CONTENTS

ILLUSTRATIONS

Plates

PREFACE

This book is a revised and partially rewritten version of a thesis submitted in 1975 for the degree of PhD in the University of Cambridge. Since it was written, several new and important works on Carolingian developments have appeared which contribute substantially to the knowledge and understanding of the Frankish achievement in the eighth and ninth centuries. Hubert Mordek's comprehensive study, *Kirchenrecht und Reform im Frankenreich,* Berlin 1975; Jean Devisse, *Hincmar, archevêque de Reims,* Geneva 1976; Ulla Ziegler, 'Das Sakramentar Gelasianum, Bibl Vat.reg.lat.316, und die Schule von Chelles', *Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens* 16 (1976), cols 1-142, and H.Butzmann, *Otfrid von Weissenburg Evangelienharmonie* (facs. Vienna 2687), Graz 1972, unfortunately became available to me too late to be able to take account of them.

No piece of work is ever completed without considerable assistance and support from institutions and libraries. My first thanks are due to the University of Western Australia, whose award of a Hackett Overseas Studentship for the years 1971-4 enabled me to return to England and Cambridge to read for my doctorate; to the President, Fellows and Graduate Students at Clare Hall, whose friendship I have enjoyed since I became a research student there in 1971; to the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst for their generous assistance during my visit to Germany in the academic year 1974-5; and to the Principal and Fellows of Newnham College, where I have been happy and proud to be a Research Fellow since 1974. I should also like to thank Newnham College, whose generous gift made it possible for the two plates to be included in this book.

I should like to thank the staffs of the following libraries: the Handschriften Abteilung, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin; the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge; St John's College, Cambridge; the University Library, Cambridge; the British Library; the Handschriften Abteilung, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich; and the Bodleian Library. Their helpfulness has always made working in these libraries a pleasure. For permission to reproduce the illustrations from the Psalter of Charles the Bald, BN lat. 1152, f.3^{v}, and the Stuttgart Psalter, Biblia folio 23, f.90^{r}, I am obliged to the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, and the Württemburgische Landesbibliothek, Stuttgart, respectively. I am very grateful to Mrs Josephine Morris for typing the book.

It is furthermore a great pleasure as well as a considerable obligation to thank both my family and the many dear friends in Cambridge, Dublin, London, Munich and Oxford who have helped, and cheered, me in innumerable ways while I was working on this book. I should like in particular to express my warmest gratitude to Professor Bernhard Bischoff for his welcome and his inspiring teaching during the Winter Semester 1974-5 in Munich, to Professor Michael Wallace-Hadrill and Mr Vivian Fisher for their criticism and comments, and to Dr Marjorie Chibnall, Professor Robert Markus and Professor Walter Ullmann for all their support and encouragement. They have all saved me from many errors, and any that remain are my own.

It has been an honour to be included among the first volumes of the Royal Historical Society's *Studies in History*, and I am indebted to Professor Geoffrey Elton for his interest and help over the past months.

My gratitude to my husband, both for his practical assistance in reading the book in typescript and in proof, and for his support and comfort in every other way, is boundless. This book is for him.

Rosamond McKitterick

ABBREVIATIONS

Barré	Henri Barré, *Les Homéliaires Carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre.* Studi e Testi. (Rome, Vatican City 1962)
Bischoff, *Schreibschulen*	Bernhard Bischoff, *Die Sudostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit* I: *Die Bayerischen Diozesen* (Wiesbaden 1974)
BL	British Library, London
BN	Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris
CC	*Corpus Christianorum*
CLA	E.A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores,* I-XI and Supplement (Oxford 1934-71)
CSEL	*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*
DA	*Deutsches Archiv für die Erforschung des Mittelalters*
DACL	*Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétien et de liturgie,* ed. F. Cabrol and H. Leclercq (Paris 1907-53)
de Clercq, *La Législation,* I, II	*La Législation Religieuse Franque,* I (Paris and Louvain 1935) and II (Antwerp 1957)
Ep(p)	Epistola(e)
EHR	*English Historical Review*
Epistolae Bonifacii	M. Tangl (ed.) *Die Briefe des Heiligen Bonifatius und Lullus.* Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Epistolae Selectae. (Berlin 1916)
Gregoire, *Les Homéliaires*	Reginald Gregoire, *Les Homéliaires du Moyen Age.* Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta. Series Maior. Fontes VI. (Rome 1966)

HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
Karl der Grosse I-IV	W. Braunfels (gen. ed.) *Karl der Grosse. Lebenswerk und Nachleben* (Düsseldorf 1965)
	I Persönlichkeit und Geschichte, ed. H. Beumann
	II Das Geistige Leben, ed. B. Bischoff
	III Karolingische Kunst, ed. W. Braunfels und P.E. Schramm
	IV Das Nachleben, ed. W. Braunfels und P.E. Schramm
Mansi	J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Florence 1759-98)
MGH AA	*Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Auctores Antiquissimi*
--- Cap	*--- Capitularia*
--- Conc	*--- Concilia*
--- Epp	*--- Epistolae*
--- Poet	*--- Poetae*
--- SS	*--- Scriptores*
MIÖG	*Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschungen*
NA	*Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*
PL	J.P. Migne, *Patrologia Latina* (Paris 1844-55)
PMLA	*Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*
RB	*Revue Bénédictine*
RHE	*Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*
RHDFE	*Revue historique de droit français et étranger*
RHEF	*Revue d'histoire de l'église de France*

RTAM	*Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*
SB	*Sitzungsberichte*
Settimane	*Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo*
TRHS	*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*
ZSSR KA	*Zeitschrift der Savigny Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Kanonistische Abteilung*

NOTE ON NOMENCLATURE

I have tried to preserve those Anglicized versions of names which are usually employed by English scholars, with one or two exceptions, as English use still tends to be somewhat inconsistent, and the Latin forms sometimes retained. For example I write Theodulph, Alcuin and Hincmar, Charlemagne and Gerbald, but Hrabanus Maurus, Paschasius Radbertus, Lupus of Ferrières and Amalarius of Metz.

I have chosen to refer to the territory ruled by the Carolingians in the eighth and ninth centuries as either the Frankish lands or the Frankish kingdoms.

INTRODUCTION

In 867, Pope Nicholas I addressed an eloquent letter to the archbishops and bishops of the West Frankish kingdoms, appealing for support and informing them in great detail of the progress of the Bulgars and the necessity that they should be part of the Roman rather than the Greek church.[1] This letter is of lively significance for a number of reasons. The confidence in, and respect for, the Frankish bishops implicit in this letter, together with the unity of purpose in the Roman church in the West and the strength of Christianity in the Frankish lands which it assumes, and the fact that it was addressed to the company of Frankish bishops rather than the king, attest to the stature which the Frankish church had attained in the middle of the ninth century. But this is not all: the Bulgarian circumstances it describes provide an instructive and vital contrast to those of the Franks in the same century.

The Bulgars were then in the initial throes of conversion to Christianity and of their transformation into a Christian society. The Bulgar king, Boris, who reigned from 852 to 889, had to enquire of Pope or Patriarch about every single step in the process of ruling his people in a framework of Christian law, religion and ethics.[2] In Boris's career we can observe the impact of conversion to Christianity upon the ruler and his policies, and how he attempted with very little help in terms of either precedent or personnel, to impose the new religion upon his subjects.[3]

The Franks had everything the Bulgars lacked. Not only did they have a succession of remarkable and able kings anxious to exercise and develop their functions as Christian rulers, they also had as a result of both royal and ecclesiastical initiative, a determined programme of ecclesiastical and intellectual reform. It can be recognized as a concentrated and conscious effort to build an unequivocally Christian realm, a society which, unlike that of the Visigoths,[4] had a future, and which was partly dependent for its success, strength and resources on

1 Nicholas I, *Papae Epistolae,* Ep. 100, ed. Perels, *MGH Epp* VI. pp.600-9.

2 One response to his enquiries was the lengthy pastoral letter from Nicholas I, *ibid.* Ep.99, pp.568-600.

3 R.E. Sullivan, 'Khan Boris and the conversion of the Bulgars: a case study of the impact of Christianity on a barbarian society', *Studies in Mediaeval and Renaissance History* 3 (1966), 55-139.

4 A contrast brought out by P.D. King, 'The Character of Visigothic Legislation', unpub. diss. (Cambridge 1967) p.xxxiii.

the preceding centuries of development and the heterogeneity of its heritage. The Franks were instrumental in the shaping of European society.

During the eighth and ninth centuries, the Frankish rulers, the Carolingians, ruled over most of present day France, Germany, Switzerland, Belgium and Northern Italy. These centuries have not only given rise to a wealth of legend and popular folklore, centred in particular on the illustrious figure of Charlemagne,[1] but have also attracted a staggering amount of learned research and distinguished scholarship. Our best witnesses to the Frankish achievement are the manuscripts and documents surviving, and since the time of Mabillon, the study of this period has derived much of its strength and purpose from the ancillary disciplines of palaeography, textual criticism and diplomatic. The Carolingian period in fact is one which derives its fame almost as much from the great scholars who have written about it as from its own achievements, to both of which the exhibition in Aachen in 1965,[2] and the four volumes of commemorative essays produced in the same year,[3] accord full acknowledgement. As well as the person of Charlemagne, and the quality and significance of Carolingian civilization,[4] it is the phenomenon known as the 'Carolingian Renaissance' which has always received special attention. The first formulation of the term was probably by Ampère in 1838, and since then all its various aspects have been subject to a number of different interpretations and emphases. Among these have been the judgements and comparisons with the 'Italian Renaissance' of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries implicit in the term. Many have adopted the view that the 'Carolingian Renaissance' was a revival of the culture of Antiquity, the 'new Rome' of western Europe, echoing some of the Carolingian scholars' own proclamations of the new Rome and their

1 Some of which is discussed in volume four, *Das Nachleben*, of *Karl der Grosse, Lebenswerk und Nachleben* (Düsseldorf 1965). One example of this is the canonization of Charlemagne in 1165, and the subsequent religious cult that grew up, described by Robert Folz, *Études sur le culte liturgique de Charlemagne dans les églises de l'Empire* (Paris 1951), and see also his *Le Souvenir et la légende de Charlemagne dans l'Empire germanique médiévale* (Paris 1950).

2 See the catalogue of this exhibition, *L'Exposition Charlemagne, Oeuvre, Rayonnement et Survivances* (Aachen 1965).

3 W. Braunfels, gen.ed; *Karl der Grosse, Lebenswerk und Nachleben* I: *Persönlichkeit und Geschichte* II: *Das Geistliche Leben* III: *Karolingische Kunst* IV: *Das Nachleben* (Düsseldorf 1965) and see the review article by Donald Bullough, *'Europae Pater;* Charlemagne and his achievement in light of recent scholarship', *EHR* 85 (1970) 59-105.

4 It formed, for example, the subject of the first Spoleto Conference in 1954. *I Problemi della civiltà carolingia. Settimane* I (Spoleto 1954). See, too, such works as Donald Bullough, *The Age of Charlemagne* (London 1973) or Jacques Boussard, *La Civilization de Charlemagne* (Paris 1968).

hopes for the dawn of another golden age.[1] Erna Patzelt, however, argues that it was a direct and dependent development,[2] albeit a brilliant one *(l'essor carolingien)*,[3] from the previous centuries of cultural growth. Was it, on the other hand, the *Wiedergeburt Studien* defined by Paul Lehmann,[4] the original goal of which was, according to J. de Ghellinck, to bring about the intellectual regeneration which must precede the reform of the clergy?[5] Or was it primarily a renewal of learning, a cultural efflorescence,[6] which saw the growth of a scholarship destined to become brilliant, with a revived vigour in theology, philosophy, the liberal arts and grammatical disciplines within the school curricula? A further more recent interpretation is that the 'renaissance with which Charlemagne was primarily concerned aimed at rebirth, a regeneration of the whole Frankish people', in which 'the individual renaissance of the Christian, the *nova creatura* effected by an infusion of divine grace, became the pattern for a collective renaissance, a transformation or renaissance of contemporary society'.[7] All these interpretations remain matters for profitable debate. Yet there would seem to be further elements in any 'revival of learning' or 'rebirth of society' and in the Carolingian context in particular, these elements are determined by the proposals for the reform of the Church and instruction of clergy and people outlined in the royal and ecclesiastical decrees of the eighth and ninth centuries. In the Carolingian reforms and revival of learning there are elements of the transformation of a pagan into a Christian society. In order to isolate some of these it is helpful to consider, very briefly, the background to the Carolingian reforms.

The Franks had been nominally Christian since the conversion of Clovis at the turn of the fifth century.[8] The conversion of the Franks to the new faith, however, involved far more than submission to a

1 Some of these are summarized by Georg Baeseke, 'Die Karlische Renaissance und das deutsche Schrifttum', *Kleinere Schriften zur althochdeutschen Sprache und Literatur* (Munich 1966) pp.377-445, Wolfram von den Steinen, 'Das Neu Beginn', *Karl der Grosse* II, pp.9-27, and Paul Lehmann, 'Das Problem der Karolingische Renaissance', *Settimane* I (Spoleto 1954) pp.310-57.

2 Erna Patzelt, *Das Karolingische Renaissance* (Graz 1923, repr. 1967).

3 The expression is also Erna Patzelt's, 'L'essor carolingien, Simples reflexions sur un sujet classique,' *Revue des sciences religieuses* 41 (1967) 109-28.

4 Paul Lehmann, *art.cit.* above n.1

5 J. de Ghellinck, *Littérature Latine au Moyen Age* I (Paris 1939) p.85.

6 See M.L.W. Laistner's survey, *Thought and Letters in Western Europe* (Ithaca 1957).

7 The phrases are Walter Ullmann's, *The Carolingian Renaissance and the Idea of Kingship* (London 1967) pp.6-7.

8 G. Tessier, 'La conversion de Clovis et la christianisation des Francs', *Settimane* XIV (Spoleto 1967) pp.149-89.

symbolic initiation rite such as Baptism, or even the acknowledgement of the main tenets of that faith. All the sources would indicate indeed that the hold the Christian faith had within Merovingian society was somewhat shaky, confined in many instances to outward observances, whose nature and spread undoubtedly possessed close affinities with the old Franco-Celtic paganism of the countryside. The Christianity of the Franks was, initially at least, a religion whose doctrinal and theological content was minimal; it has in fact been described as the 'substitution of one kind of folk magic for another'.[1] Conversion meant far more than simple adherence to the new religion and its rites: it entailed a psychological break with the past and the alignment of a man with a whole new tradition and view of the world and of man's place in it. It had ultimately to be more than the simple substitution of one form of religious observance, one set of myths, one god or gods, for others. Man's religious sensibility was to be redirected. Rather than the conversion of the Franks being an immediate and spectacular event, what is more likely to have happened was a very gradual process by which the very complexion and context of Frankish society, its religion, ethics, law and social institutions, became completely transformed.

The character of Frankish Christianity remained ill-defined in the sixth and seventh centuries as well; most of the Frankish lands were dominated by an essentially Roman tradition, represented by Gallo-Roman bishops such as Caesarius of Arles, devoted and inspiring prelates who governed and cared for their cities. Further vigour was imparted to Frankish religious life by the work of zealous foreign missionaries such as the Irishman Columbanus and his monks, who introduced an ascetic element into the Christianity of the Gallo-Romans; by native missionaries such as Vedastus and Amand; and by the widespread foundation of monasteries, often at noble or royal behest, such as Chelles, Corbie and Faremoutiers, which became centres of culture and learning in Merovingian Gaul.[2] These missions often had political overtones and in the seventh century in particular were dependent upon the goodwill of the local landowners and kings. Unlike the Bulgars, moreover, whose king had had to appeal to the Pope himself for guidance and ministers, the Franks from the very

1 The expression is J.M. Wallace-Hadrill's, from his Birkbeck Lectures in Ecclesiastical History, delivered in Cambridge in Michaelmas Term, 1973. Concerning the religion of the Franks under the Merovingians I have also learnt a great deal from an unpublished paper by Dr E.F. James of University College, Dublin, entitled 'The problem of conversion in Merovingian Gaul'.

