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Thesis Summary:

The Dissemination and Reception of the *Ordines Romani* in the Carolingian Church, c.750-900.

The *ordines romani* are products of a ninth-century attempt to correct liturgy across Europe. Hitherto, scholarship has almost exclusively focused on them as sources for the practices of the city of Rome, narrowly defined, disregarding how they were received creatively and reinterpreted in a set of fascinating manuscripts which do not easily fit into traditional categories. This thesis re-envisages these special texts as valuable testimonies of intent and principle. In the past few decades of scholarship, it has been made very clear that what occurred under the Carolingians in the liturgy did not involve the imposition of the Roman rite from above. What was ‘Roman’ and ‘correct’ was decided by individuals, each in their own case, and they created and edited texts for what they needed. These individuals were part of intensive networks of exchange, and, broadly, they agreed on what they were attempting to accomplish. Nevertheless, depending on their own formation, and the atmosphere of their diocese, the same ritual content could be interpreted in numerous different ways.

Ultimately, this thesis aims to demonstrate the usefulness of applying new techniques of assessing liturgical manuscripts, as total witnesses whose texts interpret each other, to the ninth century. Each of the *ordo romanus* manuscripts of the ninth century preserves a fascinating glimpse into the process of working out what ‘correct’ liturgy looked like, by people intensely invested in that proposition. Through them, we can reconceptualise the Carolingian achievement in liturgy, more sympathetically to the great diversity on the ground, but also to the broader goals which united all of these celebrants and intellectuals. In these texts, we can see how the Carolingians really
understood the Roman practices they revered, and how they brought this special holiness to their own cathedrals and monasteries through richly creative re-enactment, not thoughtless replication.
This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text.

It is not substantially the same as any that I have submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for a degree or diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text. I further state that no substantial part of my dissertation has already been submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for any such degree, diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution except as declared in the Preface and specified in the text.

It does not exceed the prescribed word limit for the relevant Degree Committee.
# Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .............................................. ii
Abbreviations ................................................... iv
List of Manuscripts Cited ...................................... v
Introduction ..................................................... 1

## Chapter 1: Collection A of the *Ordines Romani*

- Introduction ................................................ 13
- Part 1: BAV Pal.lat.487 .................................. 28
- Part 2: Montpellier *Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine* 412 .. 36
- Part 3: A Dismembered Manuscript of Murbach ............. 43
- Part 4: Variant Accounts of Holy Week and Ordination .. 48
- Chapter Conclusion: Purposes of Manuscripts of Collection A .... 58

## Chapter 2: Collection B of the *Ordines Romani*

- Introduction ................................................ 60
- Part 1: Verona *Biblioteca Capitolare* XCII ............. 89
- Part 2: Cologne *Dombibliothek* 138 ................... 109
- Part 4: Zurich *Zentralbibliothek* Car C 102 .......... 147
- Part 5: Paris BnF lat.14008 ................................ 160
- Chapter Conclusion: The Pontifical Tradition and its Origins and Purposes ................................ 165

## Chapter 3: Personalising Collections for Different Purposes

- Part 1: Wolfenbüttel *Herzog August Bibliothek*, Cod.4175 (Wissembourg 91) .................................. 175
- Part 2: Albi *Bibliothèque Municipale* 42 ............... 222

## Chapter 4: Explaining the *Ordines Romani*

- Part 1: Amalarius of Metz and the ‘Exegesis’ of the Liturgy .................................................. 228
- Part 2: Manuscripts of *Expositiones* and *Ordines* .......... 245
- Chapter Conclusion: The Carolingian Understanding of ‘Correctio’ ........................................... 254

## Chapter 5: Vienna Cod.Ser.n.2762 and the *Ordines of Ordination*

- Conclusion .................................................. 281
- Bibliography ................................................. 291
Acknowledgments

This thesis has been helped along by many, and I hope that is does them justice. Of my academic colleagues, I would like to single out Susan Rankin, Tessa Webber, Henry Parkes, Suzanne Paul, Giorgia Vocino, Anna Dorofeeva, Harald Buchinger, David Hiley and Eric Palazzo. A number of conferences have provided milestones along the way to this happy end. Special thanks are due to my fellow presenters and the organisers at ‘Texts and Identities’ in Cambridge, Berlin and Vienna, ‘Rethinking Carolingian Correctio’ in Cambridge and Utrecht, ‘Medieval Rites’ at Yale, ‘Senses of Liturgy’ in Bristol, ‘Rewiring Romans’ at the Norwegian Academy in Rome, ‘Ritual and Historiography in the Middle Ages’ in Münster and my colleagues at the Cambridge Medieval History Seminar, among others. For three special months the staff and my fellow award-holders at the British School at Rome made me a home away from home in the most amazing city on Earth. My college for seven years, Queens’, has supported me through them all.

For materially enabling the work without which this thesis could not have been accomplished, I would also like to thank the Trust of Roger and Ingrid Pilkington, the Bibliographical Society, the H.M. Chadwick Fund, Queens’ College, and Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst.

One of the great privileges of studying this stock of texts has been the chance to visit the great libraries and collections of Europe. The staff have been universally welcoming to a scholar, and sincerely interested in discovering what I will do with their manuscripts. For all their help, my gratitude goes to to the staff at the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, the Bibliothèque national de France, the British Library, the Cambridge University Library, the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Zurich Zentralbibliothek, the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Biblioteca Nazionale di Roma, the Biblioteca Alessandrina, the Biblioteca Capitolare of Verona, the Dombibliothek of Cologne, the Bibliothèque Municipale of Albi, Montpellier Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine, the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin and the Biblioteca dell’Abbazia di Montecassino, as well as the countless
other institutions which have kindly put their treasures online and those who have enabled them to do so.

To my friends who have provided no less essential support, Jessica, Jana, Victoria, Siobhan and far too many others to name, thank you for all the joyful years, and many to come. Without my family, none of this would have been even a remote possibility. This piece of work is for them above all, and thus, for George and Anna, my love and thanks. Thomas, your help was truly invaluable. Dad, you’ve allowed me to do more than I thought possible and I hope you always know it.

There could not have been a better supervisor than Rosamond McKitterick. I have learnt so much from her, not only about why we study the Carolingians, but about what it is to be a teacher and mentor. This project was born when she suggested that a little group of texts called the *ordines romani* could be an interesting way to be able to look at a few manuscripts. From that moment on, her guidance has been stalwart and patient. My mother, Chantry Westwell, has always been the greatest supporter and ally I could ever possibly have. I hope I have made you proud. At the very last, these small lines are dedicated to the memory of Marc Davey and Sylvia Holborn.
## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>BnF</td>
<td>Bibliothèque Nationale de France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGH</td>
<td>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conc.</td>
<td>Concilia, Legum Sectio III, Concilia I, F. Maassen (ed.) (Hannover, 1893); Concilia II, A. Werminghoff (ed.) (Hannover, 1906-1908); Concilia V, W. Hartmann, I. Schröder and G.Schmitz (eds) (Hannover, 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epp.</td>
<td>Epistolae II, L. Hartmann (ed.), Gregorius I Papae Registrum Epistolarum (Hannover, 1890); IV-VII Karolini Aevi (Hannover 1895-1932)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRG</td>
<td>Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum in usum scholarum separatim editi, 63 vols. (Hannover, 1871-1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Ordo Romanus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Conventions:
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**Introduction**

It is not enough to study medieval liturgy as the history of texts in the abstract, as if it only ever existed in our neat modern categories. The study of medieval liturgy must also be allowed to become the study of something more complex, the ‘human stories’ which shaped individual texts.¹ These stories are to be found in the testimonies of individual manuscripts, where people and communities each responded in their own way to the demands of performing and understanding rituals. Liturgy has always possessed resonances of allegiance and power. In the Carolingian era (here, c.750-900) this capacity was recognised and, to a new extent, exploited.² While such manuscripts can be often difficult to interpret, the study of medieval liturgy is served well by finding the best techniques to allow them to ‘speak’ on the same terms as they did to their medieval authors. They are composite wholes with unified and coherent messages, not more or less perfect representatives of artificial and idealised categories imposed by liturgists which elide distinction and difference. All of these insights, and some techniques to put them into practice, are to be found in recent scholarship on medieval liturgy, in which the manuscript tradition has begun to lead the agenda.³ Such scholarship built on certain traditions of older liturgical studies where manuscripts had been studied as unique entities, as in the editorial work of the Henry Bradshaw Society, or Alban

---

Dold. Yet it represents a decisive move away from a particular tradition of philological study of the liturgy, where that manuscript witness had often been obscured. Such worm often held liturgy apart from the broader study of history, a dynamic perpetuated by historians as well. The aim was to uncover the ‘development’ of liturgy, through the construction of stemmata. Informed by the religious convictions of the scholars in question, it envisaged the history of the liturgy as one of teleological evolution, inevitably growing towards the modern Roman rite. In this traditional methodology, the most valuable witness was the very first, the original redaction. A proper edition had to offer the hypothetical earliest version of the text (which did not correspond to any single manuscript entirely), from which all others descended. Michel Andrieu’s Les Ordines Romani du haut Moyen Âge is the finest example. Here, Andrieu edited 50 liturgical texts from dozens of manuscripts. Most of those have not been treated in any systematic way since Andrieu’s edition. This thesis will re-examine a selection of these manuscripts from the ninth century. It will attempt to understand the ordines romani not by tracing their intricate textual evolutions, but by considering them in the context of deeply individualised manuscripts into which they were incorporated - manuscripts which made complex statements, within the framework of Carolingian intervention in the liturgy.

One might ask, what, actually, is an ordo romanus? Although the category is referred to without qualification in the classic studies by Vogel, Palazzo and others the question is nonetheless a

---

5 E.g. Gerald Ellard, Ordination Anointings in the Western Church Before 1000 AD (Cambridge MA, 1933), pp.3-4: ‘the growth of liturgical ceremonial there operates first of all by that law of evolution where the rudimentary tends to perfection’.  
6 Bradshaw, Origins of Christian Worship, p.3 diagnoses the problem, and p.91 argues: ‘the original is not the only important historical source’.  
difficult one to answer. Ordo is an extremely broad and general term in the Middle Ages. Even in liturgy, it had numerous meanings. Here it broadly equates to ‘order of service’. According to Andrieu and Vogel, the ordo contained the instructions for the movements, gestures and positions enacted during liturgical service; these were ‘stage directions’ or choreography for liturgy but, strictly, did not contain wording of prayers or readings. However the vast majority of ordines romani do, in fact, contain prayer texts, either in full or (more often) as incipits. An alternative definition might be:

‘an ordo is the description of a liturgical action, or of a series of liturgical actions, including more or less developed indications of the texts to be voiced, aiming at its diffusion, or socialisation, whether this means ritual reproduction or not’

The qualifier romani is intended to distinguish Andrieu’s 50 texts from a multitude of other liturgical texts, mostly smaller and simpler, incorporated in larger volumes such as sacramentaries, though the distinction is not always clear. This qualifier was inherited from the earliest editions by Mabillon and Duchesne, who assumed that the texts they were recording were witnesses of the early medieval Roman liturgy, as practised in Rome. Nevertheless, no ordines romani survive in manuscripts written in early medieval Rome. Every ninth-century manuscript is the product of a Frankish pen, for a Frankish audience. Furthermore, the texts are almost invariably subject to significant Frankish

---


intervention, as Andrieu was the first to demonstrate. This was a problem for Andrieu, and one he never really solved.

