)

Prinz, F., *Frühes Mönchtum im Frankenreich. Kultur und Gesellschaft in Gallien, den Rheinlanden und Bayern am Beispiel der monastischen Entwicklung (4. bis 8. Jahrhundert)*, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1988)

Rasmussen, N.K., *Les pontificaux du Haut Moyen Age. Genèse du livre de l'évêque*, Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense, études et documents 49 (Leuven, 1998)

Reynolds, R.E., 'The Visigothic liturgy in the realm of Charlemagne', in *Das Frankfurter Konzil von 794. Kristillisationspunkt karolingischer Kultur*, ed. R. Berndt, 2 vols., Quellen und Abhandlungen zur mittelrheinischen Kirchengeschichte 80 (Mainz, 1997), II, pp. 919–45

Riché, P., *Les Carolingiens. Une famille qui fit l'Europe* (Paris, 1983)

Rosenwein, B.H., *Negotiating Space. Power, Restraint, and Privileges of Immunity in Early Medieval Europe* (Ithaca and Manchester, 1999)

La royauté et les élites dans l'Europe carolingienne (du début du IXe aux environs de 920), ed. R. Le Jan (Lille, 1998)

Saint Chrodegang (Metz, 1967)

Schieffer, R., *Die Karolinger* (Stuttgart, Berlin and Cologne, 1992)

Schieffer, T., *Winfrid–Bonifatius und die kirchliche Grundlegung Europas* (Freiburg, 1954)

Semmler, J., '*Renovatio regni Francorum*. Die Herrschaft Ludwigs des Frommen im Frankenreich 814–829/830', in *Charlemagne's Heir*, ed. Godman and Collins, pp. 125–46

Smith, J.A., 'The earliest queen-making rites', *Church History* 66 (1997), pp. 18–35

Staubach, N., '"Cultus divinus" und karolingische Reform', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 18 (1984), pp. 546–81

——, *Das Herrscherbild Karls des Kahlen. Formen und Funktionen monarchischer Repräsentation im früheren Mittelalter* (Münster, 1982)

——, *Rex christianus. Hofkultur und Herrschaftspropaganda im Reich Karls des Kahlen* (Cologne, 1993)

The Study of Liturgy, ed. C. Jones, G. Wainwright, E. Yarnold and P. Bradshaw, rev. ed. (London and New York, 1992)

Tremp, E., 'Thegan und Astronomer, die beiden Geschichtsschreiber Ludwigs des Frommen', in *Charlemagne's Heir*, ed. Godman and Collins, pp. 691–700.

Van Dam, R., *Saints and their Miracles in Late Antique Gaul* (Princeton, 1993)

Vogel, C., 'Les échanges liturgiques entre Rome et les pays francs jusqu'à l'époque de Charlemagne', in *Le Chiese nei regi dell'Europa occidentale e i loro rapporti con Roma sino all'800*, Settimane 7 (Spoleto, 1960), pp. 185–295

——, 'Les motives de la romanisation du culte sous Pépin le Bref (751–68) et Charlemagne (774–814)', in *Culto cristiano politica imperiale Carolingia*, ed. Capitani, pp. 15–41

——, 'La reforme cultuelle sous Pépin le Bréf et sous Charlemagne (deuxième moitié du VIIIe siècle et premier quart du IXe siècle)', in *Die karolingische Renaissance*, ed. E. Patzelt (Graz, 1965), pp. 173–242

——, 'Saint Chrodegang et le début de la romanisation du culte en pays franc', in *Saint Chrodegang*, pp. 91–109

——, *Medieval Liturgy. An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. and rev. W. Storey and N. Rasmussen (Washington, DC, 1986)

Wallace-Hadrill, J.M., 'A Carolingian renaissance prince: the emperor Charles the Bald', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 64 (1978), pp. 155–84

——, *Early Medieval Kingship in England and on the Continent* (Oxford, 1970)

——, *The Frankish Church* (Oxford, 1983)

Wallach, L., *Alcuin and Charlemagne. Studies in Carolingian History and Literature*, rev. ed. (Ithaca, NY, 1968)

Walters-Robertson, A., *The Service-Books of the Royal Abbey of Saint-Denis. Images of Ritual and Music in the Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1991)

Weidemann, M., *Kulturgeschichte der Merowingerzeit nach den Werken Gregors von Tours*, 2 vols. (Mainz, 1982)

Werner, K.F., '*Hludovicus Augustus*: gouverner l'empire chrétien – idées et réalités', in *Charlemagne's Heir*, ed. Godman and Collins, pp. 3–123

Willis, G.G., *A History of Early Roman Liturgy to the Death of Gregory the Great*, HBS Subsidia 1 (London, 1994)

Wood, I.N., *The Merovingian Kingdoms, 450–751* (London and New York, 1994)

Index of Manuscripts

General Index