2 Pierre Riché, 'Les foyers de culture en Gaule franque du vi^{e} au ix^{e} siecle', *Settimane* XI (Spoleto 1964) pp.279-321.

first could and did invoke the aid of their own bishops in order to reach their subjects. It was only the clergy who had any real contact with the people, and who could speak on their behalf when necessary.[1]

Thus a tradition of the responsibility borne by the Frankish clergy for the people of God was one established from the very beginning. So, too, were the general principles for the growth and security of the church. In the eighth century as well, missionaries and ordinary clergy depended as much upon the support and protection of the king as upon the guidance of the bishop and church of Rome. It was from Rome that Boniface received his pallium, and to Rome that he and the Frankish clergy directed their enquiries, notably the long questionnaire addressed to Pope Zacharias.[2] Boniface himself, however, acknowledged how much he relied upon the support and protection of the Frankish king, how he could 'neither govern the faithful of the church, nor protect the priests, clerics, monks and nuns of God, nor forbid the practice of heathen rites and the worship of idols in the German lands without Pippin's orders and the fear he inspired.[3] Boniface in fact is one of our chief witnesses to the parlous state into which the Frankish church had fallen by the middle of the eighth century, in which those who called themselves priests hardly knew what priesthood was,[4] in which ecclesiastical discipline was disregarded or despised, canon law ignored, the sees of the cities given over into the hands of wicked men, and no synod had been held for seventy years.[5] The continued prevalence of pagan beliefs and heathen practices, the ignorance of the clergy and the enormous difficulties of establishing the church in the wilder regions of the Frankish kingdoms are ever-present features of the correspondence of Boniface and his contemporaries,[6] and remain, furthermore, a constant concern of royal and ecclesiastical legislation in the succeeding decades. The very martyrdom of Boniface himself

1 See Henry G.J. Beck, *The Pastoral Care of Souls in South-east France during the Sixth Century*. Analecta Gregoriana 51 (Rome 1950).

2 His reply is extant. *MGH Epp* II, pp.479-87.

3 Boniface to Daniel of Winchester, 742-6. *Epistolae Bonifacii,* Ep 63, pp.128-32.

4 Zacharias to Boniface April 743, *ibid.* pp.86-92.

5 Boniface to Zacharias, *ibid.* Ep 50, pp.80-5, and compare Ep 78 to Cuthbert, 747, *ibid.* pp.161-70.

6 Of interest is the discussion by Derek Baker, 'Sowing the seeds of faith: theory and practice in the Mission Field', *Miscellanea Historiae Ecclesiasticae* 3 (Louvain 1970) pp.92-106, R.E. Sullivan, 'Carolingian missionary theories', *Catholic Historical Review* 42 (1956) 273-95, and J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, 'A background to St Boniface's mission', *England Before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources presented to Dorothy Whitelock,* ed. P. Clemoes and K. Hughes (Cambridge 1971) pp.35-48, reprinted in his *Early Medieval History* (Oxford 1976), pp.138-54.

attests to the difficulties encountered. The Frankish church in the mid-eighth century therefore appears to have held a somewhat tenuous position within its society. The picture is one of a church and kingdom with no strong, unified, comprehensive sense of the Christian faith or of Christian culture, even if it were still strong in the monastic centres. Boniface, his patrons and followers, were instrumental in the establishment of the Christian faith and church and in the very foundation of medieval Europe.[1] They were, however, the harbingers of the succeeding decades, for as Wilhelm Levison averred, the real religious education remained to be given after the acceptance of Christian belief.[2]

It is this 'real religious education' in the Frankish lands with which this book is concerned, for this was the principle concern of the Carolingian reforms. Whereas the introduction of Christianity into Bulgarian society was an innovation, in the Frankish context, Carolingian rule meant a consolidation, a reform, and a positive attempt at the reshaping of society within a Christian framework. In the ninth century, as well as the cultural renaissance, the doctrinal and theological element to the religion of the Franks that had hitherto been lacking was supplied, and the unequivocally Christian complexion of Frankish society was firmly and deliberately established. The means for thus shaping Frankish society were to be education and instruction in the widest senses of these words. The whole of society was to be taught and a Christian society created. The religious and didactic nature of the Carolingian reform programme is to be stressed above all. Pippin, Charlemagne and his successors were first and foremost Christian rulers. They and their clergy outlined a programme which was profoundly Christian in intent and content, the clergy were to become learned in the wisdom of the Christian writers, to read and produce Christian works, to perform Christian observances correctly and in accordance with the Roman fashion, and then to pass on their learning to their congregations, in order that the whole kingdom, the whole of Frankish society, rulers and ruled, might be full and worthy members of the *communitas fidelium.*

What exactly did such a programme of religious education entail, and how could it be carried out on a larger scale, rather than on the smaller-scaled enterprises of the missionaries hitherto? Who and what

1 See in particular, Theodor Schieffer, *Winfrid-Bonifatius und die christliche Grundlegung Europas* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau 1954).

2 Wilhelm Levison, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century* (Oxford 1948) p.47.

were to be the tools? How were the clergy to be trained for their offices, let alone taught the principles of Christian learning? How were the laity to be instructed in the Christian faith and what were the emphases and inspiration for their instruction? What precisely were the means by which the provisions contained in the programmatic legislation of the Frankish kings and church, above all those of the *Admonitio Generalis* of 789, were put into effect? How, in other words, were the Carolingian reforms to be implemented? Answers to some at least of these questions concerning reform and renewal in Frankish society will be proposed in the following chapters, and thereby a new perspective on the phenomenon of the 'Carolingian Renaissance' itself.

A word remains to be said about the sources. For the sort of questions posed here, the material is diffuse, limited, fragmentary and scattered, in old editions or else still in manuscripts surviving from the eighth and ninth centuries. The capitulary and conciliar legislation, the episcopal statutes, the homilies, sacramentaries and other liturgical books, the Christian *florilegia* and the vernacular fragments present many problems in themselves. Even though most of these texts have been printed since the sixteenth century, many remain inadequately edited, and their manuscripts, production, transmission, and accompanying problems (and in many cases sheer confusion) are of fundamental importance. For this reason, every chapter, each of which is based upon one type of source material, includes a discussion of the texts and the difficulties they present as sources in order to determine their validity as historical evidence, to attempt to resolve some of the uncertainties which exist with regard to classification, dating, provenance, authorship and transmission, and to see how they witness to the society for which they were intended and by which they were written and used, and to the sort of society they were supposed to produce. Most of this material, apart from that considered in the first part of chapter one, is discussed in the context of the Carolingian reforms and the making of a Christian society for the first time. It offers new and significant evidence for the particular contribution of the Frankish church to the lasting quality of the Carolingian achievement.

proclivities of the priesthood. The pastoral function of the priest and his care for his flock are continually in evidence.

In the episcopal statutes divers interpretations of the Carolingian reform programme were observed. On the one hand there was the emphasis on the pastoral aspects of the clergy's functions and, on the other hand, a growing preoccupation with the authority of the church and the exalted office of the *sacerdotes* on the other. If we look at the sermons in relation to these two interpretations, the sermon would remain, basically, a pious exhortation to promote works of piety in the mouths of the clergy who thought primarily of their pastoral duties. In the mouths of the clergy with very definite ideals and ambitions concerning their position as priests, however, who saw themselves as the transmitters of God's grace, as well as his words, to the people (with as a corollary, greater pretensions to social influence, even political power, beyond that originally envisaged for the clergy), the sermon would be one further means of enhancing the sacerdotal position.

The church as a whole, and the parish church in particular, was assuredly the really influential pivot upon which Frankish society could revolve. In a time of 'political' disintegration, the church provided a sense of cohesion and ideological continuity, for it provided guidance in social behaviour and in ethics, as well as making provision in part for man's spiritual needs, which for any healthy society must always be met. One further means for fulfilling these spiritual needs was through the liturgy of the Mass, which is the subject of the following chapter.

4

THE LITURGY

Within the liturgy of the Mass is symbolized the community of all Christians, who both by their corporate participation in the Mass, and by their receiving of the sacraments of bread and wine, are made 'members of one body in Christ'. It also serves to remind the Christian that 'Christ by his death gave life to the world'.[1] Of supreme significance for the Carolingian theologians was the fact that the Mass reaffirmed the identity of every man as a Christian within the *communitas fidelium.* Ratramnus of Corbie for example, writing in about 840, described the host as the 'figure' not only of the true body of Christ, but also of the people who believed in Christ, and who had been 'renewed in Christ by baptism'.

> At in isto quod per mysterium geritur figura est non solum proprii corporis Christi verum etiam credentis in Christum populi utriusque namque corporis, id est et Christi, quod passum est et resurrexit; et populi in Christo renati atque de mortuis vivificati, figuram gestat.[2]

It is evident that the difficult concept of the eucharist was a central preoccupation of Carolingian theological writing. The innumerable commentaries on the significance of the sacraments, such as those by Hrabanus Maurus, Magnus of Sens and Florus the Deacon,[3] as well as

1 'Prima igitur ac summa omnium carismatum missa canitur in commemoratione mortis domini quia mors Christi facta est vita mundi ...' Pseudo Germanus ed. E.C. Ratcliff *Expositio antiquae liturgicae Gallicanae* (London 1971). See Appendix B. The interpretation of Gregory the Great was undoubtedly influential as well. Book IV c.60: Gregory the Great, *Dialogues. PL* 77 cols.425-8. 'Hinc ergo pensemus quale sit pro nobis hoc sacrificium quod pro absolutione nostra passionem unigeniti filii semper imitatur. Quis enim fidelium habere dubium possit, in ipsa immolationis hora ad sacerdotis vocem coelos aperiri, in illo Jesu Christi mysterio angelorum choros adesse, summis ima sociari, terrena coelestibus iungi, unumque ex visibilibus atque invisibilibus fieri?'

2 Ratramnus of Corbie *De corpore et sanguine Domini* c.98 *PL* 121, col. 169. This was affirmed also by Florus the Deacon in c.64 of his treatise *De Expositione Missae.* 'Quia dominus et salvator noster mysterium suae mortis quam pro nostra omniumque salute suscepit tanta pietate memoriae fidelium commendavit, ut per oblationem et participationem corporis et sanguinis eamdem vivificant mortem suam. Et quia in participatione corporis et sanguinis sui vivificam suam mortem nos annuntiare voluit Dominus et salvator noster donec ipse veniat, dignum et salubre est ut, haec veneranda mysteria frequentando, memores sint sacerdotes et populus, universa videlicet ecclesia, beatae passionis eius ...' *PL* 119, col. 55.

3 Hrabanus Maurus *Liber de Sacris Ordinibus PL* 112, col. 11 ff. Magnus of Sens *Libellus de Mysterio Baptismatis PL* 102, cols. 981-3, Florus the Deacon *De Expositione Missae PL* 119, cols. 16-72.

the considerable controversy that arose between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie, illustrate this. Not only did the scholars attempt to expound the inner meaning and outward performance of the sacraments, but also to grasp firmly for themselves what in some cases must have been a relatively new concept. As the core of Christian ritual, it is to be expected that the Frankish clergy should evince a special interest in the Mass. The coincidence of these expositions with the massive production of liturgical texts in the ninth century however, suggests that the liturgy was to be another vital means for the instruction of people and clergy in the essentials of the new faith. Even in the dispute between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie, both, while differing in their interpretations of the true substance of the bread and wine, agreed that this sacrament was the essential one for every Christian to receive, for it meant that every man and woman was indeed fulfilling Christ's wishes as they had been recorded by the Evangelists.[1]

There is expressed indeed in all these works the fullest consciousness that the Frankish congregations, by so receiving the sacraments, were true followers of Christ and imitators of his disciples. Through baptism and through the body and blood of Christ the people were reborn in a new image: 'Sed in verbo et virtute spiritus sancti nova fit creatura in corpore creatoris ad nostrae reparationis salutem'.[2] Moreover, if we read the texts of the *Missa Ordinaria* with an eye to its potential usefulness for instruction, it can be seen how singular an opportunity was presented in the Mass for all the *fideles,* gathered together in a consecrated place, to express their devotion and belief in the Christian faith. Quite apart from the essential symbolism enshrined in the fact of their participation in the Mass, there was the edifying content and dramatic ritual of the Mass itself; the profession of faith embodied in the Creed, the hearing of the Gospel, epistle and sermon, the hymns of praise, the confessional prayers and the canon. All of this combined to express all that the Christian faith involved.

The very function and celebration of the Mass also inevitably served to enhance the status of the priesthood, for he who performs the rites of religion has ever held a special place in his society. Furthermore, fundamentally, the Mass was the intermediary between God and man: 'missa autem est legatio inter Deum et homines'.[3] It was

1 Ratramnus of Corbie *De corpore et sanguine Domini. PL* 121, cols. 103-171, and Paschasius Radbertus, *De corpore et sanguine Domini* ed. Bede Paul *CC Continuatio Medievalis* XVI (Turnholt 1969).

2 Paschasius Radbertus. c. 12. *ibid.* p. 79.

3 Hrabanus Maurus. *De Institutione Clericorum PL* 107 col. 322.

thus in the administration of the Mass, as Hrabanus continued, that the priesthood assumed their intermediary function as transmitters of God's grace:

> *cuius legationis officio fungitur sacerdos,* cum populi vota per preces et supplicationes ad Deum offert. Et bene hoc tempore sacrificii fit, quando illius passionis memoria celebratur Christi videlicet mediatores Dei et hominum qui semetipsum obtulit Patri pro nobis.[1]

Such an interpretation of the priest's function was by no means confined to the tracts of a few theologians. It is also implicit in the liturgy of the Mass, particularly in the central prayers of the *Missa Ordinaria* in the *Sacramentarium Hadrianum,* that the primary function of the priest is to act as mediator and spokesman for the laity, for at all times the priest supplicates God on behalf of the people.

> Memento domine famulorum famularumque tuarum et omnium circum adstantium quorum tibi fides cognita est et nota devotio qui tibi offerunt hoc sacrificium laudis, pro se suisque omnibus pro redemptione animarum suarum, pro spe salutis et incolomitatis suae tibi reddunt vota sua aeterno deo vivo et vero.[2]

In the Mass ordered for Aldric of Le Mans in 840, it is again the function of the priest as shepherd that is stressed:

> Hanc igitur oblationem, quam tibi pro pontifice nostro Aldrico atque grege sibi commisso et propinquitate ac familiaritate iunctis ei atque pro salute cuncti populi Christiani suppliciter immolamus.[3]

It was in the Carolingian period, as we have already seen, that the uniqueness of the *sacerdotes* as a special class set apart from the rest of the *fideles* was increasingly stressed. Here again the clergy do more than announce the Gospel and act as the source of spiritual and social guidance. They also fulfil a mediatory function between God and man; a class whose members were, whatever their personal failings, transmitters of God's grace. Again it is Hrabanus Maurus who expressed this most succinctly:

1 *Ibid.* col. 322.

2 For example, from the *Sacramentarium Hadrianum* ed. Jean Deshusses *Le Sacramentaire Gregorien* (Fribourg 1971) p. 87 and see also the *Orationes Cotidianae.* For example, numbers 914 and 921 p. 324-5.

> 914 Gaudeat domine quaesumus populus, tua semper benedictione confisus, ut et temporalibus beneficiis adiuvetur et erudiatur aeternis.
>
> 921 Da populo tuo quaesumus domine spiritum veritatis et pacis, ut et tota mente cognoscat, et quae tibi sunt placita toto corde sectetur.

3 *Concilium Cenomannicum,* 12 May 840, reprinted *MGH Conc* II, ii pp. 784-6.