Andrieu assumed that the *ordines romani* played a role in a broader programme of reform enacted directly from the Carolingian centre, that is, by direct edict of the Emperor. To him, this reform was a uniform endeavour with a single goal: to replace the decadent indigenous traditions of Francia, grouped under the terminology of the ‘Gallican Rite’, with the purer rituals of Rome.\(^{13}\) Just as the Gregorian Sacramentary from Rome was imposed, or so Andrieu assumed, the *ordines romani* too must have been enforced, as representatives of that authoritative Roman tradition.\(^{14}\) To him, the Franks were primarily passive recipients of this tradition; their own interventions, he thought, were grudging concessions to popular affection, against their own better judgement. But this was what Andrieu and Vogel expected to see, not what the evidence suggests.\(^{15}\) McKitterick pointed out that Carolingian interventions in the liturgy appear to be local initiatives, and differed in nature from one place to another.\(^{16}\) Hen revealed the total lack of evidence for any centralised imposition of

---


\(^{16}\) Rosamond McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms* 789-895 (London, 1977), pp.116-154, at p.129: ‘expediency and necessity were the prime motivators...production of liturgical manuscripts continued to be a largely individual affair...clergy were left a great deal of freedom to determine the proportion in which Frankish and Roman elements were mingled’; Roger Reynolds, ‘The Organisation, Law and Liturgy of the Western Church 700-900’, in Rosamond McKitterick (ed.), *The New Cambridge Medieval History, Volume II: c.700-900* (Cambridge, 1995), pp.618-620; Rosamond McKitterick, ‘Unity and Diversity in the Carolingian Church’ in R.N. Swanson (ed.), *Unity and Diversity in the Church*, Studies in Church History 32 (1997) pp.59-82, particularly p.66, 72, 80-82, at p.82: ‘within these overarching unities there was...enormous, rich and continually creative diversity’.
particular liturgical texts, or any detailed traditions beyond extremely general directives at
councils.17 While treating the *ordines romani* only cursorily, he pointed out that there was certainly
no evidence for any royal or centralised attempt to patronise or support these texts.18 The
complexity of the reception of ‘Roman chant’ in Francia is well-established.19 Intervening in the
liturgy was also part of the broader Carolingian culture of what is called ‘correctio’ or correction.20 In
this area, the historiographical shift away from the use of anachronistic terms like ‘Renaissance’ and
‘Reform’ because these assume a clear starting point and end goal (a paradigm in which Andrieu was
immersed), has consequences in the liturgy too.21 “Correctio” will be used here, but an interrogation

17 Hen, *Royal Patronage*, particularly at pp.54-61, p.153: ‘diversity on top of underlying unity is a more
accurate way of describing it’; Yitzhak Hen, ‘The Recycling of Liturgy under Pippin III and Charlemagne’, Geert
Claassens and Werner Verbeke (eds), *Medieval Manuscripts in Transition: Tradition and Creative Recycling*
(Leuven, 2006), p.160: ‘no general Romanisation was ever desired by the Frankish kings of their bishops-no
outright exchange of an existing liturgical corpus’; Yitzhak Hen, ‘The Romanization of the Frankish liturgy: ideal,
reality and the rhetoric of reform’ in Claudia Bolgia, Rosamond McKitterick and John Osborne (eds), *Rome
Across Time and Space: Cultural Transmission and the Exchange of Ideas c.500-1400* (Cambridge, 2011),
pp.119-123; criticism at Palazzo, ‘La liturgie carolingienne’, pp.234-235; the councils are listed at Vogel, ‘La
réforme liturgique’, pp.220-221.

18 Hen, *Royal Patronage*, p.62. 19 Karl Morrison, ‘Know Thyself: Music in the Carolingian Renaissance’, *Committenti e produzione aristico-
letteraria nell’alto medioevo occidentale*, Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studio sullo’alto medioevo,
39 (Spoleto, 1992), pp.369-481; Susan Rankin, ‘Carolingian Music’, Rosamond McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian
20 Broadly summarised in Giles Brown, ‘Introduction: The Carolingian Renaissance’ in Rosamond McKitterick
(ed.), *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge, 1994), pp.1-51; John Contreni, ‘The
Carolingian Renaissance: education and literary culture’ in Rosamond McKitterick (ed.), *The New Cambridge
21 Arnold Angenendt, ‘Libelli bene correcti: Der “richtige Kult” als ein Motiv der karolingischen Reform’, Peter
Ganz (ed.), *Das Buch als magisches und als Repräsentationsobjekt* (Wiesbahuser, 1992), pp.117-123 prefers
terms *correctio or renovatio* because the goal was never a return to classical antiquity but to guarantee
salvation through meticulous observance of religious rite; Hen, *Royal Patronage*, pp.83-84 underlines the
rhetorical nature of claiming to “correct” and argues for the continuity with Merovingian discourse around
rulership as also in Rosamond McKitterick ‘Eighth Century Foundations’, Rosamond McKitterick (ed.), *The New
application of reform’, in Julia M.H. Smith and Tom Noble (eds), *The Cambridge History of Christianity*, vol. III,
600-1100 (Cambridge, 2008), on the Carolingians pp.356-357 argues that any use of ‘reform’ is unhelpful
because the modern conception of the term imposes certain assumptions; Julia M.H Smith, “Emending evil
ways and praising God’s omnipotence”: Einhard and the uses of Roman martyrs’ in Kenneth Mills and Anthony
Grafton (eds), *Conversion in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages: Seeing and Believing* (Rochester, USA,
2008), pp. 189–92, 214–15 argues for using ‘correctio’ because it is visible in Carolingian sources; studies can
still treat ‘correctio’ as if it were universally understood but revision of the concept continues with Janet
Nelson, ‘Revisiting the Carolingian Renaissance’, James Kreiner and Helmut Reimitz (eds), *Matter of Late
Antiquity: Essays on Religion, Power and Society in Honour of Peter Brown* (Turnhout, 2016), pp.331-341 who
argues for bringing forward those enacting the programme on the ground; Rob Meens, Dorine van Espelo,
Bram van den Hoven van Genderen, Janneke Raaijmakers, Irene van Renswoude, and Carine van Rijn (eds),
*Religious Franks: Religion and power in the Frankish Kingdoms: Studies in honour of Mayke de Jong*
and further nuancing of the term will also be attempted through the *ordines romani* manuscripts and the liturgical *expositiones* which often present themselves in the same manuscripts.

There is therefore now a perfect opportunity to reassess manuscripts of the *ordines romani* as creative Frankish products, responding to particular Frankish needs. Added impetus has been supplied by the recent publication of the final volume of Bischoff’s *Katalog*.22 Andrieu’s dating of manuscripts by palaeography was often insightful, but not always accurate. Many manuscripts are dated too late, and Bischoff has supplied a new ninth-century date for certain key examples. Bischoff’s *Katalog* must be used with caution because it does not always give his reasoning, but, in most of the cases dealt with here, it can be backed up by the liturgical content or more complete accounts elsewhere.23 Today we are therefore better able to assess the *ordo romanus* manuscripts as ninth-century products, and reflect on scholarship done since Andrieu. Jeffrey has done admirable work on the *ordines* of reading from Rome, and highlighted the fluidity of Roman influence in an arresting metaphor, describing it not as a single historical event but ‘repeated waves of Roman influence...with varying strengths and effects’.24 Aubert charted the evolution of the vocabulary of liturgical speech, showing how the Franks added grades of sonic modulation to the *ordines romani*, where Roman texts had traditionally been rather terse.25 Some significant reassessments of Andrieu’s analysis of singular *ordines* were also undertaken by Van Dijk and Langlois.26 But the

---


25 Aubert, ‘When the Roman Liturgy became Frankish’, pp.57-160.

paradigm Andrieu employed has not been properly assessed, and these new treatments generally took a single tradition or ritual out of the manuscripts. Martimort’s summary went little further than Andrieu had done. 27 Chavasse discovered what he deemed a new ordo romanus, but again focused on it as a source for seventh-century practice in Rome, and gave little importance to the manuscript. 28 Romano’s work on OR I focused on Rome’s social milieu. 29 It is desirable to gather these narrower critiques in a single place, and reflect on the consequences for Andrieu’s broader paradigm. The most important work has been done by Parkes. 30 Parkes proved that Andrieu’s reconstruction of the Pontifical Romano-Germanique, a single archetype created c.950 in the city of Mainz cannot be substantiated by individual manuscripts. Andrieu presented the Pontifical Romano-Germanique as the summit of the developments which the ordines romani represented. 31 This construct guided Andrieu’s selection of several texts to be numbered among them, and conditioned his analysis of groups of ordines. Parkes’ critique has blown open the categorisation of most of Andrieu’s later manuscripts. But there are also significant consequences for the ninth-century texts. Since the Pontifical Romano-Germanique was never a single archetype, its coherence may be better understood by looking at where the texts which make up this supposed archetype came from and how they show up in manuscripts prior to the tenth century. 32

While all the ninth-century ordo romanus manuscripts could be reinterpreted as self-conscious Frankish products, this reassessment is most cogent and useful with certain kinds of manuscripts. My primary focus will be on the manuscripts Andrieu groups into ‘Collections’, particularly Collections A and B, also unfortunately termed the ‘Roman Collection’ and the ‘Gallican Collection’ respectively. 33 To a certain extent, Andrieu did recognise the programmatic composition

29 John F. Romano, Liturgy and Society in Early Medieval Rome (Farnham, 2014).
30 Parkes, Making of Liturgy, pp.183-211; Henry Parkes, ‘Questioning the Authority of Vogel and Elze’s PRG’, Gittos and Hamilton (eds), Understanding Medieval Liturgy, pp.76-100.
32 Parkes, Making of Liturgy, p.198.
of the Collections, as these titles imply. But, again, his principal aim was to dig through each
Collection for the individual ordines underlying it. His account of the aims and purposes of each
Collection as a whole is insufficient, nor does he delve into how each manuscript reinterprets the
proposition of the Collections on their own terms. Characterising Collection A as ‘the Roman
Collection’ is wholly unhelpful and each of its ninth-century examples carries a demonstrably non-
Roman ordo to supplement it. These manuscripts are BAV Pal.lat.487 and Montpellier Bibliothèque
de la Faculté du Médecine 412. There is also a third manuscript, of which Andrieu knew only a tiny
fragment (Sankt Paul im Lavanttal Stiftsbibliothek 979), but for which Bischoff discovered significant
new material. Collection B is more complex. I will continue to call it Collection B because of its
dependence on Collection A, but this is not to imply a relative value to either collection. First, there
are six manuscripts of this collection from the ninth century. Five can be usefully termed
‘pontificals’. Andrieu uses terms such as ‘petit pontifical’ or ‘pontifical embryonique’ uncritically, but
these manuscripts allow us to engage with the complexity of ‘pontifical’ as a category of analysis.
Few early liturgical manuscripts fit easily into the constraints of such modern terminology, and
Collection B adds nuance to how we might understand this type.34 Certainly, the label of Gallican
must be discarded. Collection B employs highly selective extracts from liturgical traditions of
Frankish origin, primarily from the Sacramentary. But this is not evidence of any kind of engagement
with a monumental non-Roman construction of a ‘rite’, Gallican or however one might term it. In
their manuscript context, the selection of such ‘Frankish’ texts was part of a broader purpose.35 One
manuscript, also deemed a ‘petit pontifical’, Wolfenbüttel Herzog August Bibliothek 4175, requires
significant unpicking. Almost entirely ignored beyond Andrieu, and disparaged in his writings, this
manuscript is, in fact, one of the most interesting early testimonies to the conscious deployment of

34 Parkes, Making of Liturgy, p.92, on liturgical categories as ‘blunt tools’, p.158; Susan Rankin ‘Carolingian
quotation from André Wilmart ‘Les anciens missals de la France’, Ephemerides Liturgicae 46 (1932), p.240, n.2:
tous les manuscrits de ce-temps là sont des raretés’.
35 Bradshaw, Search for the Origins, p.228: ‘the form a rite took was responsible for altering the way it was
understood’; Christopher Jones, ‘The Chrism Mass in later Anglo-Saxon England’ Helen Gittos and Bradford
Bedingfield (eds), The Liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church (Woodbridge, 2005), p.128.
the *ordines romani*. While overlapping with Collections A and B, it presents a unique compilation of texts, which can only be the product of a compiler engaged fully in the currents of what is termed ‘*correctio*’, but in a self-conscious and individualistic way. There are also several manuscripts which preserve unique testimonies to a single *ordo* from either of the collections. These can easily be discussed alongside the collections. Finally, there is one significant manuscript which Andrieu did not know, Vienna *Österreichische Nationalbibliothek* Cod.Ser.n.2762, reconstructed and edited by Unterkircher.\(^36\) This manuscript overturns what Andrieu concluded about a number of *ordines romani* for ordination ceremonies.

There are also several manuscripts which present unique collections of *ordines romani* which this thesis will not dwell upon. They include Brussels *Bibliothèque Royale* 10127-10144, Paris BnF lat.974, ‘the Collection of Saint-Amand’, and three manuscripts of St Gallen *Stiftsbibliothek* Cod.140, Cod.614 and Cod.349, the latter the so-called ‘*Capitulare* Collection’.\(^37\) Certainly Andrieu’s discussion of these manuscripts could be refined, but because the manuscripts are so completely unique the scope for the kind of analysis I am attempting is far less great. The real interest of Collections A and B is the repeated reinterpretation by different manuscript compilers. I shall refer to these unique manuscripts where necessary, but I shall not give a significant re-assessment.

Rather than presenting a re-tread of Andrieu’s discussion of these unique *ordines*, there is more interest to be found in searching for evidence of the reception of *ordines romani* in the lively dialogue surrounding the meaning of liturgy. Something in the Carolingian attempt to ‘correct’ liturgical practice gave immediate and explosive rise to myriad attempts to explain, contextualise and clarify the meaning of ritual acts and prayers.\(^38\) As Keefe pointed out with regards to expositions

\(^36\) Franz Unterkircher (ed.), *Das Kollektar-Pontifikale des Bischofs Baturich von Regensburg (817-848)*, Spicilegium Friburgense, 8 (Freiburg, 1962).


on baptism, their striking diversity makes it clear there was no expectation or desire for a single uniform explanation for even the most common rituals. The fact that only a few of Keefe’s texts brush directly against the *ordines romani* gives an indication of the elevated level of the Carolingian liturgical conversation in which the texts were used, but the work of one liturgist of unquestionably ‘elite’ formation, Amalarius of Metz, is uniquely useful for this thesis. Amalarius directly quoted from and utilised a ‘*libellus de ordine romano*’ a number of times in his writings, mostly in his *Liber Officialis*. This *libellus* was evidently one of Andrieu’s Collection manuscripts, perhaps that used in Metz. His discussion reveals at least one legitimate response to the texts, by someone who was demonstrably and intensely engaged in the initiatives by which the *ordines romani* were copied and disseminated. Amalarius’ witness has to be properly handled, and I do not intend to take his writings as accurate records of actual liturgical practice. Nevertheless, his quest for the ‘ratio’ behind liturgical practices presents a critical witness to how *ordines romani* might have been read by many, one fully in keeping with Carolingian concerns. This is suggested by a number of manuscripts which give the *ordines romani* alongside Amalarius’ own writings, or texts of liturgical exposition more generally. The designations applied to these manuscripts, as ‘schoolbooks’ in Keefe or ‘didactic collections’ in Andrieu’s writing, have hitherto rather limited the conclusions drawn about them, in some cases unfairly. I shall attempt to treat these manuscripts as sympathetically as the manuscripts that have been termed ‘pure’ or ‘proper’ liturgical books, allowing that the barrier

---


40 ‘a booklet about the Roman ordo’; published by Jean Michel Hanssens, *Amalarii Episcopii Opera Liturgica Omnia* vol.II (Vatican City, 1948); a recent English translation by Erik Knibbs (ed.), *On the Liturgy*, 2 vols. (Massachusetts, 2014), is adequate for reference but gives little to understand or contextualise Amalarius.


between, to use Palazzo’s phrases, ‘liturgical books’ (books actually used in liturgical performance) and ‘books of the liturgy’ (books reflecting on or regulating the liturgy) might be far more porous.43

Fundamentally, mine is a treatment founded on manuscripts. For each, I shall engage as much as possible the techniques suggested by recent liturgical scholarship, informed by the recognition that manuscripts are valuable and individualised witnesses more generally in the early middle ages.44 Gittos has usefully summarized some essential questions to ask of each of our texts. 45

Where and when was the manuscript written? Who was it written and/or commissioned by and for? What else is in the manuscript? For what purpose was it created? Was it used? There are some striking and new answers to many of these questions for our texts, not to be found in the examinations of Andrieu. More simply, Yitzhak Hen also suggested a ‘double axis of classification’ for liturgical books, by the ‘type’ of the book first, and by its functional destination second.46 In each case, these queries allow the manuscript itself to lead the way for the study. The intense variety of our manuscripts reflects a potent intersection of the interests of highly self-conscious practitioners of the liturgy, localised dynamics and traditions, and different demands to which manuscripts were supposed to respond. But this is not to imply any degree of chaos in the treatment of the ordines romani or to suggest that the compilers of the manuscripts suffered from compiling ‘mania’ without real purpose or design. Broader guiding principles are not absent and, in fact, the methodologies by which the ordines romani were processed for purpose rarely differ fundamentally, and similar

43 Eric Palazzo, Histoire des livres liturgiques, p. 186: ‘livres liturgiques’, ‘livres de la liturgie’; Aubert, ‘How the Roman Liturgy became Frankish’, p.85: ‘one has to admit that ordines might in principle be one or the other, irrespective of specific textual content. Different and/or actual uses can only be ascertained or estimated, case by case’; also Helen Gittos and Sarah Hamilton, ‘Introduction’, Gittos and Hamilton (eds), Understanding Medieval Liturgy, p.9: ‘Medieval manuscripts of liturgical rites were rarely if ever intended simply as a prescription of how service should be conducted’.
44 McKitterick, Frankish Church; Recently, Marco Mostert, ‘Das Studium alter Handschriften als Beitrag zu einer Kulturwissenschaft’ Hans-Werner Goetz (ed.), Die Aktualität des Mittelalters (Bochum, 2000), pp.309-10; Rosamond McKitterick, History and Memory in the Carolingian World (Cambridge, 2004), pp.13-22, 28-59, 156-173, 192; Ably summarised in Marco Mostert, “...but they pray badly using corrected books’: errors in the early Carolingian copies of the Admonitio Generalis’, Meens et al (eds), Religious Franks, pp.123-124: ‘each manuscript in principle is as valuable as the original version intended by its original author’.
techniques recur often. Is the fundamental element of liturgical ‘correctio’ to be seen in these recurring techniques and processes, rather than in any single version of the *ordines romani* themselves? In trying to answer this question I hope to show that, within this fascinating corpus of manuscripts, we can begin to grasp some deeper sense of what unified the staggering Carolingian intervention in the liturgy, one of the most lasting and powerful impacts of a programme in which so many across Europe were fruitfully engaged.
Chapter 1: Collection A of the Ordines Romani

Introduction

To re-shape Andrieu’s scholarship on the ordines romani two parallel shifts in perspective are necessary: firstly, to consider each manuscript of the Collection as a whole, and secondly to move away from the grand ideas of ‘Romanisation’ to take the Collections on their own terms. Both of these imperatives can be applied fruitfully to the first Collection of ordines romani, Collection A. Significantly, Andrieu had deemed this text ‘the Roman Collection’, as opposed to Collection B which is the ‘Gallican Collection’, and the resonances that the idea of ‘Roman’ brought forth for him dominate his treatment.47 Later studies, including those of Vogel, Palazzo and Hen repeated the idea that the Collection was intended to be a Roman one.48 This can be questioned. One new dating suggested by Bischoff’s palaeographical analysis has significance. Two ninth-century manuscripts to begin with are Montpellier Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine 412 and BAV Pal.lat.487. Andrieu dated Montpellier to the beginning of the ninth century, and Wilmart told him it was ‘very likely to have originated from Tours’.49 He thought Pal.lat.487 was a later version of the same Collection, still of the ninth century, but probably in its second half.50 He could not locate it, but suggested Corbie for its origin. Bischoff, however, determined that the Vatican manuscript was in fact the earlier of the two, falling on the 8th/9th century divide, and that this manuscript originated from Lorsch. Accordingly, it falls within the scope of his ‘older Lorsch style’, which he places between the dates 781-783 and only a little beyond 800.51 Therefore, the Montpellier manuscript is in fact the later.52

50 Ibid. pp.319-321, 469.
52 Bernhard Bischoff, Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen), vol.II (Wiesbaden, 2004), 2873, p.209: ‘Tours, [IX. Jh., 1./2. Viertel].’
One other early manuscript has been rediscovered, in fragments from Sankt Paul im Lavanttal (which Andrieu knew as Stiftsbibliothek 979), as well as Munich and Regensburg (which he did not).

As will become clear, this complicates how Andrieu understood the development of the Collection. His reconstruction was that it arose in one sublime motion. A scribe gathered *ordines romani* he recognised as Roman into the form given by Montpellier 412: OR I, OR XI, OR XXVII, OR XLII and OR XXXIV and OR XIII.A.53 This same, complete form is found in two later manuscripts, Copenhagen Kongelige Bibliotek Cod. Gl.kgl. 3443 (located on the ninth/tenth century divide by Bischoff) and British Library Add.15222, of the eleventh century.54 Yet the Vatican manuscript, now established as earliest of all, is missing both OR XIII and OR XLII from this list. Two other later manuscripts of the collection also offer pieces. Paris BnF 2399, an eleventh-century version of the Collection, which Andrieu believed was copied directly from a ninth-century exemplar, has only OR I, OR XI and XXVII.55 BAV Ottob.lat.312, also eleventh-century, lacks OR XIII, and has two extra *ordines*, OR XX and OR XLIX.56 Furthermore, several manuscripts preserve combinations of *ordines* that strongly resemble earlier ‘versions’ of Collection A, notably Albi 42 and Wolfenbüttel 4175, and Amalarius of Metz seems also to have employed a similar early version of Collection A. All strongly suggest that Collection A was a far more gradual accomplishment than, say, Collection B, whose core of texts is intact in almost all the ninth-century copies. With Bischoff’s date, Palat.lat.487 is earlier than any of Collection B’s manuscripts, and represents one of the very earliest collections available. Where Andrieu claimed that Collection A first arose around 750, nearly four decades before this first manuscript, his reconstruction is still difficult to support, as is Vogel’s notion that Pippin III patronised or supported Collection A.57

Both the ninth-century manuscripts hail from very famous and prolific scriptoria, Saint Martin in Tours and Lorsch Abbey. Both institutions were recipients of significant patronage by the Carolingian monarchy, which is not insignificant in the development of liturgy.\(^{58}\) One cannot fail to mention Alcuin’s tenure at Tours, and Chrodegang, later bishop of Metz was the first abbot of Lorsch from 764-766, and gave the monastery the body of Saint Nazarius, a Roman martyr.\(^{59}\) Aside from Tours, the manuscripts are generally otherwise concentrated in the rich region of the Rhine Valley, Bavaria and North Italy.\(^{60}\) The circulation of ordines which form part of the collection in Rheims (Albi 42), Worms (Wolfenbuettel 4175) and Lorsch, as well as Murbach, would suggest the collection was brought together in that region. It then would only have come to Tours once already complete. This ‘completed’ collection of ordines, as Andrieu envisaged it, was used by the creator of Collection B, since his version had OR XIII A and OR XLI. He probably worked in the Rhine Valley or Northern Italy. The first manuscript of Collection B is Verona XCII, from 814-817, so Collection A was certainly ‘complete’ by then (having received OR XIII A), and, in this form, had already reached the scriptorium where the creator of Collection B was active. Montpellier 412, with the earliest possible dating, may not have been written long afterwards. Thus, it is far from unlikely that Collection A was in fact ‘completed’ c.800, with the addition of OR XIII A. Forms of it pre-date the century, but not by long, and ultimately, none support dating the Collection as early as 750.\(^ {61}\)

The Ordines Romani of the ‘Roman’ Collection

The centrepiece of Collection A was OR I, OR I, which narrates the pontifical mass of Easter, as it was celebrated by the Pope and his ecclesiastical entourage in Rome. Pal.lat.483 is, in Andrieu’s analysis, the ‘best’ manuscript of OR I, by which he means it is closest to what he reconstructed to


\(^{61}\) Aubert, ‘When the Roman Liturgy became Frankish’, p.135-140.
be the hypothetical ‘original’ of the text.\textsuperscript{62} OR I is undoubtedly the most studied of all these texts. It survives in 23 medieval manuscripts which Andrieu surveyed, but it was never copied without at least several other ordines romani, and never isolated from at least some form of what one might call a ‘Collection’.\textsuperscript{63} Scholarship has mined this text extensively, but almost exclusively for the details of the Roman liturgy, and for insight into the Roman social and political milieu.\textsuperscript{64} The crystallized moment it preserves of Rome was certainly after the seventh century, probably well into the eighth. Yet, again, there is no testimony for this text before the very end of the eighth century, and all of it from Francia. Andrieu argued that OR I crossed the Alps into Francia twice, in the short recension found only in a single manuscript from St Gallen (Stiftsbibliothek 614), and in the long recension which is the more widespread form and the only one I shall treat at length.\textsuperscript{65} Romano posited that the text in fact only crossed the Alps once, and both recensions are Frankish reworkings.\textsuperscript{66} Given what this thesis shall demonstrate about the Frankish treatment of the ordines romani, this is not \textit{a priori} impossible. Peter Jeffrey is currently working on a new edition and translation, and has revealed in informal discussion that he sees the text primarily as a very detailed Frankish observation and record of the Roman liturgy, not, in fact, a Roman order of service \textit{per se}. This offers a chance to re-imagine many of the text’s features as a way for Franks to see into the atmosphere of Rome. It certainly \textit{became} that in all of our manuscripts.