> Nam a secretis virtutibus vel sacris sacramenta dicuntur quae ideo fructuose penes ecclesiam fiunt, quia sanctus in ea manens spiritus, eumdem sacramentorum latenter operatur effectum. Unde seu per bonos seu per malos ministros intra Ecclesiam Dei dispensentur nec bonorum mentis dispensatorum amplificantur haec dona, nec malorum attenuantur.[1]

Even with this enhancement of the sacerdotal status, neither Hrabanus nor his contemporaries ever lost sight of the fundamental equality of all Christians, for, 'Plebs sancta ideo simul meminisse debet, quia Christus non solum pro sacerdotibus passus est sed et pro plebe'.[2] For the Frankish clergy and theologians therefore, the Mass was of crucial importance. Not only was it the central religious rite and definition of the position of all men within the church, it was also an expression of the unity of the people, faith and belief. If this expression be considered in the context of that larger ideological unity and social cohesion which we have suggested the Carolingian king and clergy were trying to create, then the liturgy becomes more than a vehicle for religious instruction and worship. It also symbolizes the essential unity of Frankish society.

It must be stressed, however, that although this latter understanding (of the ideological importance of the Mass) must have been paired with the former, as the basis of the encouragement of liturgical revision and production, it was the former understanding, that of the practical utility of the Mass as the appropriate means to convey to all the people in explicit and invariable form the essential features of Christianity, which is most apparently put into practice by the Frankish kings.

This chapter therefore, is to be devoted to the means by which this was done, to the developments in liturgical practice, the provision of liturgical texts, their implications throughout the Carolingian period, and the extent to which the liturgy was used as a means for the instruction of the people.

Hitherto it has been assumed that Pippin, Charlemagne and their successors had a similar attitude towards the importance of the liturgy as that undoubtedly held by the clergy, and thus that any 'reform' of the liturgy is to be attributed ultimately to the directing

1 Hrabanus Maurus. *Liber de Sacris Ordinibus PL* 112, col. 1168.

2 *Ibid.* col. 1186. And in order that there should be no doubt whatsoever about the identity of the *plebs sancta*, Hrabanus continues 'sancta ideo dicitur, quia fide ac baptismo Christi percepto sanctificata est'. He possibly borrowed the expression *plebs sancta* from the ceremony of the Mass, for it is used in the *exordium* after the consecration of the host. '...Unde et memores sumus domine nos tui servi sed et *plebs* tua *sancta*'. Deshusses, *Le Secramentaire Gregorien*, p.89.

genius of the king. Klauser, for example, in an important and influential article, described liturgical evolution up to the middle of the eighth century as a process in which efforts to compile and revise the liturgy were made on an individual level by bishops and abbots, while it was from the middle of the eighth century that there was at last the 'decisive factor in the formation of the liturgy', namely, the 'supervisory authority of the king'.[1]

While there is some truth in this view, the king's interest in and support of, liturgical 'reform' must rather be considered in the context of, on the one hand, the extirpation of pagan forms of worship, and on the other, the assistance of the actual 'reform' of the liturgy in the sense of a reduction of the number of variants in use and promotion of the production of corrected texts. Further, the greater proportion of work on the liturgy continued to be conducted by individual members of the clergy in the course of the ninth century. In other words, the Frankish kings were more important in the replacement of pagan rites and beliefs with those of the Christian church, than in the liturgical formation and consolidation of Gallican and Roman rites to form a strong and coherent western form of the liturgy. This becomes clear from an examination of both the known activities of the kings and the sheer magnitude of liturgical production.

The most urgent need in many parts of the Frankish lands at the end of the eighth century appears to have been, after all, to impose any sort of Christian ritual at all. The people in many of the regions possessed and conquered by the Franks were but recently converted Christians, and we have seen from the capitularies and episcopal statutes that pagan practices were still a very real challenge to the church. Moreover that conversion, involving the formal acceptance of baptism, had been in all likelihood, as was mentioned in the Introduction, a 'simple replacement of one kind of folk magic with another' (the phrase is J. M. Wallace-Hadrill's). For example, the Old High German charm from Trier invokes the aid of Christ to rid a horse of its illness, as Christ healed St Stephen's horse, and is obviously a pagan formula uttered now *in nomine domini*.[2]

1 T. Klauser, 'Die liturgischen Austauschbezeihungen zwischen der Römischer und der fränkisch-deutscher Kirche vom achten bis zum elften Jahrhundert', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 53 (1933) 169-89. Further advocates of Pippin and Charlemagne's major role in the formation of the liturgy were E. Bishop, 'The liturgical reforms of Charlemagne', *Downside Review*, (1934) (printed posthumously) and C. Vogel, 'Les réformes liturgiques sous Charlemagne', Karl der *Grosse* II, pp. 217-33.

2 'Uuala krist, thu geuuertho gibuozian thuruch thina gnatha thesemo hrosse thaz antphangana atha thaz spurihalza, sose themo sancte Stephanes hrosse

A regularized Christian ritual was therefore one way in which to counteract, not only pagan practices, but also popular interpretations and misconceptions of Christianity. Hence the capitulary of 742 decreed:

> Decrevimus ut secundum canones unusquisque episcopus in sua parrochia sollicitudinem adhibeat, adiuvante gravione qui defensor ecclesiae est, ut populus Dei paganias non faciat, sed ut omnes spurcitias gentilitatis abiciat et respuat, sive sacrificia mortuorum sive sortilegos vel divinos sive filacteria, et auguria sive incantationes sive hostias immolatitias quaesi stulti homines iuxta ecclesias ritu pagano faciunt sub nomine sanctorum martyrum vel confessorum... sive omnes quaecumque sint paganorum observationes diligente prohibeant.[1]

This urgency to counteract pagan and alien customs by teaching and prohibition was echoed in the *Admonitio Generalis* of 789,[2] in the *Libri Carolini* of 794[3] and indeed, in the liturgy in use at the end of the eighth century itself.

> Oremus et pro paganis, ut deus omnipotens auferat iniquitatem a cordibus eorum et relictis idolis suis convertantur ad deum verum et unicum filium eius ... suscipe propicius orationem nostram et libera eos ab idolorum cultura et adgrega ecclesiae tuae sanctae ad laudem et gloriam nominis tui.[4]

A further measure to counteract pagan observance was the requirement in the *Capitulare missorum* of 802, that every layman must learn by heart the Creed and the Lord's Prayer.[5] There is also preserved in the capitulary collection compiled by Ansegisus, which implies that it was of permanent relevance, a canon which summarizes

gibuoztos zi thero burg Salonium. Amen'. Printed in E. Steinmeyer, *Die Kleineren Althochdeutschen Sprachdenkmäler* (Berlin 1916), p. 367. Other charms which must have been long in use, have the Pater Noster appended to give them a Christian flavour, such as the *contra vermes pecus edentes. Ibid.* pp. 370-97. J.M. Wallace-Hadrill commented on some of this in his Birkbeck lectures for 1973, *The Franks and the Uses of Religion.*

1 *MGH Cap* I, p. 25.

2 *Admonitio Generalis.* c.65 *ibid.* pp. 58-9. 'Omnibus. Item habemus in lege Domini mandatum: "non auguriamini" et in deuteronomio: "Nemo sit qui ariolos sciscitetur vel somnia observet vel ad auguria intendat" item "ne sit maleficus nec incantator nec pithones consolator" Ideo praecipimus, ut cauculatores nec incantatores nec tempestarii vel obligatores non fiant; et ubicumque sunt emendentur vel damnentur'.

3 *Libri Carolini. MGH Conc.* II, Suppl.

4 L.C. Mohlberg: *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae.* From Cod. Vat. Reg. lat. 316 and Paris BN lat. 7193 (Rome 1960) p. 67. This text is the one commonly, albeit misleadingly, known as the 'Gelasian'.

5 *Capitulare missorum* 802-13. c.2. *MGH Cap* I, p.147: 'Ut laici symbolum et orationem dominicam pleniter discant'.

the wishes expressed in both the *Admonitio Generalis* of 789 and the *Capitulare missorum speciale* of 802. There it is stated that baptism should be performed, and the Mass celebrated in order that the people might embrace the 'right faith' and understand the prayers of the Mass.[1] As an aid to the introduction of Christian ritual, the *Admonitio Generalis* also recognized the necessity that the 'Catholic books' should be corrected carefully, so that those who desire to 'pray to God properly' may not pray badly because they use incorrect books. Schoolboys are not to be permitted to corrupt the texts in reading and writing. On the contrary, mature men should transcribe the Gospel, Psalter and Missal, in order to lessen the possibility of error.[2]

The extent to which pagan customs did in fact survive or even influence the development of Christian ritual in the Frankish lands is almost impossible to gauge. The more tolerant attitudes recommended by Gregory the Great to Augustine and borne in mind by such eighth-century missionaries as Boniface of Mainz[3] are little in evidence. It is possible that the clergy, particularly the missionaries working in the wilder lands to the east, acknowledged the strength of the reverence accorded to the old gods and folk beliefs, the local cults of grove,[4] stream and hill, and the veneration of the local holy man, but this was in the context of undermining this strength. Such an attitude is implicit for example, in the *Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae* of 775-90, where it is urged that the churches of God should have *greater* honour than the old pagan shrines had enjoyed.[5] There is certainly lacking any respect for 'barbarian culture' such as Salvian had expressed centuries before. Instead, there was a categorical contempt for the primitive nature of heathen beliefs, their 'absurd opinions ... their disgusting rites and legends'. One can only suppose that Daniel of Winchester's sentiments thus expressed would have

1 Ansegisus I c.66 *MGH Cap* I, p. 403.

2 *Admonito Generalis* c. 72 *MGH Cap* I, p. 60 'Psalmos, notas, cantus, compotum, grammaticam, per singula monasteria vel episcopia et libros catholicos bene emendate; quia saepe, dum bene aliqui Deum rogare cupiunt sed per inemendatos libros male rogant. Et pueros vestros non sinite eos vel legendo vel scribendo corrumpere; et si opus est evangelium, psalterium et missale scribere, perfectae aetatis homines scribant cum omni diligentia'.

3 See for example Boniface's letter to Nothelm of Canterbury. *Epistolae Bonifacii* Ep. 33 p. 56, or to Pope Zacharias, Ep. 51, p. 50.

4 F. Stenton ('The historical bearing of place-name studies: Anglo-Saxon heathenism', *TRHS* 4th ser. 23 (1941) 1 ff.) demonstrates the sort of study which could well bear fruit if undertaken for the Frankish lands.

5 *Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae.* 775-790. *MGH Cap* I, pp. 68-70. For example c.2 or c.21.

found a great deal of sympathy on the other side of the Channel. Indeed Daniel recommended to Boniface that the heathen be 'frequently reminded of the supremacy of the Christian world and of the fact that they who cling to out-worn beliefs are in a very small minority'.[1] It is this attitude which prevails throughout Carolingian legislation for the extirpation of pagan religious practices, the most obvious example being again the *Capitulatio de partibus Saxoniae.*

It is therefore unlikely that the imaginative richness of pagan ritual, which can be very hazardously guessed at from descriptions of some of their burial rites,[2] or the evidence provided by grave goods,[3] enriched Christian formal ritual. It is on the other hand more than likely that heathen beliefs did colour the Christian ones, and that many customs and superstitions were retained and Christianized, as is evident from the charms referred to above, or the thanksgiving for the harvest and prayers for good weather.[4] The emphasis on the parish priest's responsibility to instruct the people in the rites and prayer of the new religious thus assumes a special significance, for it was not simply a matter of continuing established Christian customs and observances, but also one of eradicating long held pagan beliefs and introducing and establishing new and Christian ones.

Of further significance is the character of the actual contributions made by Pippin and Charlemagne, for both suggest that their encouragement of the liturgy emphasized its more didactic elements, that is, those elements of the Mass aimed more directly at the laity. Pippin's contribution was confined, according to his son and to Walafrid Strabo,[5] to the establishment of *scolae*

1 Daniel of Winchester. Ep. ad Bonifatium. *Epistolae Bonifacii* Ep. 74 p.135.

2 Capit. cit. c.7 and c.22.

3 For the period before Charlemagne see for example Peter Lasko, *The Kingdom of the Franks* (London 1917) particularly pp. 46-63. Here we can recall Hrabanus Maurus's attempts to teach his congregation the Christian attitudes towards death, described in the preceding chapter.

4 For example, *Orationes et Missa ad Pluviam Postulanda(m)* and *Missa ad repellendam tempestatem* from the *Supplementum Anianense,* Nos. 92, 93, and 96. ed. J. Deshusses *Le Sacramentaire Gregorien.*

5 Charlemagne in 'his' capitulary of 789. c.80 'Omni clero ut cantum Romanum pleniter discant et ordinabiliter per nocturnale vel gradale officum peragatur secundum *quod beatae memoriae genitor noster Pippinus rex* decertavit ut fieret, quando Gallicanum tulit ob unanimitatem apostolicae sedis et sanctae Dei aecclesiae pacificam concordiam'. *MGH Cap* I, p. 61, and Walafrid Strabo *De exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticus rerum.* c.26, ed. A. Knoepfler (Munich 1890) 'Cantilenae vera perfectionem scientiam, quam iam pene tota Francia diligit, Stephanus papa, cum ad Pippinum, patrem Caroli Magni imperatoris, in Franciam pro iustitia sancti Petri et Langobardis expetenda venisset per suos clericos petente eodem Pippino invexit, indeque usus eius longe lateque convaluit'. (p. 84).

cantorum and the attention he paid to the popularization of the chant as an integral part of religious ritual. This, while contributing substantially to the monasteries' cultural function in the kingdom, could also have helped to make the participation of the laity in the services a more active one, for it permitted them to join in the singing of portions of the Mass. The effort to increase the beauty of the liturgical Offices in this manner would also have appealed to the aesthetic sensibilities of the people, and been an incentive to them to go to church. Pippin of course was also useful to the clergy in that he procured books to assist them in their enterprise.[1]

As Pippin had intervened in the matter of the chant, so Charlemagne intervened in the matter of the most didactic portion of the Mass by commissioning the homiliary of Paul the Deacon, a collection of homilies to be used in all the churches.[2] Further, he too received at his request in about 784, through the mediation of Paul the Deacon, a copy of a Roman Mass book. Or at least so we gather from a letter from Pope Hadrian I to Charlemagne dated 784-91.[3] This Mass book is known to us as the *Sacramentarium Gregorianum* or *Hadrianum.* By making this request, Charlemagne evidently thought that only a 'pure Gregorian text' could be relied upon to provide a liturgy that was up to date and moreover, coming from Rome, completely legitimate. Now, why should Charlemagne and some of his advisors have felt the need for such a text?

A variety of books contained the liturgical texts used in the Frankish churches, namely, the Antiphonary, Epistle and Gospel lectionaries and the Sacramentaries or Mass Books. They contained the standard *ordo* for the Mass, the prayers for all the principal feasts of the Christian year, for such special occasions as the dedication of a new church, or for particular people and desires, such as masses for the king or for peace. It must be emphasized that early sacramentaries comprise only what was said by the celebrant, that is, the collects, secrets, post communion prayers, the canon, and the prefaces. The Epistle, Gospels and sung portions of the Mass were contained in

1 Books were sent by Pope Paul to Pippin: 'Libros quantos reperire potuimus: id est antiphonale et responsale'. *MGH Epp* III p. 529. The antiphonary referred to here has been identified as Brussels 10127-10144.

2 Charlemagne's letter introducing Paul the Deacon's homiliary to his clergy. *MGH Cap* I, pp. 80-1.

3 Hadrian I to Charlemagne, *c.* 784-791. *MGH Epp* III p. 626. The text of this letter presented some problems in interpretation, that were resolved satisfactorily by H. Lietzman's emendation in *Das Sacramentarium Gregorianum nach dem Aachener Urexemplar* (Münster 1921) p.xv; and see also the discussion in G. Ellard, *Master Alcuin Liturgist* (Chicago 1956) pp. 103-27.

the separate books listed above, and were subject to little or no variation. Any alteration in the structure of sacramentaries therefore was carried out with the needs of the task to be performed by the clergy for the people primarily in mind. Furthermore, Frankish contributions to the liturgy were generally in the form of changes in the whole structure of the Mass books and additional prayers, *ordines* and blessings, such as the blessing of the incense at the lighting of the Paschal candle,[1] rather than alterations of existing texts. Thus the extent of their contribution, particularly in the case of the Frankish Supplement to the *Sacramentarium Hadrianum* can be seen in all those prayers and blessings which it was thought desirable to have *in addition to* the basic content of the sacramentary. That is, all those which the compiler considered to be lacking from the texts he was using.

Before the time of Pippin, the liturgies in use in Frankish Gaul were those contained in the Sacramentaries known as the *Missale Francorum, Missale Gallicanum Vetus,* the *Missale Gothicum* and possibly the 'original' *Gregorian* and *Gelasian* texts. All these texts have received a number of editions in the past eighty years, valuable pioneering work being performed by the Henry Bradshaw Society, by H.M. Bannister, H.M. Wilson and C.L. Feltoe, who edited the Gregorian and Gothic, the Gelasian and Leonian sacramentaries respectively. Little recognition on the other hand was afforded the 'mixed-eighth century Gelasian' text until Edmund Bishop emphasized its importance as an intermediary stage between the Old Gallican and Roman sacramentaries, and the sacramentary produced by the Frankish liturgists in the ninth century, and associated it with the court of Pippin the Short. The most recent study of the eighth-century Gelasian text by Bernard Moreton has made it quite clear that the eighth-century Gelasian type of sacramentary was based on a wider tradition of earlier prayer collections consisting of Mass sets and common prayers for various purposes or seasons, rather than on a single redaction or 'original' text.[2] Other recent work on these

1 Mohlberg, *Liber Sacramentorum,* p. 69. On the possible origin of this blessing due to a misunderstanding of the rubric of the blessing of the paschal candle, see L. Eisenhofer, *The Liturgy of the Roman Rite* (Fribourg 1961) p. 204.

2 Edmund Bishop 'The earliest Roman Mass Book' *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford 1918) pp. 39-62, (hereafter abbreviated as Bishop, *Liturgica Historica,* and Bernard Moreton *The Eighth Century Gelasian Sacramentary. A Study in Tradition* (Oxford 1976). The implications (unfortunately not fully expounded by the author) of this absorbing study for the Carolingian reforms are considerable, for Moreton provides insight into the very provision by the clergy of service books for the churches and monasteries of the Frankish kingdoms on a remarkably independent and enterprising scale, a provision which takes due consideration of local tradition.

liturgies, notably that of L.C. Mohlberg, Reinhard Elze and Cyrille Vogel has produced a number of fine editions of these older sacramentaries.[1] These scholars have also cleared up many of the perplexing features of the evolution of the liturgy in the eighth and ninth centuries. Further, the solid contributions of H. Lietzmann[2] and L.C. Mohlberg[3] give clear accounts of developments in research on these texts.

Under Pippin, however, there was a definite effort to reestablish what was understood to be 'Roman' usage. It is possible that the influence of the Anglo-Saxon missionaries led by Boniface of Mainz, played a considerable part in the 'Romanization' of the liturgy.[4] Some scholars wish to take the initiation of 'reform' of the liturgical texts even earlier,[5] but there would seem here to be a confusion between natural growth of the liturgy in earlier centuries, and the deliberate attempts made to produce better texts for a specific purpose for which the clergy in the time of Pippin, Charlemagne and his successors were responsible.

The eighth-century clergy's contribution has tended to be minimized in general accounts of the liturgy, but palaeographical and liturgical evidence now suggests that the first Romanized sacramentary in use in the Frankish lands (that is to say, consciously Romanized, which

1 L.C. Mohlberg (ed.) *Missale Francorum,* from Vat. reg. lat. 257 (Rome 1957), *Missale Gallicanum Vetus,* from Vat. Pal. lat. 493 (Rome 1958), *Missale Gothicum,* from Vat. reg. lat. 317 (Rome 1961), and *Liber Sacramentarum Romanae Ecclesiae,* from Vat. reg. lat. 316 (Rome 1960). (Hereafter abbreviated to the title only).

2 H. Lietzman, *Das Sacramentarium Gregorianum nach dem Aachener Urexemplar* (Münster 1921).

3 L.C. Molhberg: *Die älteste erreichbare Gestalt des Liber Sacramentorum anni circuli der römischen Kirche,* Padua D47 f. 11r-100r (Münster 1927). A guide to the texts is contained in Bernhard Bischoff and K. Gamber, *Sakramentartypen; Versuch einer Gruppierung der Handschriften und Fragmente bis zur Jahrtausendwende* (Beuron 1958), M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani* (Louvain 1951), C. Vogel, *Introduction aux sources de l'Histoire de culte chrétien au Moyen Âge* (Spoleto 1966), K. Gamber, *Codices Liturgici latini antiquiores* (Freiburg 1968 2nd ed.) and the introduction to R, Elze and C. Vogel, *Le Pontifical Romano-Germanique du Xe siecle,* Studi e Testi 269 (Rome 1972).

4 See the discussion by Cyrille Vogel, 'La réforme liturgique sous Charlemagne', *Karl der Grosse* II pp. 217-33, and also the older articles by H.M. Bannister, 'Liturgical fragments. *A*: Anglo-Saxon Sacramentaries', *JTS* 9 (1908) 400-6 and 'Liturgical fragments of an Anglo-Saxon sacramentary', *JTS,* 12 (1911) 451-3; H. Frank, 'Die Briefe des Heiligen Bonifatius und das von ihm benutzte Sakramentar', *Bonifatius Gedenkgabe* (Mainz 1957) pp. 60-70, and compare C. Hohler, 'The type of Sacramentary used by St Boniface', *ibid,* pp. 89-93.

5 Such is the implication in C. Hohler's review of G. Ellard, *Master Alcuin, Liturgist, JEH* (1957) pp. 222-6.

incorporated elements of the liturgy actually in use, or thought to be in use at that time) was produced by them. This sacramentary was even called the 'Roman sacramentary of Pippin' by Edmund Bishop,[1] but is now more usually described as the 'mixed eighth-century Gelasian Sacramentary'.[2] The text of the original 'Gelasian sacramentary' which was used by the compilers of the 'mixed' Gelasian text has been mistakenly attributed to Gelasius, for it has now been established that its Roman elements were those used in the basilicas and title churches of Rome by the Roman clergy before the mid-seventh century, and perhaps as early as the beginning of the sixth century. In compiling the mixed eighth-century Gelasian, the compilers evidently tried to add to the text of this old 'Gelasian' Mass book (which they understood to be Roman) all those elements of the liturgy from the sacramentaries or collections of Mass sets and prayers already in use which had evolved to suit the Frankish clergy and congregations. These elements were particular Masses for special days and prayers and blessing formulae. Thus, not only were Masses for certain Gallo-Roman saints such as Germanus, Remigius or Vedastus included in the eighth century's Gelasian text, but also such characteristically Gallican blessings as the formula for the blessing of the salt to be used in baptism. Some Gelasian prayers have also had words inserted to suit a Frankish audience, such as the addition of *sive Francorum* to the following prayer: 'Oremus et pro Christianissimo imperatore vel rege nostro illo ... Respice propicius ad romanum sive Francorum benignus imperium .[3] Further additions indicative of the particular needs of the church at the time are services for the *Reconciliatio rebaptizati ab heredicis* which beseech God to forgive those 'qui fraude diabolicae malignitatis a baptismi unitate descedunt', which was apparently evolved especially for those who had been inadvertently baptized by a bad or heretical priest, and was thus excellently suited to cater for such cases as

1 E. Bishop in a footnote, *Liturgica Historica*, p.152.

2 Apart from the edition of this text by L.C. Mohlberg cited above, p.125, n.3 (Vat. Reg. lat. 316), the fundamental study is that of E. Bourque, *Etude sur les Sacramentaires Romains* II, i. *Le Gelasien du VIII^c siecle* (Quebec 1952) (hereafter cited as E. Bourque, *Etude sur les Sacramentaires Romains*). Many of the points made by A. Chavasse *Le Sacramentaire Gelasien* (Paris 1957) still hold, although account should be taken of the criticisms of C. Coebergh, 'Le Sacramentaire Gelasien Ancien' *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 7 (1961) 45-88. See also Bernard Moreton, *The Eighth Century Gelasian Sacramentary* (Oxford 1976).

3 L.C. Mohlberg, *Liber Sacramentorum*, p.6 and see the brilliant article by Gerd Tellenbach, 'Römischer und Christliches Reichsgedanken', *SB Heidelberg*, 1934, pp. 1-71.

were described by Boniface.[1] Then there is the elaborate ritual for the consecration of a new church, its altar and its sacred vessels, where the emphasis is on the church's primary function to serve as a house of prayer for the people. '...Ut omni tempore in hoc loco supplicantes tibi familiae tuae auxilietates releves, egretudines cures, praeces audias, vota suspicias, desiderate confirmes, postolata concedas'.[2] As well as these *ordines* being added to the eighth-century Gelasian sacramentary, there is also in some of the type's manuscripts a special provision for the needs of monks and monasteries in the form of particular blessings for monastic buildings, or such masses as the *missa pro sacerdote sive abbate,* where each is accorded his special dignity as intermediary, as can be seen from the secret: 'Concede quaesumus omnipotens deus, ut anima famuli tui *illi* abbatis atque sacerdotis per haec sancta misteria in tuo conspectu semper clara consistat que fideliter ministravit'.[3] This provision for monks, which was also noted some years ago by Edouard Bourque,[4] may perhaps be attributed to the influence of Boniface of Mainz and the obvious need of the monasteries newly founded for a sacramentary they could use in their chapels. Indeed, the diffusion of the Gelasian type of sacramentary and its minor adaptation for local use was largely confined to the monasteries, particularly the Benedictine abbeys of Gellone,[5] St Remigius at Rheims, Reichenau, St Peter of Gand and St Gall.[6] Its popularity remained undiminished, despite the introduction of the *Hadrianum* after 784, for, to mention only two instances, it remained in use in three of the six churches in the diocese of Rheims; and in the library catalogue of the monastery catalogue of St Riquier of 831 there are listed no fewer than nineteen Gelasian missals.[7]

1 Boniface, Ep. ad. Gregorium II, *Epistolae Bonifacii*, Ep. 33, pp. 56-8. The Ordo is in Mohlberg, *Liber Sacramentorum*, p. 106.

2 *Ibid.* pp. 108-9, and here see the comments by E. Bishop, 'The genius of the Roman rite', *Liturgica Historica* pp. 1-20, and L. Eisenhofer, *The Liturgy of the Roman Rite* (Freiburg 1961).

3 *Ibid.* p. 239.

4 E. Bourque, *Etude sur les Sacramentaires Romains* II. i p.250. 'Nos Gelasiens du VIII^e siècle trahissent a leur face meme leurs fortes attaches monastiques; toute une serie de formulaires se rapportent uniquement a la consécration des personnes religieuses, une autre, à des coutumes specifiquement monacales'.

5 P. de Puniet, 'Le Sacramentaire de Gellone, Paris BN lat. 12048' *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 48 (1934) 1-65, 157-97, 357-81, 517-33; 49 (1935) 109-25, 209-29, 305-47; 50 (1936) 1-33, 261-95; 51 (1937) 13-135, 267-309; 52 (1938) 3-27.

6 Such texts for example as the following manuscripts: The sacramentary of Godelgaud from Rheims (now lost), Zurich Zentralbibliothek 30, from Rheinau, Brussels Bibl. royale 10127-10144 (1) ff. 125^v-135^v, used at St Peter's in Ghent, and St Gall Bib. Canton. 348, 349 and 350.

7 Rheims catalogue, Guérard (ed.) *Polyptique de l'Abbaye de S. Remy de Reims* (Paris 1853) 8, 39, 56, 62, 78, 81. St Riquier catalogue of 831 'De

The principal observation to be made about this eighth-century Gelasian text is its deliberately mixed character, for it contains elements from the Gelasian type (represented by the Vat. reg. lat. 316) the Gregorian type (represented by Padua D.47) and various elements selected from the *Gallicanum Vetus* and the *Missale Francorum,* as well as drawing on the whole tradition of collections of mass sets and prayers described by Bernard Moreton.[1] The inclusion of the Frankish elements has every appearance of being a matter of fact inclusion of that which was in use already, and which was familiar and practicable. It suggests that the Romanity of the liturgy was not of the first importance to the clergy at the end of the eighth century. In view of the official support given to the alternative text, the *Hadrianum,* after 784, two questions arise. Firstly, why the Frankish clergy, before the compilation of the eighth-century Gelasian, should want any Roman rites at all if they were so content with their current Gallican liturgies and secondly, why the Gelasain should be rejected in favour of the *Hadrianum.*

It is not enough to assert that the Romanization of the cult was a result of the rapprochement between the Franks and the papacy brought about by the agreement of Pippin and Pope Stephen, and the ensuing relationship between the papacy and the Frankish rulers. Nor was the propagation of the Roman rite due solely to the zeal of the Anglo-Saxon missionaries rather than that of the Frankish clergy.[2] That is to say, the interest in Roman ritual was not imported from elsewhere, even though the English missionaries were undoubtedly assiduous in the introduction of the Roman rites, as we can deduce from the contents of the 'German' monastic libraries such as St Gall and Reichenau. Equally productive areas at the end of the eighth century however were Bavaria and Central France. It would therefore seem, bearing the later introduction of the *Hadrianum* text in mind, that

libris sacrarii qui ministerio altaris deserviunt ... missales Gregoriani tres ... missalis Gregorianus et Gelasianus modernis temporibus ab Albino ordinatus I ... missales Gelasiani XIX'. G. Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn 1885) p. 28. On the St Riquier entry, often taken as proof that Alcuin revised and supplemented the *Hadrianum* text, see C. Hohler in the review of Ellard cited above, p.125, n.5, who suggests that this is an eighth-century Gelasian text with Alcuin's votive Masses added to it.

1 Bernard Moreton, *The Eighth Century Gelasian Sacramentary.* The Sacramentary was characterized as possessing a 'caractère hybride-romano-franque' by C. Vogel, 'La réforme liturgique sous Charlemagne', *Karl der Grosse* II p. 232.

2 See C. Vogel, 'Les échanges liturgiques entre Rome et les pays francs jusqu'à l'époque de Charlemagne', *Settimane,* VII (Spoleto 1960) pp.185-295, and Th. Klauser, 'Die Liturgische Austauschbeziehungen zwischen der Römischer und der fränkisch-deutscher Kirche vom achten bis zum elften Jahrhundert', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 53 (1933) 169-89.

expediency and necessity were the prime motives. That is, that the new churches had to be provided with a reliable and useful text which had a greater or lesser proportion of Roman elements according to the individual bishops.

The initiative on the part of individual members of the clergy in liturgical production is in fact as apparent in the eighth century as it became in the ninth. If we here refer to Bourque's list of manuscripts containing the whole text or extracts from the eighth-century Gelasian, it can be seen that most surviving manuscripts were produced for use within each particular monastery or cathedral such as the sacramentary of Gellone (Paris BN lat. 12048) the sacramentary of Angoulême (Paris BN lat. 816) and the Phillipps Sacramentary (Berlin 105 Phillipps 1667).[1] Some of the shorter collections of Gelasian extracts were evidently made in order to produce an 'abridged' sacramentary for a specific purpose, such as the Palimpsest fragments from Reichenau (Karlsruhe Landesbibliothek Cod. Aug. XCII) which Bourque describes as intended for the use of itinerant missionaries,[2] for it contains only the barest essentials, namely, the chief festivals of the *sanctorale* up until Good Friday. Similarly, Brussels Bibliothèque royale 10127-10144, contains only the baptismal and blessing formulae, plus eleven Masses, from Christmas to Ascension Day.

The evidence is unfortunately very sparse as far as surviving texts of this sacramentary type are concerned. Enough is extant however to indicate that the production of liturgical texts continued to be a largely individual affair conducted by the different monasteries and dioceses, in which the clergy were left a good deal of freedom to determine by actual use the proportion in which Frankish and Roman elements were to be mingled.

Until the time of Charlemagne it was a secondary need to reduce the diversity in liturgical usage that existed. As the proliferation of types of text increased, exacerbated by the work of Pippin's clergy, the need to standardize the liturgy became more urgent.