The long discourse on the seven regions that precedes the text (nn.1-5) is a case in point.\textsuperscript{67}

In every Frankish copy of the ‘long recension’, that is twelve ninth-century manuscripts, this

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
discourse is copied again and again, showing that a powerful interest in Rome’s topography was present in Frankish regions, and was a part of how these texts were received.\textsuperscript{68} This discourse opens a number of our manuscripts, since OR I almost invariably comes first in most gatherings of ordines romani. It would induct any reader of the texts to think first of all of the liturgical map of the Eternal City before they began any perusal of the ordines for any purpose, study or performance. This is, I shall argue, no accident. Unremarked in Andrieu is the obvious connection to the fascinating phenomenen of the Roman church names being maintained in Frankish prayer, chant and lection manuscripts, which similarly mapped out Rome in the book and encouraged close identification of texts (and liturgical feasts) with places in Rome, something that is peculiarly Carlingian just as the ordines are.\textsuperscript{69} In every copy of OR I, but particularly in the version found in Collection A, the narrative distinguishes itself by the presence of the papal court’s wealth and its peculiar dignitaries and ecclesiastical positions: regionarii defensorum who precede the Pope’s horse, vicedominus, vestiarius, nomenclulator and sacellarius who all follow his horse, and a pater diaconiae, referring to that peculiarly Roman institution of diaconiae, among others.\textsuperscript{70} To understand how the Franks read the activities of these extravagant and exotic personages and to see how OR I might have become the premier script for the Mass for most of the ninth century, one must study the text within the manuscripts in which it is transmitted, beginning with those of Collection A.

OR XI, the narrative of the seven Lenten scrutinies and baptism, is the next ordo, and was to Andrieu of unquestionable Roman provenance.\textsuperscript{71} Scrutinies were pre-baptismal sessions of instruction for the catechumens which took place in Lent, and materials were given for them in

\textsuperscript{68} Rosamond McKitterick, ‘Les Perceptions Carolingiennes de Rome’, Woljciech Falkowski and Yves Sasser (eds), Le monde carolingien: Bilan, Perspectives, champs de recherches, Actes de colloque international de Poitiers, Centre d’Études Supérieures de civilisation médiévale, 18-20 novembre (Turnhout, 2009), pp.89-90.

\textsuperscript{69} Among countless examples, three important liturgical manuscripts are the Godescalc Evangelistary (Paris, BNF. lat.1203), the Antiphoner of Compiègne (Paris BnF lat.17436) and the Drogo Sacramentary (Paris BnF lat.9428).

\textsuperscript{70} Most are discussed in Roger Reynolds, ‘Clerics in the Early Middle Ages: Hierarchies and Functions’, Clerics in the Early Middle Ages (Aldershot, 1999), pp.1-13.

indisputably Roman form, in the Gelasian Sacramentaries, which have three scrutinies each.72 The intensity of interest in baptism at every level of Carolingian society was documented by Keefe, and is most striking in the personal request of Charlemagne himself in 813 to his bishops to explain the component parts of the ritual to him, and their numerous responses.73 Yet Keefe also highlighted the diversity in these answers. Five of them, Jesse of Amiens, Amalarius of Metz (then bishop of Trier), Theodulf of Orleans, Leidrad of Lyons and Maxentius of Aquileia, all discussed a baptismal ritual which resembled, in some instances, OR XI, and yet they all differ on certain details of the rite. Only Amalarius actually mentions an *ordo romanus* explicitly, and only, as Keefe indicated, in the context of the scrutinies themselves, not baptism, though it was certainly OR XI.74 Keefe also pointed to the crucial, parallel testimony of certain pieces of legislation about baptism.75 They only vaguely affirm that baptism ought to be practised according to Roman custom, or tradition, without defining this. One crucial witness is the Council of Mainz of 813 which states ‘that the sacrament of baptism be celebrated...concordantly and uniformly according to the Roman *ordo*, that is, the scrutiny in the *ordo* of baptism’.76 As Keefe explained, this appears to conflate the Roman *ordo* with the scrutiny ritual, rather than having anything to do with how baptism itself was to be performed. Nor does the council give any indication of how many scrutinies there were supposed to be or when they were. OR XI offers seven scrutinies, offering direct justification by reference to the sevenfold gift of the Spirit, as does Amalarius. Jesse of Amiens had six, while the Sacramentaries provided the material for three.

The idea of a pre-baptismal scrutiny was certainly appropriate for the endeavour the Carolingians were engaged in. It allowed for sustained education of those present, godparents


especially, in the fundamentals of the faith. OR XI provided a framework for this, which explains its copying in both Collections of *ordines romani*. The catechetical homilies said on the third and most important of the scrutinies offered sustained meditation on the Creed, the Lord’s Prayer and each of the four evangelists, to teach ‘correct’ understanding of these key matters to the present godparents. This cohered notably with Charlemagne’s instruction to Gerbald of Liège that every sponsor at baptism would be able to recite the Lord’s Prayer and Apostle’s Creed.  

Collection A’s version gives only one-sentence openings to these allocutions and homilies. Thus, for this version of OR XI to be used, the Gelasian Sacramentary would have to accompany the service to provide the words. There are some significant Roman details, among them that the Creed would be spoken both in Greek and in Latin, once for a Greek-speaking child, and once for a Latin-speaking one.  

Aubert’s lengthy article on the sonic vocabulary in Frankish reception of Roman texts offers a significant attempt at re-assessing Andrieu’s reconstruction of OR XI, but the argument, as it concerns this text, was weakened by insufficient attention to the individual manuscript witnesses. Aubert argued that the *ordo*, OR XI, was not Roman at all. According to him, the only testimony we have to a Roman text for baptism is found in the Sacramentaries, in particular the Sacramentary of Angoulême. In short, Rome only ever accepted three scrutinies, the seven scrutiny model as represented in OR XI came out of Frankish editing of the text taken from a Sacramentary (the seven scrutiny model is only otherwise seen in the Sacramentary of Gellone’s second *ordo* of baptism), and Andrieu’s idea that OR XI represents the practice of seventh-century Rome was a simple fallacy for which we have no evidence. Aubert’s discussion of ‘the general issue’ underlying Andrieu’s edition is deeply insightful; he noted that the great liturgist gave almost no credit to the creativity of the Frankish recipients of the Roman liturgy.

---

79 Aubert, ‘When the Roman Liturgy became Frankish’, pp.117-135.
81 Aubert, ‘When the Roman liturgy became Frankish’, pp.130-131.
But Aubert made a significant error in his discussion of the Collections. First, he only considered OR XI on its own, when it is never transmitted like this, and did not venture to discuss the Collections as a whole. This is the same error Andrieu’s editions encourage. Aubert saw both versions of OR XI as derived from a common ancestor, rather like the Old Gelasian Sacramentary (BAV Reg.lat.316), which offers the Creed in both Greek and Latin. From this, he suggested that the compiler of Collection A chose to keep the Greek and eliminate the Latin because of what is termed in his discussion ‘phantasies of Rome’, while Collection B chose the Latin, presumably because it was more useful for Franks. However Aubert misread both Andrieu’s apparatus and commentary. Collection A does not offer ‘only’ the Greek Creed out of two options. No manuscript does so. In fact, Collection A actually offers both options, Latin and Greek, as does the Wolfenbüttel 4175 manuscript, about which Aubert made the same mistake. It was only Collection B which eliminated the Greek, as did the Sacramentary of Gellone, from the recension of OR XI found in Collection A. Both Collections are not independent adaptations of a common ancestor, but OR XI in Collection B is an adaptation of OR XI in Collection A, exactly as Andrieu described it. Therefore, Collection A is actually earlier than and a source for Collection B, as is obvious from an examination of the other ordines shared between the two collections. Aubert’s discussion of the filling in of the catechetical homilies in B, which he presents as more equivocal than Andrieu, is therefore also misplaced. While it is true that the relationship between ordo and prayer can be ambiguous, the filling in of prayers to ordines is in fact a process we can observe through the manuscripts of the ordines romani in the ninth-century, for which Collection B is particularly useful. The primacy of Collection A’s version of OR XI is fundamentally maintained. Far from being invented out of ‘phantasy’, the option

---

82 Eizenhöfer et al. (ed.), Liber Sacramentorum, 312 pp.48-49; Vogel, Medieval Liturgy, pp.64-70; Smyth, La liturgie oubliée, pp.125-139.
83 Aubert, ‘When the Roman Liturgy became Frankish’, p.129: ‘the witnesses of Collection A transmit the Creed in Greek, while those of Collection B present it in Latin’, p.132: ‘OR 11 of Collection A chose the Greek from two possibilities, just as it might have happened that the OR 11 of Collection B chose the Latin’, p.134: ‘the redactor of the baptismal ordo in Collection A chose the Greek—possibly, as we have suggested because of his phantasies of Rome, and the redactor of the baptismal ordo in Collection B chose the Latin’.
84 Ibid., p.130.
85 Aubert ‘When the Roman Liturgy became Frankish’ p.128.
for the Greek Creed given in Collection A probably does go back to Rome and the seventh century. However, I would entirely agree with Aubert that Andrieu’s terminology is problematic, and calling Collection A ‘the Roman Collection’ leads to significant misunderstanding.\textsuperscript{86} The ‘Roman Collection’ was not at all what the Frankish compiler of A aimed to achieve. Yet he kept the Greek Creed, whereas his later follower, the creator of Collection B, deleted it. Why each one acted as they did is best understood in the context of their collections.

The next ordo significantly complicates the idea of the ‘Roman Collection’. This is OR XXVII, Collection A’s ordo for the ceremonies of Holy Week. Again, Palat.lat.487 represents the text in its most archaic state, according to Andrieu.\textsuperscript{87} The text is already a combination of three older ordines romani. The first half, the narrative for Wednesday to Holy Saturday, which is nn.1-66 in Andrieu’s edition, was created by the fusion of OR XXIV, for the Day Office of Holy Week and OR XXVI, for the Night Office. Curiously, the author kept only the title of the OR XXVI, and thus the text is titled in both our manuscripts De officiis in noctibus a caena domini usque in pascha, which is rather deficient for a text that actually contained both Day and Night Office.\textsuperscript{88} Both original texts, OR XXVI and XXIV, themselves circulated independently in four manuscripts, including Albi 42, from Rheims, and Wolfenbüttel 4175, probably from Worms. It was the versions shared by this particular pair which fed into the creation of OR XXVII.\textsuperscript{89} There are two additions not found in the other two manuscripts, at OR XXVI, n.10, on mass of Maundy Thursday, and OR XXVI, n.14, on the rite of New Fire.\textsuperscript{90} Both were carried into OR XXVII, becoming OR XXVII, n.12 and OR XXVII n.13.\textsuperscript{91} The addition of OR XXVII, n.66, which parallels the ‘supplement’ to OR XXIV, is found in the Wolfenbüttel, Brussels and St. Gallen manuscripts, but not in Albi 42. According to Andrieu, OR XXIV and XXVI were created on the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{86} Ibid.\textsuperscript{,} p.135.
\item \textsuperscript{88} Ibid.\textsuperscript{,} p.347: ‘Concerning the night office from Maundy Thursday until Easter’.
\item \textsuperscript{89} Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.341: ‘les manuscrits des Ordines XXIV et XXVI dont disposait notre auteur étaient du type AW (Albi 42 et Wolfenbüttel 4175) sans être identique à aucun de ces deux exemplaires’.
\item \textsuperscript{90} Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, pp.309-310, 327, 329.
\item \textsuperscript{91} Ibid.\textsuperscript{,} pp.350-351.
\end{itemize}
basis of Roman documents, perhaps reflecting usages of the suburban churches more than papal.\footnote{Ibid., pp.280-282, 320-322.}

There is only one significant addition Andrieu spots, at OR XXVII, n.65, the very end of the narrative as it follows Holy Week.