We may attribute such diversity partly to the tenacity of different texts, the reluctance to adopt other forms of religious observance, the sheer difficulties of communication and the time and expense involved in producing a new sacramentary, and partly to the basic ecclesiastical structure of the Frankish lands. The Frankish episcopate was an

1 See P. de Puniet, 'Le Sacramentaire de Phillipps', *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 44 (1930) 10-33; 45 (1931) 116-23; 46 (1932) 279-395.

2 E. Bourque, *Etude sur les Sacramentaires Romains,* p.18.

acephalous episcopate. Each bishop assumed the functions of an autonomous lord, who ruled his diocese with similar, but not the same books as his fellow bishops. The emphasis was above all therefore, on practical utility. The texts available had to contain the prayers, blessing formulae and ordines for the principal rites of the church. They had to be authorative and the Latin text had to be correct.[1]

It is quite possible that the monastic distribution of the 'Gelasian text' meant that an up to date sacramentary was lacking in the parish churches; and that the Gelasian text was replaced because it was not primarily suited to the pastoral objectives of the Frankish clergy in the ninth century. Probably too, Charlemagne and his advisers mistrusted texts long in use, and had a particular anxiety about corrupt texts, as well as the variety of forms in circulation. They must have felt that a good solution would be to ask for the sacramentary used by the pope himself, the rock on which the church was built, and to issue it to the Frankish lands as the 'authorized version'. As well therefore as the importance of the liturgy as a concise means for the instruction of the people, which with its symbolic significance and collective function reflected the unity of all Christians, there had to be a commonly used form of the liturgy suitable for both priest and monastic communities in the whole of the Frankish kingdom. The unity symbolized in the Mass would thereby gain an extra dimension. Furthermore, the stipulation that it be the liturgy according to the *Ordo Romanus*[2] meant that the liturgy provided one line of communication with Rome that helped to determine the character of the Carolingian Renaissance.

The efforts of the Frankish clergy in the ninth century were therefore devoted to the Gregorian-type sacramentary known as the *Hadrianum*.[3] This text was that received by Charlemagne from Pope Hadrian, sometime between 784 and 791. It was understood to be a 'pure Gregorian text', that is, that used by Pope Gregory I. The Franks did realize on examining this text, however, that it could not possibly be a 'pure Gregorian text', for it included such later innovations as the Masses for the Thursdays in Lent introduced by Gregory II (715-31).

1 Charlemagne, *De Litteris Colendis*, ed. P. Lehmann, *Fuldaer Studien, SB* Bayerische Akademie, (1927) pp. 3-13.

2 One of the few specific references is in the Examination for priests dated to 809. 'Interrogo vos presbiteri ... missam vestram secundum ordinem Romanum quomodo nostris vel intelligitis'. *MGH Cap* I, p.234.

3 Now in a new edition: Jean Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Gregorien* (Fribourg 1971) and see his introduction for summary and discussion of the disputes concerning this text up to 1970.

Rather, the contents of this book, which we shall term henceforth the *Hadrianum*, can be taken to represent the state of the liturgy used by the pope in Rome at the end of the eighth century.

In the form in which it was sent to the Frankish court however, it was extraordinarily ill-suited for widespread use in the young and expanding Frankish church, for it was evidently a pope's personal book, containing only the stational masses for use in the basilicas of Rome, and lacking Masses for ordinary Sundays, that is, for the Sundays after Christmas, Epiphany, Easter and Pentecost, as well as the rites for baptisms, weddings, funerals and votive masses. As a further inconvenience it was organized according to a different arrangement of the calendar from that of the Epistle and Gospel lectionaries currently in use, so that the Masses, Gospels and Epistles did not match. It could seem extraordinarily cavalier of Hadrian to send such a deficient book. Lacking the text of Charlemagne's request, we do not know exactly what he asked for. It may be that the pope had absolutely no conception of the difficulties which beset the Frankish church and what their primary needs were. It may be too that he thought he was conferring a singular honour upon the Frankish king by graciously sending him the book at all, Charlemagne's political status being less then than it later became. In any event, the deficiencies of the book must have been a great disappointment as well as a nuisance, for it meant that instead of having a well-organized Mass book which would become the Authorized Sacramentary in the Frankish lands, a considerable amount of work had to be done in order to make the book serviceable for parish use. To this end it was deemed necessary for the *Hadrianum* to be provided with a Supplement, containing all those elements which it was felt the *Hadrianum* lacked. Thus, in this Supplement, and the reasons provided for its compilation, are mirrored the liturgical requirements of the Frankish church in the ninth century.

The deficiencies of the *Hadrianum* must also have afforded a measure of wry satisfaction to those members of the Frankish clergy who were quite content with the Mass books already in use. Alcuin in particular protested to Eanbald of York at being asked to supplement the new book when it arrived, for he was reluctant to relinquish older forms of worship when they served their purpose well enough.[1] The Missal in fact most probably used by Alcuin was one of the eighth-century Gelasian type, to which some Gregorian prayers as well as his own

1 Alcuin to Eanbald of York: 'Quod opus est nova condere dum vetera sufficiunt?' *MGH Epp* IV, p. 370.

votive masses were added.[1] Rather than being responsible for the Supplement to the *Hadrianum,* Alcuin played a considerable part in the diffusion of the eighth-century Gelasian text. Until recently, it has generally been held that Alcuin was responsible for the whole of the Supplement to the *Hadrianum,* mostly on a combination of some fragments of ambiguous purport and a tendency to attribute much of the textual work of the early ninth century to him.[2] It has now been suggested by the *Hadrianum's* new editor that the compilation of the Supplement and correction of the *Hadrianum's* text should be more correctly ascribed to Benedict of Aniane,[3] although Reinhard Elze and Cyrille Vogel still cautiously describe it as 'par Alcuin ou par Benoît'.[4]

The significance of this alteration in responsibility for the compilation cannot be overemphasized, for if Deshusses be right (and his arguments not only make good sense but clear up the puzzling discrepancy between Alcuin's reluctance to produce a Supplement, and his supposed production of it nevertheless),[5] then the extent of the supervisory authority in liturgical matters by Charlemagne must be considerably lessened, as must also the need he felt for uniformity in usage. The evidence suggests that it was a distinct party within the church who were anxious to oppose diversity in liturgical observances and introduce a standard text, and that this party had its origins in the southern part of the Frankish lands, in the court circle of Louis the

1 See H. Barré and J. Deshusses, 'A la recherche du missal d'Alcuin', *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 82 (1968) 3-44, and the discussion by G. Ellard, *Master Alcuin, Liturgist* (Chicago 1956) pp. 144-73. Both discuss in particular Alcuin's letter to the monks of St Vaast d'Arras. *MGH Epp* IV, pp. 454-5, and to the monks of Fulda, *MGH Epp* IV, pp. 404-6, in which Alcuin said that he had sent some masses to them for their use. Compare also the discussions of P. de Puniet, cited above p.129, n.1.

2 Such references as that to the *missalis Gregorianus et Gelasianus modernis temporibus ab albino ordinatus,* in the St Riquier catalogue for 831 and the note by Bernold of Constance in his *Micrologus,* to the effect that Alcuin is supposed to have compiled a missal: 'nam Gregorianas orationes in libris sacramentorum collegisse asseritur, *PL* 151, col. 1020, which are explained quite convincingly by Deshusses in the introduction to his edition, *Le Sacramentaire Gregorien,* p. 64.

3 *Ibid.* And see also Jean Deshusses, 'Le Supplement au Sacramentaire Gregorien, Alcuin ou Benoît d'Aniane', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 9 (1965) 48-71 and *idem* 'Le sacramentaire gregorien pre-hadrianique', *RB* 80 (1970) 213-37.

4 C. Vogel and R. Elze, *Le Pontifical Romano-Germanique du X^es.* III. Studi e Testi 269 (Rome 1972) p. 4.

5 E. Bishop mentioned Alcuin's reluctance, and ascribed his change of heart to a 'strong sense of a powerful and paying patronage', *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford 1918) p. 55. No doubt Alcuin did possess such a sense, but it seems out of place to make it account for whether he compiled the Supplement to the *Hadrianum* or not.

Pious in Aquitaine, which was strongly under the influence of Benedict of Aniane. It may be that it was this same party which was behind Florus and his fellow clergy's opposition to Amalarius of Metz.

The diffusion of the *Hadrianum* texts occurred later in the ninth century, rather than being adopted on a wide scale as soon as it arrived. Indeed, Deshusses's work on the Sacramentary of Gellone suggests that, although the Supplement to the *Hadrianum* had already enjoyed some use in the kingdom of Aquitaine in the early years of the ninth century (the best and earliest manuscripts of it are from the region of Marmoutier and Lyon) its dissemination on a considerable scale in the north and east had to wait until Louis the Pious succeeded to his father's throne.[1] This further supports the earlier assertion that individual efforts by bishops in compiling a Sacramentary to suit them from all the material available for the purposes of their own diocesan ministry were the most important impetus for liturgical production.

It was an individual freedom determined by practical necessity, and accounts in part for the retention of so many Gelasian and Gallican elements. Even though the eighth-century Gelasian and the old Gallican texts ceased to be copied in their entirety after about 800 in France, and only lasted for a further century or so in North Italy, Germany and Alemannia (particularly at St Gall),[2] this is in itself an indication of the success enjoyed by the *Hadrianum.* As a major part of the Supplement to the newly imposed *Hadrianum* on the other hand, the eighth-century Gelasian continued to survive, and it was owing to its very incorporation of Gelasian elements that the *Hadrianum's* success was assured.

If we look at the liturgical production of the *Hadrianum* and its Supplement in the course of the ninth century, it is quite clear that the clergy took it upon themselves to supply suitable texts for use in the monasteries and churches. For example; the compiler of the Sacra-

1 Jean Deshusses, 'Le Sacramentaire de Gellone dans son contexte historique', *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 75 (1961), 193-210, particularly at 210. *Hadrianum* texts from the Lyons-Marmoutier region are those manuscripts now listed as Autun, Bibliothèque Municipale 19 (Marmoutier) BN lat. 2812 (Lyons) and Vat. reg. lat. 337 (Lyons).

2 As can be seen from such texts as the St Gall sacramentary fragment, St Gall Stiftsbibliothek 350 dated before 800, *CLA* VII, no. 939. and ed. G. Manz, 'Ein St Galler Sacramentar Fragment', *Liturgie Geschichtsquellen und Forschungen,* (Münster-in-Westphalen 1939) and 348 (dated *c.*800 *CLA* VII 936), ed. K. Möhlberg, 'Das Fränkische Sacramentarium Gelasianum in alamannischer Uberheferung', *ibid.* (Münster-in-Westphalen 1918), Zurich Zentralbibliothek, Rheinau 30 ff. 27^r-165^r written *c.*800. See H. Wilson *The Gelasian Sacramentary* (London 1894) pp. 317-71 and the Phillipps Sacramentary, Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Phillipps 1667, V. Rose, *Verzeichnis den lateinische Handschriften* (Berlin 1893) No. 105.

mentary of Stavelot (London BL Add 16605) included a special mass for St Remaclus, bishop of Maastricht;[1] the sacramentary of St Gall for use in the monastery, was adapted for use in the cathedral of Mainz soon afterwards by the addition of the episcopal benedictions and a calendar which included the name of St Alban of Mainz; the sacramentary of St Vaast d'Arras which contains a number of Alcuin's votive masses; and most important, the sacramentary of Hildoard (Cambrai Bibl. Municipale 164) which is the earliest surviving text and apparently a direct copy of the book sent by Hadrian I to Charlemagne.

Moreover, most of the sacramentaries surviving were produced during the reign of Charles the Bald. Some perhaps, like the sacramentary of Nonantola, (Paris BN lat. 2292) were even written at the court of Charles the Bald, or, as in the case of the sacramentary of Chelles (New York Pierpont Morgan Library G.57) commissioned by Charles from the monks at St Amand in 860.[2] From Deshusses's descriptions of the manuscripts there appear to have been three main centres of production: at St Amand, Reichenau-St Gall and Lyons. Elsewhere other texts were copied, and added to individually. It should be noted too, that those texts commissioned by Charles the Bald are the only Mass books for which we have evidence that the king asked for these to be copied. It is very little to go on, but the tentative suggestion could be made that the emphasis on all the Frankish kings' contributions to the evolution of the sacramentaries should be on their function as patrons, who would commission a particular text for a specific purpose, rather than having the expertise to impose any one text.

Benedict of Aniane explains in his preface to the Supplement[3] his reasons for producing such a work, and the sources for its contents. These reveal that he too, while wanting to impose uniform observance, did by no means reject the masses, prayers and blessings from earlier missals. The Sacramentary immediately preceding his Preface, was, he

1 BL Add 16605, ff. 13-15^{v}. A mid ninth-century sacramentary written for the abbey of Stavelot; see Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Gregorien*, p. 37.

2 See the list of manuscripts in Jean Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Gregorien*, p. 37.

3 This '*Hucusque* preface' has in fact been the focus of disputes concerning the authorship of the whole Supplement. The function of the Preface of separating the original *Hadrianum* text from the Supplement was definitively settled by R. Amiet, 'Le prologue *hucusque* et la table des Capitula du Supplement d'Alcuin au Sacramentaire Gregorien', *Scriptorium* 7 (1953) 177-209. He was lead to his conclusions through the work of Edmund Bishop, 'The earliest Roman Massbook', *Dublin Review* 115 (1894), 245-78 (reprinted in *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford 1918) 39-61) and G. Morin, 'Une rédaction inédite de la preface au Supplement du Comes d'Alcuin', *RB* 29 (1912) 341-9. The present text used is that printed in Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Gregorien*, pp.351-9.

explained, 'the work of the blessed Gregory', with the exception of the Masses for the Nativity, the Assumption of the Virgin Mary and for Thursday in Lent. As it had been sent, the *Hadrianum* text needed to be corrected and restored 'for the benefit of all' *ob multorum utilitatem*, and also, since there was other material which was used by their church, and yet not collected by Gregory, he had collected them together so that the reader might find in this work 'all things which we have thought necessary for our times'.[1]

Benedict therefore primarily intended the sacramentary to be of practical use, and not too unfamiliar, and compiled the Supplement from older sacramentaries already in circulation. However, there was some attempt to elevate the status of the *Hadrianum* text itself by making its use compulsory, whereas use of the Supplement was optional. This is indicative of a positive attempt from above, in the person of Benedict, presumably with the full support of the king, to impose uniformity in liturgical observance.[2]

Thus the Supplement's author cunningly preserved the respect accorded to traditional authority (represented by the Gregorian text) yet did not presume to demand respect for his Supplement, merely relying on the fact that its contents were indispensable to make use of the whole book, *Hadrianum* plus Supplement, once it became known far more widely. This is indeed what happened.

Most of the episcopal statutes and the *Epistola generalis* of 802 stipulate that 'Mass books' should be possessed by all the clergy in order that they may perform their pastoral duties efficiently. For example, the Statute of Haito of Basle (804-823) listed the necessary books:

> Sexta, quae ipsis sacerdotibus necessaria sunt ad discendum, id est *sacramentarium*, lectionarius, antifornarius, baptisterium, compotus, canon penitentialis, psalterium, homeliae per circulum anni dominicis diebus et singulis festivitatibus aptae.[3]

Within the Supplement, the parish priest and diocesan bishop would be completely provided with all that the *Hadrianum* lacked: the Masses for ordinary Sundays, forms of ordination for the minor orders, Masses for particular events or people which the Franks would be most likely

1 Preface to Supplement, *ibid.* p.352.

2 *Ibid.* p.352.