This was a formula for chrismation. Technically, chrismation would have fallen earlier in the ceremony, but OR XXIV and XXVI, which had a rather deficient narrative of baptism, did not give it. Here our texts added it almost as a reference note, referring back to a point in OR XXVII. There was, of course, already a narrative of baptism in Collection A, in OR XI. This leads to the curious situation where baptism is repeated twice in the course of the Collection, a situation to which Collection B demonstrably responded. In OR XI, n.101 chrismation is described in almost the same formula, while lacking the response.\footnote{In Montpellier 416 and MSS dependent on it, this response is added to OR XI, probably taking from OR XXVII directly.}

The second half of OR XXVII (n.67-94) is perhaps the most revealing portion of the so-called ‘Roman Collection’. Entirely separate from OR XXIV and XXVI, this is a narrative for the Vespers on Easter Day, and for the following week, until the Saturday before Sunday in albis, primarily focusing on the chants said on each day. Andrieu believed that this was a true record of the practices for these days from Rome, a ‘true ordo romanus’.\footnote{Ibid., pp.342-343: ‘sans aucun doute un veritable Ordo romanus’.} Easter is n.67 ‘ad locum crucifixi’ i.e. Santa Croce in Gerusalemma, and then moves to n.76 ‘ad sanctum Iohannem ad Vestem’, and at n.77 at ‘sanctum Andream ad Crucem’. These latter two were oratories at the Lateran Baptistery, built by Pope Hilarus.\footnote{Louis Duchesne (ed.), Le Liber Pontificalis: Texte Introduction et Commentaire (Paris, 1886), vol.I, p.242: ‘Hic fecit oraturia III in baptisterio basilicae Constantinianae, sancti Iohannis Baptistae et sancti Iohannis evangelistae et sanctae Crucis’.} The Monday is at the Lateran (n.80), as is the Tuesday (n.83), and Wednesday, and also
involve the oratory *ad Sanctum Andream* again (at n.82, n.85, and n.88). Thursday has no church name but describes a procession ‘*ad crucem, ad cubicellum Rigodem*’, (n.90), Friday and Saturday also lack church names. Notable also are the Greek chants, rendered here in Latin, phonetically. As with the Greek Credo offered in OR XI, such chants seem to go back to bilingual seventh-century Rome, or at least a choir sufficiently conversant in both languages. And yet, there are significant gaps in this *ordo*. Where is the ritual for Sunday *in albis*, and why are the last three days not given proper Roman church names? Why has Wednesday received so many more chants than the other days (n.88)? These were the troubling details highlighted by Van Dijk, who showed that Collection A’s version of this *ordo* is in fact heavily interpolated.98

As Van Dijk described it, there is another version of this same text, to be found in Wolfenbüttel 4175. Van Dijk also found this text in the Carolingian antiphoner of Compiègne, Paris BnF lat.17436 (fols.58r-v), of which Andrieu was not aware.99 This manuscript which was written around 877. This manuscript is otherwise a straightforward antiphoner, except this unusual inclusion of an *ordo*. This *ordo*, at least, could be coherently understood across different liturgical books, here because of its focus on Vespers chant. It would suggest that in certain specialised locations, the antiphons were actually performed in Francia, as they were in Rome (in Compiègne, each Greek word is carefully separated out by a line above them—which indicates they were to be read). But given that the Antiphoner of Compiègne does also contain Roman church names for the feasts of the liturgical year, this also highlights that this interest in the *ordo* must have rested in its evocation of Rome via reference to the Roman church names (which did not rest necessarily on it being accurate to Roman practice in every detail). Van Dijk thought the *ordo* was distinctive enough to warrant a

---

97 On Monday ‘*O kyrius ebasileosen. Item uersum. Cae car itereosen tin icumeni ti tis u saleutisete*’ (n.74), which is Psalm 112 in Greek. On Tuesday ‘*O pymenon ton Israel proches*’ (n.81), which is Psalm 112, and ‘*Ampelon ex egypton*’, which is Psalm 79. On Wednesday ‘*Proschete laos mu*’, which is Psalm 77 (n.84). On Friday, ‘*Alleluia. Y uram dyigunte*’ (n.93), which is Psalm 18, and on Saturday, ‘*Deute galeasometa*’ (n.94), which is psalm 94.


separate edition, but we must rely on Andrieu’s for now. The *ordo* here goes on all the way to Sunday *in albis*. A separate section, in the midst of OR XXVII, n.88, is taken away from Wednesday and given to Thursday (n.88, var.9), and what was Thursday in Collection A becomes Friday, what was Friday Saturday and what was Saturday the true Sunday *in albis*. They are each then given their proper church names. So here the new *ordo* for Friday is located, once again ‘*in Hierusalem*’ (n.89, var.1), the new Saturday is ‘*ad sanctam Mariam maiorem*’ (n.92), and the Sunday *in albis* is ‘*ad sanctos Cosmam et Damianum*’ (n.94), which makes a great deal more sense. It also, as Van Dijk discussed, lines up far better with what Amalarius of Metz tells us about the Roman chant.

Amalarius referred to a *libellus de ordine* romano three times in his *De Ordine Antiphonarii* implying that this was a different *libellus* from one he used for the *Liber Officialis*, but he certainly agreed with the Wolfenbüttel example best. Andrieu had to see the ‘Roman original’ represented in Collection A, adjusted by the compiler of Wolfenbüttel by the forcing in of one day (Thursday) into the middle of Wednesday, and the addition of Sunday *in albis*. This is nonsensical, particularly when the manuscript W gives ancient terminology like ‘*in albis*’. Why on Thursday, for example, would the Romans process ‘*ad crucem ad cubicellum Rigodem*’? This is clearly meant to be a place inside the church of Santa Croce, probably referring to the presence of a relic of the True Cross in some kind of niche, as Van Dijk supposed. And Wolfenbüttel 4175 has the true ending of Sunday at n.94, var.38, where everyone has a drink and then goes on to the Lateran, which accords with what is said earlier in the *ordo*, at n.79. It is Collection A which represents the interpolation, and Wolfenbüttel the

---

original. In both cases, Andrieu was misled by his misconceptions about the two manuscripts. Wolfenbüttel 4175 was a maladroit compiler in his eyes, while Collection A was more or less pristinely Roman, so Collection A had to be the original and Roman Vespers, while Wolfenbüttel had created an inexpert interpolation. What Van Dijk’s study shows for Wolfenbüttel 4175 will be addressed in the chapter on that manuscript. For now, I address what it means for Collection A.

Why exactly did the Collection A compiler draw back Thursday after Easter, and erase the Sunday in albis? Van Dijk suggested that he tried to bring the ordo in line with the ‘titles in the Gregorianum, providing also solemn stations for Thursday’. The Gregorian has a stational service at the Basilica of Santi Apostoli on the Thursday after Easter, representing a later development of the papal ritual. Baldovin argues that, in the Roman Easter Week, the readings chosen had rich associations with the particular station churches, adding impetus to our compiler’s need to reconcile the testimonies. This is a lesson in the complication of the Roman inheritance as it was taken up in Francia. It represented different stages of the development of the Roman Rite, and had to be reconciled, as here. Here, the compiler of Collection A has preferred to offer something closer to the Gregorian format rather than that given by the ordo romanus, but, in the process, has mutilated his source.

The next ordo in the sequence, as it is usually found, is OR XXXIV. This presents the ordination rituals, from acolyte to bishop, as they must have been in Rome itself. This is shown by the constant use of the language of that city’s church, domnus apostolicus and sacellarius, as well as the fact that Pope Hadrian I cited something very similar when describing how he ordained bishops. Yet the text does appear to offer a Frankish eye on the Roman ceremonials: in the episcopal ordination, the bishop must swear he has not violated a nun, the Roman term ‘ancilla Dei

---

106 Van Dijk, p.292.
sacrata’ are specified to be ‘Francis nonnata dicitur’. Therefore, in every version of the text, unremarked by Andrieu, the Frankish point of view was kept in mind.

There were two other ordines that Andrieu counted among his Roman Collection. These are OR XIII A and OR XLII. The latter is the ordo for the deposition of relics in a new church and seemed uncomplicatedly Roman to Andrieu. OR XIII A narrates the sequence of readings for the church year, and Andrieu found it in 14 manuscripts (those prior to the ninth century, Vercelli Biblioteca Capitolare 183 and St Gallen Stiftsbibliothek Cod.205 are both manuscripts of patristic authors, suggesting that the ordo was first transmitted into Francia as an addition to complete manuscripts concerning other matters). However, only in the three Collection A manuscripts that contain it is it accompanied by any other ordo text. It coincides with what Amalarius of Metz reported, based on his discussion with the archdeacon Theodore. Jeffrey has provided a convincing argument that this text represents late eighth-century practice of reading in the basilica of Saint Peter. Notably, the manuscripts in the Collection A tradition all share a certain interpolation on the readings during Holy Week (Andrieu OR XIII A n.2-5), which may have been added by the Collection A scribe, perhaps based on his text OR XXVII, but it is not in some earlier manuscripts. This represents yet another adaptation of the Roman text for the sake of completeness. However, OR XIII A is found in only three Collection A manuscripts, and, of those, only one of the ninth century, Montpellier cod.412. It is absent, entirely, from the earliest Collection A manuscript, BAV Palat.487, and so is OR XLII. Jeffrey saw OR XIII being redacted only with or after the reign of Pope Zacharias (741-752). If so, Collection A could not have been brought together in Francia in 750 as Andrieu supposed, and must be later, as the manuscripts show. In the process, a liturgical piece of ambiguous character, OR XIII A,

110 Ibid., p.607; OR XXXIV, n.16: ‘whom the Frank call nuns’.
113 Ibid., p.476.
116 Jeffrey, ‘The early liturgy at Saint Peter’s’, p.172: ‘OR XIII would have begun to replace OR XIV at some time during the eighth century’.
which was otherwise copied at the end of non-liturgical manuscripts, was added. The title’s situation of the order given definitively to Rome would be a recommendation for this inclusion, in a Collection whose object seems to be to build up a ‘liturgical picture’ of the City from the Frankish point of view.\(^{117}\)

OR XLII was a Roman ordo for the rite of deposition of relics. Andrieu showed that the prayers selected are also those to be found for the ritual in the Gregorian Sacramentary, and the antiphons sung are those to be found in Antiphoners like Compiègne, which contain the chants sung in Rome for the same occasion. The text aligns with certain letters of the Popes from the 6th century, where we can find some scanty evidence of such rites.\(^{118}\) Nevertheless, the deposition of relics in churches was demanded by law in the Carolingian era, so the ordo certainly cohered with Frankish concerns too.\(^{119}\) When the earliest example of Collection A lacks both these texts, it seems fair to question the cohesiveness of the Collection as a discrete entity before the start of the ninth century. It seems more likely that Collection A went through revision rather than that Pal.lat.487 simply decided to get rid of two ordines, particularly when manuscripts such as Wolfenbüttel 4175 and Albi 42 are considered. Andrieu argued that the ‘too different’ character of the text of OR XIIIA, being a catalogue rather than a description of ceremonies, might have compelled scribes to let it fall by the wayside, but this is by no means certain.\(^{120}\) The absence of OR XLII from Pal.lat.487 is not explicable in this regard. The question whether there was ever a ‘canonical’ form of this Collection becomes more urgent since our ninth-century manuscripts do each add another ordo from outside what Andrieu regarded as this Collection.


\(^{120}\) Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.I, p.469.
Part 1: BAV Pal.lat.487¹²¹

BAV Pal.lat. 487 is an amalgamation of two once separate manuscripts, but fols.1-30 present us with the relevant *ordo* content. This, it seems, was originally a separate *libellus* which was bound to a later second part containing some classical poetry, particularly works of Virgil. The entirety of the manuscript was written at Lorsch. Andrieu had thought it was perhaps from Corbie, because a manuscript which copied from it, Saint Petersburg Q.V. II n.5 (tenth century), has some connection to the monastery.¹²² As I mentioned at the opening of this chapter, the majority of the *ordo* content was, in fact, written at the very end of the eighth century, or towards the beginning of the ninth.¹²³

This early text contains *ordines* I, XI, XXVII and XXXIV, in that order, thus covering the pontifical mass of Easter, Holy Saturday baptism, the office of Holy Week, and the Roman ordinations. It lacks OR XLII and OR XIII A from Andrieu’s Collection A. The text has a noticeable surfeit of early letter forms, which doubtless contributed to Bischoff’s dating, and very tall descenders and ascenders, but it is quite plain compared to some later manuscripts. There is no colour in this manuscript, no visible apparatus to contribute to reading or performing of the texts it offers. The only differentiated script is in the titles, given in a broad, visibly angular uncial. Marginal notes and corrections are limited to matters of orthography, with one exception, on the final folio of *OR I*, fol.9v, a hand of very similar type has added a note saying ‘*sanctorum pariter promitte principum natalem*’, which means ‘promise (this probably should be *permitte*) equally on the feast days of the principal saints’. This seems to refer to the blessing given by the bishop which is next to this note ‘*iube domne benedicere*’. Here, *OR I* was used for all major Masses, not just Easter. Andrieu presumed that Collection A became a book solely for abstract study, but says nothing definite about the use of Pal.lat.487, while

¹²¹ Digitised at [http://bibliotheca-laureshamensis-digital.de/bav/bav_pal_lat_487/0001/image?sid=c3cb4870331d64c8a1a3b17aeb40cb3b](http://bibliotheca-laureshamensis-digital.de/bav/bav_pal_lat_487/0001/image?sid=c3cb4870331d64c8a1a3b17aeb40cb3b).
Susan Keefe called the manuscript a ‘school book’. She seems to have based this on the separate second half of the manuscript, from folio 31-45, with its collection of epigrams and classical poetry, and particularly fol.31r where there are neums for the boys in the monastic school to chant answers to their teacher’s question (this was added in the tenth century). This part of the manuscript was all written in the middle of the ninth century, and was some decades later than the part with the ordines. The original libellus must have seen some use before that.

Thus, the manuscript with which we are concerned comprises:

- fols.1r-9v OR I
- fols.9v-15v OR XI
- fols.15v-22r OR XXVII
- fols.22r-24r OR XXXIV
- fols.24r-v Alcuin’s Credimus (with one folio missing)
- fols.25r-30v OR XXIX

After the closing of OR XXXIV, the last ordo of Collection A, there was a significant space left blank in the original manuscript, one folio and a half. A slightly later hand quickly used this space, and then proceeded to add another whole quire. Immediately following the text of OR XXXIV, this new scribe has begun to write the Credimus portion from the De fide sancte trinitatis of Alcuin of York, here entitled only ‘Fides s(ansci?) Albini diaconi abbatis cognomin Alchuini’. Alcuin’s original text, written in 802, was a complete summation of Christian doctrine. The Credimus portion

---


125 Based on the Heidelberg university description of the manuscript, which is the most up-to-date available, by Michael Kautz, 2014: [http://www.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/digi-pdf-katalogisate/sammlung51/werk/pdf/bav_pal_lat_487.pdf](http://www.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/digi-pdf-katalogisate/sammlung51/werk/pdf/bav_pal_lat_487.pdf).


127 Vatican Pal.lat.487, fol.24r ‘The beliefs of the holy Albinus, deacon and abbot, surnamed Alcuinus.’
often ends this text; it is a summary of the summary, recapitulating the most critical points, but perhaps with a more immediate and direct role in some form of spiritual exercise. The editors of the *De fide* call this text a prayer or a ‘profession of faith’.\(^\text{128}\) In *Pal.lat.*487 the text of the *Credimus* is alone. This is not unknown in other manuscripts, but is unusual.\(^\text{129}\) One folio is lost, so only half of the text is here. It is known that, by the tenth century, both the *Credimus* and the *Adesto* of Alcuin were read during the Office of Trinity Sunday.\(^\text{130}\)

The same hand added the final text, another *ordo romanus* which Andrieu called OR XXIX. This *ordo* is not one of the usual Collection A *ordines* at all. In fact, it only shows up in this manuscript and one other, Saint Petersburg Q.V. II n.5 (perhaps from Corbie), which copied directly from it.\(^\text{131}\) OR XXIX is yet another narrative of the liturgy of Holy Week, which this manuscript, of course, already has, in OR XXVII. Andrieu characterises this *ordo* as a simple re-tread of OR XXVII, but it is more innovative than that.\(^\text{132}\) While the actions of the celebrant and the ceremonies described are broadly similar, the language shows that these ceremonies were re-framed to take place in a monastery. The congregation are *fratres* (n.3) who celebrate *nones* on Wednesday, the Roman *mansionarius* becomes a *custos* (n.15, 17), and instead of a *pontifex* we have a *presbyter* or a *sacerdos* (n.4,6,30,31,33 etc.), who would be an eminently more practical celebrant for a monastery. Otherwise, some rites we do know to be Roman, original to the texts, have been removed, such as the blessing of Holy oils and the recitation of the *agnus dei* by the archdeacon on Maundy Thursday. There is certainly scope to examine further the additions this text makes to the Holy Week *ordo*, to decipher its purpose. The sheer volume of detail added to the text concerning the extinguishing of


\(^{130}\) *De fide*, Knibbs and Ann Matter (eds), p.XVIII.

\(^{131}\) Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.III, pp.429-431; The Saint Petersburg manuscript is a composite and was once bound to others in the same library; Antonio Staerk, *Les Manuscrits Latins du Ve au Xlle siècle conservés à la Bibliothèque Impériale de Saint-Petersbourg*, vol.I (repr. Hildesheim, 1976), pp.193-205 gives the contents including the *ordo* and Andrieu copied from him directly rather than the manuscript itself.

candles during Maundy Thursday nocturnes is noteworthy; OR XXVII had not made it clear when and how the lights were gradually extinguished, this *ordo* goes into exhaustive detail. 133 Also very interesting is a significant addition at OR XXIX nn.24-25, on the fraction of the Host into three and communion of the people during the Mass on Maundy Thursday. 134 Other additions include the specification of the intercessory prayer on the Wednesday as ‘Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui gloriam tuam’. 135 The specification that bells, with the old High German *clocca*, are not to ring until the Saturday is also new. 136 Equally, details are added about the singing of *kyrie* on Wednesday (n.6), but not on Thursday (n.20), and no antiphons on Saturday except a single one, *Vespere autem sabbati quae luscecit* (n.56). The *Agnus dei* and kiss of peace are not to be performed on Thursday (n.23). 137 These additional details would seem to arise from questions asked of the *ordo* as it was performed, as well as the consultation of other liturgical books. Both are impulses to which the *ordines romani* were subject again and again.

Andrieu had supposed that this second hand was writing very late in the ninth century, 870-890, and, since he assumed Vatican Palat.lat.487 was written at Corbie, he asserted that OR XXIX had

---


its origins there.\textsuperscript{138} Vatican Palat.lat.487 is, in fact, from Lorsch, so it seems fair to consider this text of OR XXIX also as a Lorsch product. Bischoff also tells us that this second hand was writing, not at the end of the ninth century, but in the first half of that same century. This script is, accordingly, one example of his ‘younger’ Lorsch style.\textsuperscript{139} This reveals that a previously exclusively episcopal version of Holy Week had been adapted into a coherent and intelligible monastic liturgy within a few decades of the ninth century. Moreover, it throws severe doubt on Andrieu’s dichotomy between Collection A as ‘library piece’ and Collection B as practical manual.\textsuperscript{140}

It is likely that OR XXIX represented the way in which monks of Lorsch had already, perhaps for some time, adapted the written instructions contained in OR XXVII for practice in their monastery by themselves, and thus reflects how they really practised Holy Week, inspired by the Roman structure but innovatively received. It is also quite possible that OR XXIX represents what might have been done in many other ecclesiastical centres with ordines like this one, taking their instructions about the timing of feasts, the movement of clerics and the employment of objects, but substituting automatically those personnel who would be available there for the Roman staff of the Pope, and simply skipping over inappropriate details or performing a few extra, well-known, rituals in the course of the narrative where they were needed. This adaptation did find its way by the tenth century into North-East Francia, in the Saint Petersburg manuscript, so its dissemination beyond Lorsch is certainly attested.

There is evidence of an even more direct liturgical relationship with Rome and the papacy. Following the end of the ordo proper in Palat.lat.487, there were added a few lines, again onto the end of the folio, 30v. As Andrieu noted, this was the work of another scribe, certainly it is noticeably thicker and darker than the preceding script, but Bischoff provided no comment on this text as distinct from the preceding section of the Credimus and OR XXIX.\textsuperscript{141} The note is certainly also in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{138} Ibid., p.433.
\item \textsuperscript{139} Bischoff, Die abtei Lorsch, p.22: ‘von fol.24r an in jüngerem Stil, saec IX1, fortgesetzt’.
\item \textsuperscript{140} Rasmussen, Les Pontificaux, pp.27-29.
\item \textsuperscript{141} Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.1, p.320.
\end{itemize}
Bischoff’s ‘younger Lorsch style’, and it shares some similarities with the preceding text, such as the ‘two-c’ a on the ligature ar. This text writes as follows, without any title or introduction:

‘et interrogauimus nihilominus domnu(m) apostolicum adrianum secundu(m) mandata u(est)ra si in paschaliubbatto debeant flecti ienua du(m) lectiones recitantur. et ipse respondit hoc debere omnimodis fieri cui cum diceremus et quomodo sacerdotes uel ministri seu clerus cu(m) stolis et planetis poss(un)t in t(er)ra(m) p(ro)sterni ille adiecit non debere sacerdotes ministrosue seu ceru(m) stolis prius [indui]142 planetisque uestiri, nisi tunc demum cu(m) lumen nouu(m) introducitur ut cereus benedicat(ur). P(er)contati sum(us) rursum qua hora in sabbato pentecostes conueniens sit ad lectionu(m) officii ingredi qui nobis dixit hora sexta hoc fieri oportore’143

These lines claim that the author, presumably a monk of Lorsch since we have no other evidence, had been to Rome and on the instructions of someone else (probably the abbot) had asked Pope Hadrian himself three questions about seeming minutiae of liturgical practice during Holy Saturday, and the Saturday of Pentecost. Firstly, which Pope Hadrian? Andrieu supposed that it must concern either Hadrian II (867-872) or Hadrian III (884-885), by his own dating of this section.144 It is clear that the author of OR XXIX knew about this text before he had begun writing, and incorporated the Pope’s answers into his own text. Firstly, concerning the genuflection during the readings on Holy Saturday, as compared to OR XXVII:

142 This word is erased with a simple line drawn through it.
143 BAV Pal.lat.487, f.30v: ‘And we questioned nonetheless the lord apostolic Hadrian, according to your order, if in the Saturday of Easter they should genuflect when the readings are recited. And he responded that this ought to be done on every occasion. When we said to him, ‘And how should the priests and ministers and clerics be able to prostrate themselves with their stoles and chasubles?’, he replied ‘The priests, the ministers and the clerics ought to wear neither stole nor chasuble, not until when the new light is taken inside so that the candle might be blessed’. And when in turn we inquired at what time on the Saturday of Pentecost one should gather to enter for the reading of the office, he said to us this should be done at the sixth hour’.
The prayer here added by the author, \textit{deus qui mirabiliter}, Andrieu identified as a prayer from this occasion in the Gregorian Sacramentary, but it does also show up in that particular tradition of the Gelasians of the eighth century.\footnote{147 Andrieu, \textit{Les Ordines}, vol.III, p.444: ‘And the reader ascends to the pulpit, but he does not announce ‘\textit{libri genesis}’ but begins ‘\textit{in principio}’ only. And when he has read it through, the priest should say ‘\textit{Oremus}’ and the deacon ‘\textit{Flectamus genua}’. And they should pray until when the deacon will say ‘\textit{Leuate}’. And then they rise and the priest gives the prayer ‘\textit{deus qui mirabiliter creasti hominem}’. And it should be similarly in all the other readings.’} This shows the author was a conscientious editor, integrating the Pope’s recommendations thoughtfully with the prayer traditions he knew best. The second of the Pope’s answers, about the wearing of vestments on Holy Saturday, is also integrated into the text.