3 Haito of Basle, *Statute* c.6. *MGH Cap* I p. 363. This does not however specify whether the sacramentary to be used was the *Hadrianum* plus Supplement. We can only cautiously assume that it could have been, for Hildoard of Cambrai's copy of the *Hadrianum* was made in 812, five years after Haito assumed office. See Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Gregorien*, introduction, p.36.

to need, such as the *missa pro rege* and the Mass to be said when the king convoked a synod. Most significant as a clear affirmation of how essential the book was to aid the clergy in their pastoral functions, was the inclusion of the blessings to be pronounced over the people by the bishop: 'Addidimus etiam et benedictiones ab episcopo super populum dicendas ... ut pro me praeces ad dominum fundatis qui ob utilitatem plurimorum ea colligere atque corrigere studuimus'.[1]

With these blessings, the special character of the clergy as intermediaries between God and the people which the theologians had been so anxious to stress, was particularly enhanced. By delivering them, the priest acted as intercessor, admonitor and instructor. He reminded the people in the blessing for Easter Sunday, for example, of their sinfulness, exhorting them to try and renew themselves, become true followers of Christ and diligent observers of the faith that in many cases they had but newly embraced:

> Benedicat vos deus qui per unigeniti filii sui passionem vetus pascha in novum voluit converti, concedatque vobis ut expurgato veteris fermenti contagio, nova in vobis perseveret consparsio. Et qui ad celebrandum redemptoris nostri caenam mente devota convenistis, aeternarum dapium vobiscum aepulas reportetis.
> Ipsiusque opitulante clemantia mundemini a sordibus peccatorum qui ad insinuandum humilitatis exemplum, pedes voluit lavare discipulorum.[2]

A Carolingian contribution to the *ordo* of the *Missa Ordinaria* itself served to define more exactly the status of the Christian, every one of the Frankish people, as a servant of God, and furthermore, all equally sinful. An addition was made to the canon of the Mass in the corrected *Hadrianum* which was absent from both Gregorian and Gelasian texts:

> Memento etiam domine famulorum famularumque tuarum ill. et ill. qui nos praecesserunt cum signo fidei et dormiunt in somno pacis. Ipsis et omnibus in christo quiescentibus locum refrigerii lucis et pacis ut indulgeas depreceamur.[3]

Botte suggested that this addition was the result of Irish influence, although he does not suggest the possible source.[4] He also comments

1 Preface to Supplement. Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Gregorien*, p.352; and note that he had to *correct* the text as well. That is, the *Hadrianum* as sent was corrupt, which suggests that it was a very ordinary book that Hadrian sent to Charlemagne.

2 *Ibid.* pp. 583-4 (Supplementum Anianense). And see now the new edition of *The Freising Benedictionals*, Munich Clm 6430, ed. J. Deshusses *HBS* (London 1974).

3 *Le Sacramentaire Gregorien* p. 87.

4 B. Botte, *L'Ordinarie de la Messe* (Paris 1953) p. 24. Compare *The Bobbio Missal* (facsimile ed. E.A. Lowe) f. 11^{v} where there occurs this very prayer, which could be the source, and Bobbio was an Irish foundation.

on the prayer immediately following, which starts with the words, *nobis quoque peccatoribus*, which he suggested added subtly to the emphasis on the sinfulness of every member of the congregation and the importance of their participation in the Mass as a measure to aid their seeking salvation.

Other fundamental aspects of the church's ministry in the Frankish lands were also catered for in the Supplement, the most important being the provision of the entire *ordo* for baptism, including the Gallican blessing of the salt (interpreted as a symbol of the spiritual food with which God is to nourish the catechumen). As well as full provision being made for the creation of new Christians, there is an *ordo* for the consecration of a new church, consecrated, above all, according to the blessing formulae, as a house of prayer and worship for the people. Other additions were Masses for extra feasts such as All Saints, the prayers to accompany the ordination of a priest, again essential for a bishop to have, and the Masses for the king, and in time of war.

The last two named merit special consideration. The function of the king portrayed in the words of the prayers for this sacramentary is that of a warlord, for whom God's aid and strength is invoked in order to preserve and protect the peace and security of the people. This emphasis on the king as fighting protector is a distinctively Gallican or Frankish one, which is present not only in the earliest known Merovingian regal formulae,[1] the *Missale Gothicum*, the *Missale Francorum* and the *Missale Gallicanum Vetus*,[2] but is also preserved in the eighth-century Gelasian text,[3] and added now by Benedict of Aniane to the *Hadrianum*. Here, the secret of the *missa pro regibus* is the fullest expression of the role envisaged for the king.

1 A palimpsest manuscript, Reichenau 253, f. 16, noted by C.A. Bouman, *Sacring and Crowning*, (Gröningen-Djakarta 1957) p. 92, n.3.

2 Ed. L.C. Mohlberg, *Missale Gothicum*, Vat. reg. lat. 317 (Rome 1961) p.64. *idem Missale Francorum*, Vat. reg. lat. 257 (Rome 1957) p.20, where God is implored 'ut regni Francorum nomenis libertas in tua devotione semper exultet: et ab hostium nos defende formidine, ut omni perturbatione submota liberis tibi mentibus serviamus'. *idem Missale Gallicanum Vetus*, Vat. Pal. lat. 493 (Rome 1958) p. 28. 'Oremus et pro Christianissimus regibus ut deus et dominus noster subditas illis faciat omnes barbaras nationes ad nostram perpetuam pacem'. In all these prayers the king's function is to deliver God's people from their enemies *(ab hostibus nos defende)*. Compare the prayer *pro regibus et pace*, p.38. See also Gerd Tellenbach, cited below n.1, p.138. The *deus et dominus noster* has been shown to be Domitian's designation which in the old Good Friday doxology assimilated Domitian's title to the Christian framework.

3 'Oremus et pro Christianissimo imperatore vel rege nostro. *Illo*, ut deus omnipotens subditas illis faciat omnes barbaras nationes ad nostram perpetuam pacem', ed. L.C. Mohlberg, *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae* (Rome 1960) p.65.

> Suscipe domine preces et hostias ecclesiae tuae pro salute famuli tui *illius* supplicantis, et in protectione fidelium populorum antiqua brachii tui operare miracula, ut superatis pacis inimicis secura tibi serviat *Christiana* libertas.[1]

Such an emphasis on *Christianitas* indeed endured not only as a result of the popularization of the *Hadrianum* sacramentary, but is also apparent in the whole development of the sacramentary in the Frankish lands in the ninth century. Similarly, in the *missa in tempore belli,* one of the oldest Gallican texts reused in this sacramentary, the priests seek God's protection for the Christians of the kingdom, and there is altogether implicit the notion that it is this very kingdom of Christians which the Frankish clergy were working to create, which is especially worthy of God's attention, that the Franks are the new 'chosen people'.[2]

At the beginning of this chapter, the potential value for the Frankish clergy of the liturgy as a vital means of instruction as well as the fitting expression of the central elements of the Christian faith was stressed. It was above all in the ceremonial performance and in the wording of the liturgy itself that this potential was to be realized, and that the liturgy's function as a means of instruction can be understood.

It has been suggested that during the ninth century the Mass was made more of a 'sacred mystery' to the people, rather than its being a fully communally performed ritual. Dix has remarked for example that the spirit of the liturgy became strongly clerical, in contrast to the old Roman collective tradition as it had been practised among the early Christians.[3] That is, that the liturgy became the exclusive expression of the clergy, and the congregation were spectators, so that as the beauty and ornament of the liturgy increased, so the active comprehension and participation of the laity decreased. There is indeed some basis for such a remark but in a sense the comprehension and participation of the laity was increased, if we see the laity as an audience participating in the liturgy as they would in a play. It is

1 Ed. Jean Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Gregorien, Supplementum Anianense,* p.424. On the whole question of the use of *Christiana libertas* rather than *Romana libertas* as in all other Sacramentaries, see again Gerd Tellenbach; 'Römischer und christliches Reichsgedanken', *SB Heidelberg* 1934 pp. 1-71, and Walter Ullmann *The Growth of Papal Government in the Middle Ages* (London 1953) p. 62.

2 Supplementum Anianense p. 441. 'Deus cuius regnum regnum est omnium saeculorum supplicationes nostras clementer exaudi et *christianorum regni* tibi subditum protege ut in tua virtute fidentes et tibi placeant et super omnia regna praecellant'.

3 Gregory Dix, 'The idea of the church in the primitive liturgies', *The Parish Communion* (S.P.C.K. n.d.) p. 135.

therefore necessary to determine the actual nature of the participation of the people in the liturgical rites to make a clear distinction between, on the one hand, the actual ceremonial and performance of the Mass, and on the other hand, its words and form.

With regard to the actual ceremonial of the Mass, it has recently been suggested as the 'drama of the Middle Ages' in which the Mass itself is a 'rememorative drama depicting the life ministry, crucifixion and resurrection of Christ'. Christ was understood to be present at every mass, and thus dramatic significance was sought at every point of the service and of the Christian year.[1] Little description of ceremonial is contained in the Sacramentaries themselves, apart from very terse rubrics. Most of our information therefore, comes from descriptions and commentaries on the Sacraments made by various Carolingian theologians. From what is known, it is quite clear that the ritual performance of the Mass, with its processions and ceremonial, was charged with a high degree of religious symbolism, which would have had an intensifying effect on the people's response to the mass, and their recognition of its full significance.

Provision was made in the episcopal statutes for the people to have the significance of the liturgical rites explained to them by their parish priests.[2] We can only assume that, as well as the procedure of the Mass, the significance of the Eucharist, the importance of the prayers, hymns and readings, and the function of the priest, the people would be taught the significance of the gestures, processions, blessings and various positions taken up by the clergy during the service. For example,

1 O.B. Hardison, *Christian Rite and Christian Drama in the Middle Ages* (Baltimore 1969) p. 44. The excellence of Hardison's book and the plausibility of his two theses, (*A*) that the Mass was consciously interpreted as drama during the ninth century, and (*B*) that representational ceremonies were common in the Roman liturgy long before the earliest manuscripts of the *Quem Quaeritis* play, is somewhat vitiated by his almost total reliance on the liturgical exegisis of Amalarius of Metz as evidence for 'ninth-century attitudes' towards the Mass. As will be evident a little later in this chapter, there was a strong and articulate body of contemporary opinion which condemned much of Amalarius's exposition as the fanciful creations of his own imagination, which bore but little relation to what most clergy thought, or were supposed to think. Thus although Hardison's main thesis is basically sound, and makes very good sense indeed, his evidence in his first chapter, 'The liturgy as sacred drama' must force one to have reservations. On the other hand, his following two chapters on the 'Lenton *Agon*' and 'Christus Victor' are more closely based on Frankish liturgies in use and are wholly illuminating, careful and intelligent discussions, to which my debt in the next few pages will be obvious. He is one of the few scholars who has made a detailed study of the early liturgies in the particular context of their dramatic impact.

2 For example, by Theodulph of Orleans and Haito of Basle. Theodulph of Orleans Statuta I c.22, 28, 29 and 46. *PL* 105, cols 198-208. Haito of Basle, *Capitula ecclesiastica* c.2 *MGH Cap* I, p. 363.

the people would be told that, when they processed from the church on Palm Sunday to a place outside which represented the Mount of Olives, they represented the people of Jerusalem who welcomed Christ into the city, waving palms and singing his praises.[1] Such a hymn as the famous *Gloria laus et honor* attributed to Theodulph of Orleans would be sung on this occasion.

Hardison has demonstrated the dramatic import of much of the ceremonial observances customary in the church in the ninth century.[2] During the season of Lent the church was devoid of colour or ornament and the Gloria was dropped from the rites from Ash Wednesday until Easter Eve because of its identification with the angel chorus which celebrated the nativity. On Ash Wednesday itself, the congregation was instructed in the proper Lenten practices, based on the Epistle from Joel,[3] while the whole season of Lent was that of the Lenten *Agon* or spiritual struggle, in which the connection between fasting and Christian warfare is explicit: 'concede nobis Domine, praesidia inclitiae Christianae incohare jejuniis'.[4]

As the weeks of Lent passed, the imminence of death and sorrow become ever more explicit. Or, as Hardison puts it, it is in the events of Holy Week that the culmination of the Lenten *Agon* is to be observed when 'the *agon* of the preceding weeks leads with ritual inevitability to abuse, defilement, torture and destruction, the Christian embodiment of the *spargamos* of pagan religion'.[5] A vivid pictorial image of sorrow and shame was presented on Passion Sunday, where it was customary, at the point in the Gospel where it says, 'Iesus autem abscondit se' to shroud the cross and any holy images in the church. These remained covered until Easter Day. On Good Friday, the most powerful reminder of the death of Christ was the cessation of the daily Mass, for the eucharist was the symbol of the living Christ. It is easy to imagine emotional responses to the events as they were presented on this day, Good Friday, above all. The atmosphere was one of sorrow and mourning, the church desolate, the altar bare, the cross

1 Amalarius's description here, Hanssens II pp. 58-9, is one of the instances when his account is reliable. He said: 'in memoriam illius rei nos per ecclesias nostras solemus portare ramos et clamare: Osanna'. And compare Hrabanus Maurus, *De clericorum institutione PL* 107. col. 347 a-b, c.35, *De die Palmorum.*

2 An old but still useful discussion is that by Oswald Reichel, *Solemn Mass at Rome in the Ninth Century* (London 1893) while essential of course is J.A. Jungmann, *Missarum Sollemnia* (New York 1959 in English translation).

3 Joel 2; 12-19, esp. v.12. 'Nunc ergo dicit Dominus convertimini ad me in toto corde vestro, in ieiunio et in fletu et in planctu ...'.

4 O.B. Hardison, *Christian Rite and Christian Drama*, pp. 180, and 80-177.

5 *Ibid.* p. 130.

and images shrouded, the lights extinguished and the clergy garbed in black.[1] The complicated colour system with which we are familiar today was a later development. In the Frankish period, white and black were the principal colours; white of course symbolized purity and light; the catechumens for example wore white robes at their baptism. Egeria's description of the observance and emotion of Good Friday in fourth-century Jerusalem is probably as applicable to the response of the ninth century audience: 'the emotion shown, and the mourning by all the people is wonderful, for there is none, either great or small, who on that day, during those hours, does not lament more than can be conceived that the Lord had suffered these things for us'.[2] As Hardison observed, the joy and hope of the Resurrection was a far more difficult and moreover, alien concept to represent than the sorrow and imminence of death of most of Lent. The ceremonies of Maundy Thursday, the reconciliation of the penitents, and the blessing of the holy oil; and particularly those ceremonies of Easter Eve, and kindling of the paschal fire[3] and baptism of the new catechumens, were the liturgical heralding of the rejoicing of Easter Day itself, where the lights, white robes of the priests, the singing of the Creed and the Gloria, and the resumption of the eucharist were all the most emphatic proclamation of the joyful Eastertide.

The emphasis of the liturgical symbolism, the alternate stresses on mourning, repentance, praise, thanksgiving and joy, indicate that it was above all designed to make its strongest appeal to the people's emotions and sensibility rather than to their reason or intellect. Every dramatic effect was to be employed to induce what amounts to *catharsis,* an intense response to the events of Christ's life on earth, his Passion and his Resurrection. As we observed in the sermons, the instruction of the people in matters of faith was undertaken on the basis of an identification of the Frankish people with the first hearers of Christ's teaching in Judaea. The responsibility and obligations acquired as a consequence of their embracing the Christian faith at baptism were charged with a deeper meaning and significance because of the participation of the people in the liturgical rites and then receiving the sacraments.

As the audience of a drama therefore, the participation of the laity

1 For a lucid summary of the development of ceremonial, see Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London 1949) pp. 397-433.

2 *Itinerarium Egeriae* (Peregrinatio Aetheriae) XXXVII. 7. ed Otto Prinz (Heidelberg 1960) p. 47.

3 This ceremony became one of the most elaborate of all during the ninth century. Even the incense pressed into the candle to represent the five wounds of Christ had its special blessing formula. For the whole set of formulae see Jean Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Gregorien,* pp. 567-98.

in the Mass acquired a unique character, for their actual presence, and their emotional and aesthetic response to the ritual would have offset the lack of any complete comprehension of the written words. Nevertheless, there is evidence of a certain withdrawal of the *Sacerdotes* from the *laicales* in the liturgy. For example, there was the change effected in the recitation and ceremonial of the canon of the Mass during the Carolingian period, whereby the silent prayer was extended to include every word from the *Te Igitur* onwards. This change was also reflected in the iconography of the Frankish sacramentaries for it is the *T* initial of the *Te Igitur* which received the fullest powers of the illuminator's art, as it represented the beginning of the most sacred part of the Mass.[1]

Eisenhofer suggested that the result of this extension of the part reserved for the priest alone was that the core of the Mass became the unilateral exclusive concern of the celebrant, and the *plebs sancta* the passive spectators.[2] According to this interpretation, the Mass was deliberately being made more of a 'sacred mystery' to the people rather than being a collective and communally performed ritual. In terms of the recitation of prayer and actual action and movement, it is indeed apparent that there was a marked tendency, apart from the great increase in choral singing, to stress the laity's function in religious ceremonial, and indeed with the whole *ecclesia,* as recipients and observers initially, and participants only to a limited degree. In some respects it must be acknowledged that the laity played but a passive role, in contrast to the active role of the clergy. The laity received God's grace only through the mediation of the priest. They received all the sacraments of the church from the ministers of the church; they were instructed by the clergy in all the ways in which they could appeal to, or praise, God, and follow in the footsteps of Christ's disciples.