OR XXIX, n.47

Expletis lectionibus, regradiantur foras, praecedentibus eum duo notariis cereos tenentes, et
induantur sacerdotes et diaconi et ministri et ceteri clerici dalmaticis et stolis et omni
ornamento.\footnote{148 Andrieu, \textit{Les Ordines}, vol.III, p.444: ‘When the readings have finished, they return outside, while preceding him (the priest) are two notarii holding candles, and the priests and deacons and ministers and the rest of the clerics all put on their dalmatics and stoles and all the ornaments.’}

Here the difference from OR XXVII is even more glaring, since the ceremony of the lighting of the Paschal candle with the ‘new fire’ on Holy Saturday was not mentioned at this point in the source text of OR XXVII at all. The whole section, unique to OR XXIX, (n.47-49) detailing this particular rite as...
it happened on Holy Saturday, was probably added here simply because the Pope had occasion to mention it.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p.444: ‘Expletis lectionibus, regradiantur foras, praecedentibus eum duo notariis cereos tenentes, et induantur sacerdotes et diaconi et ministri et ceteri clerici dalmaticis et stolis et omni ornamento. Et inluminetur cereus, qui eodem die benedicendus est, de igni qui quinta feria excussus est. Et intrent in ecclesiam et benedicatur cereus a diacono, sicut in Sacramentorum continetur.}

It is thus certain that this discussion with Pope Hadrian had happened before OR XXIX was written, and perhaps some time before it was even conceived. Even within the broad date that Bischoff supplied for the second hand which wrote this \textit{ordo} (800-850), there is no chance that the Pope was either Hadrian II or Hadrian III. It must therefore be Pope Hadrian I (772-795) with whom our interlocutor spoke, possibly discussing and querying the very text of OR XXVII which we find in Vatican Pal.lat.487.\footnote{On Hadrian, Raymond Davis’ translation of the \textit{Liber Pontificalis} provides a useful summary; Raymond Davis, \textit{Lives of the Eighth Century Popes} (Liverpool, 1992), pp.107-172.} Hadrian’s involvement with the Frankish liturgy is well-known, notably in the sending of the \textit{Hadrianum} Sacramentary to Charlemagne, but here is an example of perhaps a more intimate consultation with him. This text was then re-copied from a letter or report into Vatican Pal.lat.487, taking its place after the \textit{ordo} which was demonstrably influenced by the Pope’s recommendations.

This choice to include this little piece of correspondence just after the narrative of the \textit{ordo} is significant, it seems to function as commentary or justification of the \textit{ordo} which precedes it. The interrogation by the anonymous author recalls Amalarius of Metz’s discussion with the Roman archdeacon Theodore in 831, during the time of Pope Gregory IV (827-844).\footnote{Amalarius of Metz, \textit{De ordine antiphonarii}, Hannsens (ed.), \textit{Opera Omnia}, vol.III, pp.361-363.} The two are alike both in the concern with seeming minutiae of liturgical practice, obviously recalling real problems encountered within the text of an \textit{ordo}, and the deference shown to the Roman interlocutor for the answer to these questions. For both Amalarius and our Lorsch monk who encountered Hadrian, the close association of the \textit{ordo} with the papacy continued even after the \textit{ordo} had been edited to remove the specifically Roman details, and Rome was perceived as ultimate judge and arbiter even
on seemingly minute liturgical questions. This category ‘Roman’ clearly had a great deal of concrete resonance, but different from the way historically it has been interpreted.\(^{152}\) In Häußling’s inspired insight: ‘the Roman church lived as a city church and therefore an imitation of the Roman liturgy was, for the Franks, not only the assimilation of any one element of the liturgy of a single feast, but, far more fundamentally, confrontation with the specific conditions of the Roman city liturgy (\textit{Stadliturgie}).\(^{153}\) In Lorsch, with the physical relics of a Roman martyr, Nazarius, beneath the very altar, that would have had a particular resonance. So, where confusion arose, it was still desirable to seek arbitration and validation from the Pope himself, the very representative and pinnacle of Roman primacy. It also provides a Roman sanction in the eyes of the Carolingian reader to the \textit{ordines} that surround them, but also to the \textit{ordo} project, that is the adaptation of the Roman rite. This note proves that OR XXIX was still viewed as an ‘\textit{ordo romanus},’ as much as any of the other texts that go before it, or Collection A. Andrieu’s notion of ‘true’ \textit{ordines romani} as those only that originated in Rome and passed into the record unstained by Frankish innovation, would be an alien one to the scribe to whom we owe it.\(^{154}\)

\textbf{Part 2: Montpellier Bibliothèque de la faculté de Médecine 412}

Andrieu’s best example of the complete and canonical Collection A was the Montpellier manuscript, from Tours.\(^{155}\) As above, Bischoff and Andrieu agreed that this manuscript originated in the first or second quarter of the ninth century. It offers the complete version of the Collection and it contains:

In immediate aspect, it is quite different from Palat.lat.487. It has beautiful full page initial D in violet, red and blue opening the manuscript, and the two smaller drawings of initial ‘P’ in red and brown, with organic flourishes, which open the ordo section on folio 87r and open OR I, as well as the strikingly regular script of Tours throughout (the same hand is found in Paris BnF lat.5726 and lat.13759, a partial copy of Livy’s Ab urbe and a copy of the Martinellus respectively). A large part of the manuscript is given over to Augustine’s Enchiridion, from fols. 1-86r. This is clearly a text for studying, probably privately rather than in a school setting, since, throughout, an assiduous reader has left notae and signae concerning interesting passages. The ordines do not show any clear sign of such reading, and how Augustine’s text might relate to them is obscure. On the spare page before the ordines and after the end of Augustine (86v), two processional antiphons with neums have been written, both for Pentecost, though in a later hand. Compared to Palat.lat.487, the ordines of Collection A in Montpellier 412 have been subject to some correction, largely for matters of grammar, and Andrieu sees this as the work of ‘the Carolingian correctors’ who work ‘to the rules of

---


157 PL XL, cols.231-290.
good Latinity’. At, OR XXVII, n.46, Montpellier is the only manuscript to offer the incipit of Psalm 118 ‘Beati immaculati’, and at OR XXVII, n.54 the further readings from Exodus and Isaiah, and Psalm 41 on Holy Saturday are actually specified where they were simply ‘alias lectiones’ in the Vatican text. This proves the employment of other liturgical books, a psalter (in order to find out what the correct psalm for this day of the year was) and a text of readings, probably a Gospel book or comes, in order to offer a more complete narrative of the rites in question, an impulse for which there is considerable evidence in other manuscripts. At OR XXXIV, n.9, Montpellier records the text of the Kyrieleison in Greek letters, but uses gamma instead of upsilon for ‘γ’, suggesting some knowledge of Greek letters but no real cognisance of it. One might argue that the text represents a snapshot of liturgical texts produced for study and reading, perhaps at Tours, or perhaps produced by the scriptorium there to be exported to another library, which is common in Tours. Andrieu might have said that this was for the study of the ‘Roman liturgy’, but that comes with significant complication. If this was the context into which the ‘Collection A’ represented by Palat.lat.487 entered, the additions of OR XIII A, for readings, and OR XLI I, for church dedications, would allow the study to be of broader length. All these texts in some way claimed Roman provenance, the latter two ordines in their titles. Yet, as we saw with OR XXIX, association with Rome did not preclude significant reworking of the texts in question.

Montpellier’s own addition to Collection A itself claims Roman provenance too, but is highly complex. At the mid point of the manuscript, between Augustine’s Enchiridion and the opening of OR I, is to be found another ordo romanus, OR XV, or a part of it (nn.1-85). The compiler makes a reader immediately aware that this text is of an order apart from Collection A. It has its own large initial and rubricated title. Only OR I, the opening of Collection A, has a similar large initial, so there is

160 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.605, OR XXXIV,n.8, var.3.
a break implied, more significant than that between the single ordines within Collection A itself. This text is the so-called Capitulare Ecclesiastici Ordinis, which boldly asserts its Roman origins from the start: ‘qualiter sancta atque apostolica ecclesiae romana celebratur’. Briefly, in its entirety, the text of OR XV presents a narrative of the annual cycle of the liturgical year, from the Conception of Mary (December 8), through Lent and Easter, with various prescriptions concerning the order of prayers and chants as well. The full expanse of the ordo is found only in St Gallen Stiftsbibliothek 349, where it opens a distinct Collection of ordines romani, the Capitulare Collection. Our manuscript, Montpellier 412, has a version of it running from nn.1-85, with significant differences from that St Gallen text. Montpellier’s variations are close to versions of the text carried on spare folios in three manuscripts of the canonical Collection known as the Collection of Saint-Maur: The Hague, Meermanno Westreeanum cod. 10.B.4 (of the late eighth century), BAV Reg.lat.1127 (of the ninth century and copied in the vicinity of Tours, later in Angoulême) copied from it and finally Paris BnF lat.2400 (from the 11th century and Angoulême). It was also found in the lost manuscript, once in Laon. Examining the manuscripts in question, it is quite clear that the compiler of the Hague manuscript added the liturgical text, OR XV, onto spare folios, and his later copyists simply copied it as if it were integral. The Hague copyist only had part of what we now know as OR XV. All three manuscripts offer only OR XV, nn.1-75. Notably the Hague and other manuscripts end in the middle of OR XV, n.75, without even completing the sentence. Nevertheless, all four manuscripts do agree where they overlap.

166 As with pieces examined in Roger Reynolds, ‘Pseudonymous Liturgica in early medieval canon law collections’, Law and Liturgy in the Latin Church, 5th-12th centuries (Aldershot, 1994), pp.67-76.
OR XV has been recently presented by Hallinger (along with a number of other ordines) as if this text were the practice in monasteries in Rome, and Van Dijk made the same argument.\footnote{168} This is the basis of Semmler’s new edition of OR XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX and parts of XV in Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum which further divorces the texts from their manuscripts by putting them in a different order, and extracting pieces from other ordines which deal with monks.\footnote{169} But Hallinger, while he made the point that certain of the rituals Andrieu characterised as ‘Gallican’ were also present in Italy, never fully dealt with Andrieu’s proof that these texts were still not Roman, as Jeffrey also pointed out.\footnote{170} Even in Montpellier 412, for example, the text prescribed baptizing at Epiphany, which the Popes actively forebade.\footnote{171} The baptism narrative itself was based on the Sacramentary of Gellone, a Frankish text.\footnote{172} Partly, this error arose from Hallinger’s own ideas of what Carolingian ‘Reform’ was supposed to have looked like.\footnote{173} Van Dijk assumes an ‘Eastern’ influence on the papacy explains that baptizing on Epiphany could have come to Rome, yet that custom has certainly left no trace in any Roman Sacramentary.\footnote{174} The mass ordo (OR XV, nn.12-65) which is enclosed in the text is not an early form of OR I but a later abbreviation of it.\footnote{175} Van Dijk argues that this mass ordo is early because ‘it does not know the complex hierarchy of papal personnel...the assistants of the domnus apostolicus are all clerics: bishops, priests, an archdeacon, 


\footnote{170} Peter Jeffrey, ‘Eastern and Western Elements’ pp.128-130, particularly n.85: ‘other non-Roman liturgical traits that are not particularly monastic, such as the practice of baptizing at Epiphany, go unmentioned or are not really dealt with.’; Smyth, La Liturgie Oubliée, pp.151-153; Martimort, Les Ordines, pp.32-33.