The dramatic impact of the liturgy however lent to the relative 'passivity' of the role of the laity a vital element, which meant that their collective involvement in the Mass, while being different in character perhaps from that of the early Christians, was nevertheless a corporate participation. This becomes quite clear if the language and form of the liturgy in use in the Frankish lands are considered.

What has been described as the 'sacral stylization of liturgical Latin'[3]

1 See for example the 'T' initial in the sacramentary of Stavelot BL Add 16605, 11r. An article on the iconography of the *Te igitur* prayer in medieval sacramentaries is in preparation.

2 L. Eisenhofer, *The Liturgy of the Roman Rite* (Fribourg 1961) p. 305.

3 The phrase is that of Christian Mohrmann, *Liturgical Latin, its Origin and Character* (London 1959).

poses a crucial question in the context of the Carolingian reform programme. If the Frankish king and clergy were so anxious that all the people be instructed in the faith and understand fully its tenets, as they affirm that they were, why then was not the whole office of the Mass conducted in the vernacular rather than this requirement being confined to the homilies?

The sources themselves restrict speculation, for they can be interpreted in two different ways. Some prayers do exist in the vernacular, namely, those designed to be recited by the people during the service; the Gloria, Creed, Pater Noster and Confessional and Penitential Prayers.[1] It was also explicitly decreed in the capitularies and councils that these prayers should be known and understood. The sacramentaries are not conclusive for they only contain those prayers and blessings to be pronounced by the celebrant himself. The sung portions of the Mass, hymns, psalms and Creed, could reasonably be expected to remain in Latin, although the Murbach hymns suggest that hymns in the vernacular were also sung during the Mass.[2]

Now, either the clergy were deliberately confining the laity's vocal contribution and their full understanding of the liturgy to these few vernacular prayers and the homily, or these same prayers represent a considerable extension towards the people, or at least, concession to their ignorance of Latin. Jungmann indeed favoured the latter alternative and interpreted the translation of the people's prayers into the vernacular as evidence of the Carolingian clergy's attempts to draw the people into the liturgy.[3] It was also specifically required that the Creed and Lord's Prayer be known to every Christian, every age, sex and condition, men and women, the servants, the freedman, the boys, the married man as well as the unmarried girls.[4] Such a levelling of society, aimed at the participation of every member of the community in Christian rites, can hardly be interpreted as exclusive, for

1 Printed in E. Steinmeyer, *Kleinere Althochdeutsche Denkmäler* (Berlin 1916) and K. Müllenhoff und W. Scherer, *Denkmäler Deutscher Poesie und Prosa* (Berlin 1892). 'Good' Latin versions of these prayers were also required however, as can be seen from Alcuin's praise of Paulinus of Aquileia's rendering of the Creed. *MGH Epp* IV, p. 220. For details and discussion of these prayers see chapter 6.

2 Ed. Ursula Daab, *Drei Reichenauer Denkmäler der Altalemannischen Frühzeit* (Tübingen 1963) pp. 29-76.

3 J. Jungmann, *Missarum Sollemnia,* trans E.A. Brunner (New York 1959) p.65.

4 *MGH Conc* II i, Council of Friuli, 796-7, p. 189. 'Symbolum vero et orationem dominicam omnis Christianus memoriter sciat, omnis aetas, omnis sexus, omnisque conditio, masculini, feminae, iuvenes, senes, servi, liberi, pueri, coniugati, innuptaeque puellae, quia sine hac benedictione nullus poterit in caelorum regno percipere portionem'. And compare Synod of Frankfurt, 794, c.33. *ibid.* p.169.

here we have a precept which cuts right across all social barriers and delineations.

Certainly there is evidence apart from the words of the liturgy that the people contributed to the liturgy. The best example is that it was the particular responsibility, even honour, according to most of the Carolingian episcopal statutes,[1] of the people in each parish to offer the oblations for the Mass. That is, the people baked and brought the bread to the church that was to be consecrated and transformed into the symbol of the living Christ. That their homely offerings could be so mystically transformed can only have made a singularly profound impression in the laity, for it was their particular contribution that became the central object of the whole sacramental ritual. It is, furthermore, a repeated assertion by the bishops that the whole point of the Mass was the participation of the people, and no priest was supposed to celebrate the Mass alone.[2] At this stage too, communion in both kinds was the general rule, and the cup was not withheld from the laity. Indeed, the people were told that their receiving of the unleavened bread and wine as to remind them that Christ had died for every one of them, and that the mixing of water with the wine represented the union of the *fideles* with Christ, a union that began with the incarnation.[3] It is not known how many times the laity received communion in the course of a year. It was obligatory to receive it at least three times a year: at Christmas, Easter and Pentecost, but the reiterations that the laity be exhorted to come to church on every feast day and festival and that Mass be celebrated on these days, coupled with the above mentioned prescription against private masses, suggest that fairly frequent communion was received by the people.[4]

1 For example, Theodulph of Orleans, *Statuta* I c.24. *PL* 105, col. 198. 'Concurrendum est etiam cum oblationibus ad missarum sollemnia'. On the offertory, see for example, Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London 1949) pp. 110-23.

2 Solitary Masses are forbidden for example in Theodulph's *Statuta* I c.7. 'sacerdos missam solus nequaquam celebret, quia sicut illa celebrari non potest sine salutatione sacerdotis, responsione plebis, admonitione sacerdotis, responsione nihilominus plebis, ita nimirum nequaquam ab uno debet celebrari ...'

3 Such was the interpretation accorded the water and wine (following Isidore of Seville) by Walafrid Strabo: 'ne vinum in sacrificio sine aquae admixtione offeratur ut videlicet per hoc indicetur, populos qui secundum Joannem aquae sunt, a Christo, cuius sanguis in calice est, dividi non debere. Ergo, nec vinum sine aqua, nec aqua sine vino offertur, quia nec Christus aliter quam pro populo suo passus est, nec aliter populus quam per passionem Christi potest salvari'. Ed. A Knoepfler *De exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationis ecclesiasticis rerum*, c.16 (Munich 1890) pp. 38-9.

4 There are also the exhortations to come to Mass contained in the sermons, and in the advice to priests contained in the episcopal statutes. For example, Theodulph of Orleans, *Statuta* I c.24. *PL* 105, col. 198. On the frequency of communion in the early Middle Ages see the accounts in, for example, Josef Jungmann, *Missarum Sollemnia;* L. Duschesne, *Origines de Culte Chretien* (Paris 1925); L. Eisenhofer, *Handbuch der Katholischen Liturgik* (Freiburg-im-Breisgau 1932); and Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London 1949).

In the church architecture of the time is reflected the reservation of the most mysterious parts of the Mass. The structure of the altar for example gradually evolved from a table with a space all round it, behind which a priest stood facing the people, to the more rigid structure, surmounted often by a reliquary, before which the priest stood.[1] Thus, at the supreme moment, the priest would now have his back towards the people. Nothing could be more excluding than that. Architectural innovation also made explicit provision for the increase in the numbers of the congregations, and churches such as that of St Martin of Tours were designed to accommodate throngs of pilgrims.[2] The cult of relics was becoming increasingly popular too, a sure indication of popular piety. The relics of St Germanus for example were ceremonially installed in the crypt of St Germain d'Auxerre in 859. There were too, greater demands for choir space, and the Westwork was a prominent functional addition to Carolingian churches to cater for this demand.[3] Generally, Carolingian churches were built to house many altars, to satisfy the extensive requirements and to provide an impressive setting for processional liturgies.[4] Such structures suggest that the clergy had considerable success in encouraging the people to come to the church. It is also apparent that there was a didactic intention behind the ecclesiastical architecture as well as the whole liturgy itself. Conant cites the particular example of the placing of the chapel of the Saviour in the church of St Riquier, cut from the main nave by an arched screen, whose 'bold form was clearly didactic in intent ... to emphasize the cult of the Saviour in a rather superstitious period when it tended to be obscured by devotions to local saints and wonder-workers'.[5] Of further value for the instruction and edification of the laity were the wall paintings and mosaics,[6] the most famous

1 Described by Edmund Bishop, 'The historical development of the altar', *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford 1918) pp. 20-39.

2 The church of St Martin of Tours was further enlarged in about 903-18. K. Conant, *Carolingian and Romanesque Architecture, 800-1200.* (Harmondsworth 1966 (1959)) p.38. St Martin's of Tours was more than once enlarged before 903.

3 On the Westworks and their relation (functional) to the liturgy in particular, see Carol Heitz, *Les rapports entre l'Architecture et la Liturgie* (Paris 1963). See also Jean Hubert, *Carolingian Art* (London 1971) chapter 1.

4 See in particular K. Conant, *Carolingian Architecture*, pp. 43-69.

5 *Ibid.* p 444.

6 The *Libri Carolini* affirm the usefulness of pictures to instruct the people. *MGH Conc* II ii Suppl. (Hannover 1924).

example of which are the mosaics at St Germigny-des-Pres designed under the direction of Theodulph of Orleans,[1] the ninth-century paintings which still survive in the church of St George at Oberzell, which was built in 836, and those in the abbey church of St John at Mustair.[2]

The drama of liturgical rites, architectural and pictorial innovation, the demand for material offerings from the people, and the evidence we have for the encouragement of popular piety, singing and veneration of relics, all suggest that the Frankish clergy did believe they should make the effort to ensure that the laity were comprehending and even delighted participants in the offices of the church. It would be a mistake therefore to interprete the paucity of vernacular prayers as a wilful desire on the part of the clergy to keep the congregations in ignorance. Apart from the Slavic liturgy of Cyril and Methodius, there was after all, little precedent for the expedient of rendering the liturgy into the vernacular in the ninth century. Their translation was moreover, partly influenced by their coming from a place where the liturgy could surely still be understood by the laity. The Franks do not appear to have resorted to a similar expedient, but make provision instead for the explanation of all portions of the Mass to the people,[3] while the particular portions of the service recited by the people, and the homily, were in their own language, or at least, they were taught the meaning of these prayers in their own language.

That the liturgy should remain in Latin is perhaps not so surprising. Not only was Latin the literary language, the language of the Bible and of the writings of the Fathers, it was also regarded as one of the three sacred languages.[4] Furthermore, the ultimately Roman origins of the liturgical prayers and the closeness of communication between the Frankish church and Rome meant that the rites were first received in the Frankish lands in their Latin form. The prevailing attitudes towards the worthiness of the vernacular as a vehicle for matters of faith,[5]

1 On Theodulph of Orleans and the apse of St Germigny-des-Pres see now Ann Freeman, 'Further studies in the *Libri Carolini*', *Speculum* 40 (1965) 203-87.

2 Some of these are illustrated in Jean Hubert, *Carolingian Art*, pp. 11-27.

3 For example, Theodulph of Orleans, *Statuta* II, c.2. ed. C. de Clercq *La Legislation* I, p. 323. And on Cyril and Methodius, see Antonin Dostal, 'Sprachen probleme in der Zeit Cyrills und Methods', *Das Grossmährische Reich* (Prague 1966) pp. 329-55.

4 As defined for example by Isidore of Seville in his *Etymologiae* IX.i, ed. W.M. Lindsay (Oxford 1911). 'De linguis gentium ... Tres sunt autem linguae sacrae: Hebraea Graeca Latina, quae toto orbe maxime excellunt'. The Irish (characteristically) added their own language to this group.

5 Such as is expressed for example by Alcuin in a letter to Hugbald. 'Verba Dei legantur in sacerdotali convivio. Ibi decet lectorem audiri non citharistam sermones

coupled with the sheer practical difficulties of translating the text into the vernacular for each particular region in the Frankish lands argue against it being thought practicable to produce a vernacular liturgy. A series of translated texts would have been rather a futile exercise in view of the averred intent to provide a semblance of uniformity in the Frankish lands. Furthermore, the possibility must be conceded that the majority of those who heard and participated in the various offices were the members of the cathedral canonries and monasteries who would have had at least a partial understanding of Latin.

Surely, if the people had had explained to them the symbolic meaning of the rituals they observed and in which they participated, it was sufficient for them to receive and participate in the eucharist. In other words, it was unnecessary that the full literal meaning of the Mass be understood, so long as the symbolic meaning was quite clear.

It is rather the special character of liturgical Latin itself which accounts for the retention of Latin as the language of the rites of religion. In her discussion of the character of liturgical Latin Christine Mohrmann drew on Paul, I Corinthians, 14:14, and the commentary by Ambrosiaster on this text, to explain why the liturgy remained in Latin. Ambrosiaster said that anyone praying in a familiar tongue prays with both mind and spirit, but whenever he prays in a foreign tongue his spirit as a result of his baptism still knows what he is praying: that is, the spiritual value of a Christian's prayer is not dependent on its intellectual value. What is involved here in fact is the conflict between religious expression and communication. The liturgy used by the Franks itself provides us with perhaps the best answer to our enquiry about the place of Latin in the liturgy. In the introductory section of the recitation of the symbol at the ceremony of baptism included in the eight-century Gelasian sacramentary the question is asked:

> Qua lingua confitentur dominum nostrum Iesum Christum?

and the response is given:

> Latinae. Adnuntia fidem ipsorum qualiter credunt.

The acolyte then puts his hand on the head of the infant and the Nicene Creed is recited, after which the priest comments: 'Haec summa

patrum non carmina gentilium. Quid Hinieldus (Ingeld) cum Christo?' *MGH Epp* iv, p. 183 11 21-2. Otfrid of Weissenburg refers to the *laicorum cantus obscenus* in his prefatory letter to Liutpert of Mainz, ed. Oskar Erdmann, *Otfrids Evangelienbuch* (Tübingen 1973) p.4.

est fidei nostrae, dilectissimi nobis, haec verba sunt symbuli, non sapientiae humano sermone facta sed vera divinitus ratione disposita'.[1] This is a quite explicit elevation of the Creed, and it follows, of the whole liturgy, above common human discourse.

The words of the liturgy were an attempt to realize the words of Augustine: 'Et tamen Deus, cum de illo nihil digne dici possit, admisit humanae vocis obsequium, et verbis nostris in laude sua gaudere nos voluit'.[2] A form of language was demanded which rose above that of ordinary everyday speech in order that the words and ritual in themselves be a work of art as well as a form of worship. In short, the words of the liturgy were a form of worship in themselves.

We can only guess at the people's understanding of the Mass as a result of their instruction and participation, although it can have been little different from the emotional fervour described by Egeria, or the simple summary recorded by a Corbie monk at the end of the eighth century:

> Pro quod causis celebratur missa? Pro multis causis. Prima aut sepe rogant dominum. Secunda ut Deus suscipiat preces et oblationes. Tertio pro offerentibus et defunctis. Quarta pro osculo pacis. Quinta ut sanctificata sit oblatio. Sexta ut confirmetur per spiritum sanctum oblatio in corpore et sanguinem Christi. Septima ut cantetur pater noster, in qua continentur VII petitiones ...

(And there follows a detailed description and explanation of the Lord's Prayer.)[3]

On a far more sophisticated, even extreme level, was the liturgical exegesis of Amalarius of Metz, whose work was the great exception to the general convention of exposition of the liturgy prevailing at the time. These latter works cannot really be described as exegesis in fact, for they are relatively unsophisticated, straightforward expositions, which proceed by a descriptive explanation of each stage in the offices, drawing heavily, and exclusively, on the works of the patristic authors on the subject. Remigius of Auxerre, writing at the end of the ninth century, is one exception in this respect.[4] Thus most scholars augmented their exposition from tradition and authoritative views. They provide a great contrast to the at times imaginative extravagance

1 L.C. Mohlberg (ed) *Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae* Vat. reg. lat. 316, p. 50, and see also Christine Mohrmann 'Sakralsprache und Ungangsprache', *Archiv fur Liturgiewissenschaft* 10 (1968) 344-54.

2 Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana.* I.6.6. *PL* 34 col. 21.

3 From BN lat. 12444 ed. A. Wurnburger, *Über eine ungedruckte Kanonen-sammlung aus dem 8 Jht* (Munich 1890) p. 60.

4 Remigius of Auxerre, *PL* 101, cols 1173-1287. This treatise is sometimes attributed to Alcuin, but is more likely to be the work of Remigius, for it

of Amalarius, who averred that he was his own main source in his exposition of the liturgy, that everything he had written he had read 'deep within his own spirit'.[1]

It is all too easy, because of the manner in which his critics recorded Amalarius's activities, to view the latter under the spell of Florus the Deacon, and regard him as a piece of somewhat disreputable extravaganza. On the other hand, modern studies have perhaps gone too far in the other direction,[2] possibly mislead by the authoritativeness and coherence of the works in the excellent edition by Jean Hanssens,[3] and claimed for Amalarius a greater worthiness than perhaps he deserves.

Amalarius of Metz (*c.*775-*c.*850) was the first Carolingian scholar to make a systematic attempt to interpret the liturgy, exegesis hitherto having been confined to the text of the Bible. It is possible that Amalarius's attitudes towards the liturgy had been influenced by his observation of Byzantine ritual which he would have had the opportunity to observe on his diplomatic mission to Constantinople in 810. Certainly the particular form of allegorical interpretation of the liturgy which became popular in the Frankish lands seems to have been influenced by Greek methods of exegesis.[4] After his return from the eastern empire in 812, Amalarius settled down somewhere in the West Frankish kingdom to write his commentaries on the liturgy, with a zeal that sometimes bordered on the indiscreet. His *magnum opus* was his *De Officiis*,[5] a treatise in four books on all aspects of the Office, in which he provided an allegorical meaning for many of their features. His work has been treated, as was remarked above, as if it expresses typical ninth-century attitudes towards both the liturgy as a whole, and to the symbolic significance of its performances, as well as some of the rites. It should be stressed however, that Amalarius was unique,

shows close similarities with the methods of exposition employed by his contemporaries at Auxerre. See also the comments on the Auxerre school of exegesis in H. Barré, *Les Homéliaires Carolingiens de l'Ecole d'Auxerre*, Studi e Testi 225 (Vatican City 1962).

1 Concilium Carisiacensis, 838 *MGH Conc* II ii p. 778, although his exegesis was also evidently influenced a great deal by the writings of both Isidore of Seville and the Pseudo-Germanus.

2 For example A. Cabaniss, *Amalarius of Metz* (Syracuse 1954) p. 65.

3 Amalarius of Metz, ed. J. Hanssens, *Amalarii Episcopi Opera Liturgica Omnia*, Studi e Testi (Rome 1948-50).

4 See M.L.W. Laistner, 'Antiochene exegesis in western Europe during the Middle Ages', *HTR* (1947) 19-31, and also the new evidence in B. Bischoff, 'Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der Lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter', *Sacris Erudiri* 6 (1954) 189-281.

5 See above, n.3.

or at least, so his reception leads us to suppose. Not only were many of his interpretations judged to be beyond the pale, but the manner in which he modified the chant in particular, and attempted to introduce it among the clergy at Lyons, considerably annoyed a number of his colleagues. Agobard of Lyons for example protested about Amalarius's introduction of a method of chanting with 'Theatrales soni et scenicae modulationes'[1] and it was Amalarius's bullying of the Lyons clergy about his antiphonary apparently, which precipitated his arraignment before his fellow clergy.

Much of his teaching and interpretation must have struck a responsive chord in the minds of his clerical readers, especially such comments as that on the importance of reading the Gospel: 'Quod infixit sacerdos per suam deprecationem in corde diaconi hoc unusquisque fidelis studeat infigere animo suo'.[2] The immediate popularity of Amalarius's liturgical exegesis, judging from the manuscript tradition,[3] suggests that even if he stood apart from his contemporaries because of it, and was the subject of acrimonious dispute among his colleagues, many of his fellow clergy were in fact ready for it and read it. In 853 for example, either Remigius or Florus of Lyons complained bitterly.

> Ut Amalarium de fidei ratione consulerent, qui et vetis et libris suis mendaciis, et erroribus, et phantasticis atque haereticis disputationibus plenis omnes pene apud Franciam ecclesias, et nonnullas etiam aliarum regionum, quantum in se fuit infecit atque corrupit; ut non tam ipse de fide interrogari, quam omnia scripta eius saltem post mortem ipsius debuerint igne consumi, ne simpliciores quique, qui eos multum diligere et legendo frequentare dicuntur eorum lectione et inaniter occuparentur, et perniciose fallerentur ac deciperentur.

Thus there were many 'simpletons' among the clergy who were reported to love Amalarius's books and read them assiduously.[4]

The appeal of some of Amalarius's interpretations is indeed apparent, but it is easy to see too that they could have been found too contrived, such as his description of the eight days of the catechumenate preceding baptism on Easter Eve as representing the entire course of earthly life,[1] or the Mass itself being interpreted as a progression of tableaux of the life of Christ from his birth to the Ascension.[2] Sometimes Amalarius was unable to provide a fuller meaning. He commented for instance that 'although the washing of the pavement of the church serves a practical purpose, that of cleaning it for the Easter festival, nevertheless a deeper meaning for this action is not lacking',[3] and does not go on. Presumably a parallel could be drawn with the Christian who cleanses his soul through penance and confession in preparation for Easter.

1 Agobard, *De Correctione antiphonarii PL* 104, col. 334 C.

2 Hanssens, II, p. 309.

3 Described by Jean Hanssens, *Amalarii Opera Liturgica Omnia* I, pp. 83-91. Seven manuscripts are at St Gall for example.

4 *PL* 121 col. 1054 C. c.40. Cabaniss when he translated this particular passage rendered, rather misleadingly, *simpliciores* as 'simple ones' from which Hardison was lead to deduce that it meant simple folk and that Amalarius was popular reading matter among the common people, rather than among simple (i.e. uneducated) minded clergy, as it seems certain Florus intended *simpliciores* to be understood.

Amalarius's intention therefore had been to provide and teach a deeper meaning for each liturgical act, and indeed to introduce rules, gestures and processions to act as the outward expression of his exegesis. With his interpretations he hoped to give the fullest doctrinal and theological implications to the outward expressions of the faith that were embodied in religious ritual. He hoped too, both to add to the clergy's performance of the rites by thus 'enriching' their understanding, and to give to the Mass a greater prominence as an expression of the faith and as a vehicle for instruction. The criticism he received makes it apparent that he did not choose perhaps the best interpretations and methods in his exegesis. Indeed, he laid himself open to charges of heresy, charges based partly on the criticism and probably wilful misunderstanding of Florus the Deacon, and it was at Quierzy in 838 that he was summoned before the assembled clergy to answer charges of heresy.[4]

The major charges of heresy involved two passages in the third book of his *De Officiis.* In his description of the canon of the mass, Amalarius divided it into two parts, the first from the *Te igitur* until *et in electorum tuorum iubeas grege numerari* he called the sacrifice of the elect, and the second, up to *nobis quoque peccatoribus,* the sacrifice of the sinner.[5] Florus therefore accused him of saying there were two

1 Hanssens II, pp. 253 ff. For an excellent and detailed discussion and description of Amalarius's presentation of the Mass as a sacred drama, see O.B. Hardison, *Christian Rite and Christian Drama,* Essay II, pp. 35-79.

2 Hanssens II *Liber Officiis* I 12:36, p. 80.

3 *De Officiis,* II 23.5. Hanssens II, p. 331 and adds that III 24.1, 2. For as there were two altars in Moses's tabernacle, and in Solomon's temple, one of incense, the other of burnt offering, so there are two sacrifices offered in the Christian church. Hanssens II p. 337.

4 Concilium Carisiacensis, *MGH Conc* II ii, p. 778. In addition to Hanssens, an old but still useful account of Amalarius's life and writings, as well as a discussion of his heresies is to be found in R. Mönchemeier, *Amalar von Metz. Sein Leben und Seine Schriften.* (Münster-in-Westphalen 1893) particularly at pp. 49-52.

5 *De officiis* III 35.1-3. Hanssens II p. 367 ff. For Florus's scathing opinion of this, see *PL* 119, col. 74 and see also, L. Duschesne, *Christian Worship* (London 1927) p. 219.

sacrifices, and that to speak of the 'elect' smacked of Pelagianism. Mönchemeier suggested here that Amalarius probably meant the saints when he referred to the *electi.* A further charge was his exposition of the threefold fraction of the host, saying that the body of Christ was threefold.[1] He said too that the bread was the body of Christ and the wine the soul and that only both together constituted the whole Christ, so that mixing the wine and bread in the chalice meant the rejoining of Christ's soul with his body. These charges, together with scathing comments about his liturgical allegories generally and his pagan allusions (he had described King David as being inflamed with Mars) were levelled at Amalarius at Quierzy. The clergy there assembled were evidently far from enthusiastic about his writings, and it was conceivably in some genuine alarm at the harmful effects such teachings could have on the ingenuous and naive minds of a semi-literate clergy that Amalarius was summoned and his opinions condemned as so extreme as to be positively dangerous.[2]

In such strong terms therefore was Amalarius condemned. Florus indeed accused him of preferring the fancy of his own imagination to the obvious sense of scripture, and was thus overreaching himself, as he had done in introducing his own form of the chant at Lyons. Undoubtedly personal animosity on the part of the opposing clergy had a great deal to do with the violence of the attack upon Amalarius. One has only to read the *furibondae ac contumeliosae notae* of Florus the Deacon in the margin of the Lyons manuscript of the *De Officiis*[3] to realize that this was no ordinary disagreement with another man's views, but that Florus's vituperations stemmed also from a deep rooted personal resentment of Amalarius. The latter had been made the incumbent of the see of Lyons during the exile of Agobard, Florus's bishop, and had attempted to enforce his Antiphonary in the churches of his diocese and in particular in the cathedral church at Lyons.[4] It was his conduct as a usurping bishop that had raised Florus's ire, ruled no doubt by a personal jealousy of a successful man which could voice itself in irritation at the habit Amalarius had of boasting of his exploits in Rome and Constantinople.

1 Amalarius's other errors according to Florus, *Adversus Amalarium PL* 119, col. 74 ff., at 82A and 80-4.

2 Concilium Carisiancensis *MGH Conc* II. ii, pp. 778 ff.

3 Paris BN nouv, acq. lat. 329 printed by Hanssens II, pp. 567-80. For example, *insania,* vanitas, insanissima fal(sitas) quae multum aber(at) a veritate evangelica: Mira vanita(s) execrabilis dementia. Bene omnia dict(a) contra amal(arium).

4 Only the preface to this work is now extant, printed in Hanssens I, pp 361-3 and Amalarius's treatise, *De Ordine Antiphonarii,* is in Hanssens III, pp.9-109.

Despite his condemnation, and the fact that he cannot be taken as representative of the liturgical thinking or practice prevailing in the Frankish kingdoms in the ninth century, his undoubted success in some quarters, and his position as a bishop of some public standing make him a significant figure in the evolution of the liturgy. He offended the basically conservative spirit of his fellows, he was thought to be a threat, but his attempt at least is significant, for he provides a further example of an individual Frankish bishop's efforts to use the liturgy primarily as a means of instruction and edification for his clergy and congregation.

The affair of Amalarius brings into sharp relief the different attitudes prevailing within the ranks of the Frankish clergy about the means by which Christian tenets and rituals were to be applied, and the content and comprehensiveness of the explanations. The affair is symptomatic of certain divisions within the Frankish church, for as in the differing interpretations of the episcopal office observed in an earlier chapter, there were also distinct schools of thought or sympathy about the function and performance of the liturgy. It is also of great interest that even by 838 such a situation as occurred at Quierzy did so, for even a quarter of a century earlier, the principal preoccupations of the Frankish clergy had been rather to establish *a* text of the liturgy. It is more than likely moreover that there is a real connection between the attitudes evinced by the clergy at Lyons, namely, those of a conservative body, anxious to preserve the liturgy as they knew it, and the fact that it was in this very same region that the *Hadrianum* and its Supplement was first introduced and prescribed, and that in all probability it was the church of Lyons which was most instrumental in the dissemination and popularization of the Mass book compiled by Benedict of Aniane. As was noted above, two of the best manuscripts of this sacramentary come from Lyons, and it is perfectly possible that this was the Mass book used by Florus and the cathedral clergy, and which Amalarius attempted either to modify, or to ignore altogether. There may be in the Amalarius affair therefore, an example of two different reactions to the introduction of the *Hadrianum* and the implications of the imposition of liturgical uniformity which it carried with it.

Throughout the ninth century therefore, the Frankish clergy made every effort both to provide each church and priest with a reliable text of the Mass and offices necessary for the ministry, and to encourage the laity to come to the church. The state of the liturgy at the end of the eighth century and the process of liturgical text production and compilation throughout the ninth century, made it apparent that there was a concentrated purposeful operation directed towards the provision

of a liturgy which would not only conform to the highest standards, and be a fitting form of worship, but also serve to edify and instruct clergy and people. The motives for the remarkable liturgical activity in the ninth century are quite clear, and they are those of the Carolingian reform programme generally; the extirpation of paganism, promotion of unity, the proclamation of Christianity, and above all, the instruction of the people. The liturgy was one of the most crucial elements in the shaping of Frankish society.

5

THE 'FLORILEGIA'

The Christian God made moral demands upon those who professed belief in him.[1] The Christian faith imposed a new ethic and moral code upon the faithful, those newly baptized Christians in the West and East Frankish kingdoms, and interpreted within a Christian context the social responsibility of everyman. At his baptism the catechumen committed himself to a whole new framework of religious and moral obligation.[2] The primitive, or rather, heathen, Germanic view of evil (in so far as this can be determined), had tended to be an objective one, an almost concrete force wielded by malignant creatures, where physical ill was frequently understood to be the cause and explanation of moral ill, and the gods themselves imposed no ethical demands upon believers. Some traces of this old notion of evil being entertained by the Carolingians can be observed, for example, in the attribution of the cause of the invasion of the Northmen to the general wickedness of the people, and it was one of course which they would find very commonly in the Old Testament as well. An increasing concern for morality is, indeed, one of the striking features of the laws formulated in the ninth century, with a manifest zeal for eradicating sin and wickedness which suggests in fact, according to Julius Goebel, some articulate penal theory being read into the existing law.[3]

Not only was there a positive ethical response demanded by the Christian God in contrast to what was demanded by the heathen gods, Christianity also entailed a greater internalization of the apprehension of evil. Some of this can be seen in its process of development in the penitential literature of the eighth and ninth centuries, where at times penances are ordained for the intention to do something wicked, or thinking about something sinful, even were the act itself not performed (a sophisticated theology in fact, not to be fully elaborated until the *Ethics* of Peter Abelard). The Penitentials also illustrate how gradual an interpretation of Christian morality it was, for there the prevailing moral attitudes assess morality largely in relation to social position, the

1 A characteristic also emphasized by Denys Green in his absorbing study, *The Carolingian Lord* (Cambridge 1965).

2 According to both Latin and vernacular catechetical texts extant from the ninth century, such as those in Clm 6325 ff.134^{v}-135^{v} (see Appendix B) and Clm 19410, edited by J.M. Heer, *Ein Karolingischer Missionskatechismus.* Biblische und Patristische Forschungen (Freiburg-im-Breisgau 1910) both in Latin, and the vernacular texts cited at the beginning of chapter 3.

3 Julius Goebel, *Felony and Misdemeanour* (New York 1937) p.94.