\footnote{171} OR XV, nn.70-78; Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.110-112, and analysed at pp.79-81; Duchesne, Origins du culte chrétien, p.511 details the forbidding of this action by Siricus, Leo and Gelasius.


\footnote{173} Hallinger, Die Römischen Ordines, p.467.

\footnote{174} Van Dijk ‘Urban and Papal Rites’, p.455: ‘in those days, many things Byzantine were forced on the pontiff and his diocese’.

deacons and subdeacons etc.’. However, these are the exact same adaptations we have seen Franks make of *ordines romani* for their use. These queries have led to some recent misconceptions, such as that Roman monasteries practised the Benedictine Rule prior to the tenth century. However, Andrieu here cannot yet be overturned. Therefore, OR XV, in Montpellier 412 itself, makes a claim to Roman origin that is questionable. This claim, like the one made by the Old Gelasian Sacramentary, must question whether the Franks really understood the title of ‘Roman practice’ as meaning that the text must reflect every aspect of Roman ritual life.

Notably, some of the readings in Montpellier and the three other manuscripts are simply more accurate renderings, which St Gallen 349 sometimes copies imperfectly, or clarifications where the original was unclear. Others add significant new details in keeping with alterations made elsewhere in the Montpellier manuscript; at n.23 the *dominus vobiscum* dialogue is added, at n.55 an archiepiscopus and archidiaconus take the chalice, as in OR 1, rather than a subdiaconus. In the baptism at Epiphany narrative there are some significant alterations, the clothing of the clerics in white (as in Gellone, and Pseudo-Germanus), the invocation of the Holy Trinity at n.74, and the addition of confirmation soon afterwards by a bishop at n.77 imply ‘correction’ towards a more accurate and theologically satisfactory narrative of baptism. The portion our manuscript copies,

---

179 Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.II, pp.50-51; e.g, OR XV, n. 33, 50, 57, 42, 63
181 *Ibid.*, p.112: ‘Deinde discalciati presbiteri aut diaconi <induentes se aliis vestibus mundis vel candedis>, ingrediuntur in fontes et acceptis infantibus de parentibus baptizantur eos, ter mergentes in aqua, in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti, tantum <sanctam trinam mersione> semel invocantes….<Baptizati autem infantes mox deportantur ante episcopum et datur eis gracia spiritus septiformis cum chrisma in fronte et invocatio sanctae trinitatis, id est confirmatio baptismi, vel christianitas>’; compare OR XI, n.99-102; Dumas (ed.), *Gellonensis*, 2319, 2321, 2325, pp.335-337. ‘Deinde presbiteri aut diaconi, etiam si necesse fuerit et acoliti discalciati, induentes se aliis vestibus mundis uel candedissimis ingrediuntur in fontes intro aquam…baptizantur eos sub trinam mersionem tantum sanctam trinitatem semel invocantes…et dat orationem pontifex super eos, cum
nn.1-85 covers up until the middle of Lent. The Montpellier manuscript comes to a halt just at the point when OR XV begins to describe the Lenten scrutinies. Since the text of OR XV on the Lenten scrutinies and the baptism which follows on Holy Saturday is quite similar to OR XI (though based on something quite like the Gellone ordo of baptism related to it) it seems quite obvious that it was surplus to requirements for the Montpellier manuscript and could be discarded. But OR XV does provide descriptions for some liturgical customs which Collection A did not already offer, the Conception of Mary, the Ember Days of December and Lent, Christmas, the Octave of Christmas, Epiphany, and Candlemas. Many of these only have small indications of liturgical use, but they provide the Montpellier text with what would be a more complete sweep of the liturgical year, coming to an end just at the point where Collection A, which includes ordines for Lenten scrutinies, for Holy Week and for Easter, would provide more thorough treatment. Some of the most striking include indications of the proper Roman stations (particularly for the Ember Day of December n.3 and Christmas at n.11). Since the following text OR I opens with a fully decorated initial, a sign of separation from OR XV, the compiler was aware, and wished his reader to be aware, that Collection A and OR XV were somewhat distinct. But he found the narrative of OR XV, despite its complications, sufficiently compelling to offer it with a version of Collection A. Collection A, however, was copied at Tours from an exemplar from elsewhere, probably Alsace, as the next manuscript witness we shall examine reveals.

\[\text{crisma faciens crucem in frontibus eorum cum innuocatione sanctae trinitatis et tradedit eis septiformem spiritus sancti gratiam'.}
\]

Part 3: A Dismembered Manuscript of Murbach (Sankt Paul im Lavanttal Stiftsbibliothek 979, Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14659, Clm 14655 and Regensburg Staatliche Bibliothek, fragmenta sine numero)

Andrieu was aware of a fragment of OR XXXIV bound as the first folio of a manuscript of St Paul im Lavanttal, now with the classmark 979, though Andrieu called it 29.4.9.\textsuperscript{183} This fragment comprised OR XXXIV, nn.13-19, with the very end of the priest’s ordination (n.13), and the beginning of the bishop’s, describing how the citizens of the city in need of a bishop came to Rome with their candidate and he had to swear on Peter’s body that he had not transgressed the four canones (homosexuality, congress with a nun, bestiality or bigamy). Andrieu dated the manuscript to the beginning of the ninth century, and duly used it for his edition of OR XXXIV, but there was little to be said for such a small fragment, and no way to locate it. Bischoff, however, discovered multiple additional fragments of this very manuscript, two being endleaves in manuscripts of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek.\textsuperscript{184} The piece of greatest interest, and the one Bischoff linked to the St Paul fragment first, is to be seen at the end of Munich Clm 14659, which is a fifteenth-century manuscript of Alexander of Villedieu’s Commentary on Donatus. Two folios are bound to the end from the very same manuscript at the St Paul fragment. These are small and slim pages, at 210 by 120 mm. The pages were bound into Munich Clm 14659 on the wrong side, so each folio is the wrong way round, but the reconstruction is fairly simple.

Fol.1*v OR XXXIV, nn.22-26 ‘…benignitas et omnia bona’ to ‘protegat nos dominus’

Fol.1*r, OR XXXIV, nn.26-27 ‘Respondent omnes. Amen’ to ‘fecisset et respondit…’

\textsuperscript{183} Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.1, pp.347-349.

Fol.2*v, OR XXXIV, nn.42-45 (end) ‘...domnus apostolicus super omnes episcopos’ to ‘comnicat omnem populum. Amen.’

Fol.2*r ORDO OFFICII IN CENA DOMINI IN NOCTE. The first half of a new ordo for Maundy Thursday.

Like Palat.lat.487, there is no rubrication or signs of adaptation to use. Only the title of the Maundy Thursday ordo is in red. The scribe made a few forgivable errors: at n.27 he has damnatione rather than datione, and at nn.44 and 45 he twice misspells communicat as communcat and comnicat but in general his version can simply be read from Andrieu’s edition.

The ordo for the Night Office of Maundy Thursday was certainly an addition. This text owes nothing to OR XXVII, or to any ordo romanus Andrieu edited. There are, certainly, small resonances of Maundy Thursday texts that can be seen elsewhere (like Palat.lat.47, below, it begins with bells ‘clocca’ ringing), but there is no obvious textual relationship. Regrettably cut off halfway through, the ordo is short enough to write out in full:

**ORDO OFFICII IN CENA DOMINI IN NOCTE**

Primo clocca modice sonatur. Deus in adiutorium meum non dicatur nec venite cantetur.
Sed tantum antiphonam zelus domus tuae. Ad nullum psalmum Gloria non dicatur. Sed psalmo finito finis non trahatur. Tertium psalmum omnes pariter dicit versum. Ille nocte lumen non extinguatur. Lector benedictionem petat, sed finem de ipsa lectione facit. homelia de ipso die legantur non lamentationes. Item ad matutinas non dicatur deus in adiutorium sed antefonas matutina finita. Non dicatur kyrie leyson nec presbiter orationes.
nihilo; aliud. nisi tantum inclinant esse. Vadunt... 185

---

185 Munich Clm 14659, fol.2*r: ‘AN ORDO FOR THE OFFICE OF MAUNDY THURSDAY AT NIGHT. First the bells sound restrainedly. Deus in adiutorium meum is not to be said, nor is Venite to be sung. But only the antiphon Zelus domus tuae. At none of the psalms is Gloria to be said. And when the psalms finish, the ending is not to be drawn out. At the third psalm, all say the verse together. On this night, the light is not to be extinguished. The lector seeks blessing, but he does this at the end of the reading. Homilies pertaining to the day are read,'
This ordo was certainly composed for a community performing the Office, who were served only by a presbiter. Yet, it does provide more detail on the Maundy Thursday nocturnes than OR XXVI did (n.2), though, unlike that text, it does not give the ceremony of New Fire.\textsuperscript{186} Despite the title, the text does go into the Matins of the next day, Good Friday. The activities of the lector in this and other ordines of simpler character (which seem, like this one, to be redacted on demand for communities) queries the idea, asserted by Barrow based on a lack of evidence elsewhere, that the minor orders had no real function by the Carolingian era.\textsuperscript{187} There is some interest in modes of chant, developing what Aubert pointed out was an apparatus which differentiated Frankish texts from Roman ordines. In any case, it is immediately striking that this ordo, indisputably and absolutely Frankish, of a simple character, came immediately after OR XXXIV, a papal Roman ordination ritual set in Saint Peter’s. What kind of manuscript was this?

The other piece of the manuscript is bound as the very last folio (42) of Munich Clm 14655. This manuscript is a fourteenth-century copy of the Constitutions of Pope Clement. The folio bound to it was almost certainly the blank first or final page of the manuscript which once contained OR XXXIV. The page was ruled, but it was left blank on one side, 42v. On the other (42r), are written a list of names in the same hand as the other folios.\textsuperscript{188} There is absolutely no indication of who they are. They do suggest that a community might have held the manuscript and have written the names, perhaps for commemorative purposes.\textsuperscript{189}

\textsuperscript{189} Bischoff raises an analogy with the Prague Sacramentary, for recent work on the name list there: Carl I Hammer, ‘The Social Landscape of the Prague Sacramentary: The Prosopography of an Eighth Century Mass Book’, Traditio, 54 (1999), pp.41-80; Stuart Airlie, ‘Earthly and Heavenly Networks in a World in Flux: Carolingian Family Identities and the Prague Sacramentary’ in Diesenberger et al (eds), Prague Sacramentary, pp.204-221.

but not lamentsations. Then at matins, \textit{deus in adiutorium} is not to be said, but when matins are finished, antiphons (are sung). \textit{Kyrie eleison} is not to be said, nor says the priest the prayers. Nothing else except they only are to be inclined. They go...'
In his first edition of *Schreibschulen*, Bischoff did not connect all three manuscripts, but offered Regensburg as a point of origin for them separately. But the second edition made the connection, and added that there were further fragments to be seen in Regensburg’s *staatliche Bibliothek, sinenumero*. With the kind assistance of Professor David Hiley, I was able to examine these pieces from photographs. They comprise a single bifolium with a half-page attached:

Fols.1r-v. OR XXVII, nn.47-54¹⁹⁰ ‘...crucis in quo salus mundi pependit’ to ‘usquedum pontifex uenerit...’

Fols.2r-v OR XXVII, nn.69–76.¹⁹¹ ‘archidiaconus primo scolae’ to ‘cantendo antiphona lapidem...’ This covers the beginning of the Roman Easter Vespers, proving it was OR XXVII.

Half leaf, cut down the middle (starts right of fol.2r, continuation left of 2v), OR XXXIV, nn.19-22¹⁹² ‘...ab archidiacono...’ to ‘...hospitalitas...’.

With OR XXVII added, it becomes even more likely that this manuscript was once a copy of Collection A, plus an extra *ordo* for Maundy Thursday. The recensions are very close to Montpellier 412: we can see at OR XVII, n.51 the manuscript gives Holy Saturday a title DE SABBATO SANCTO and at n.54, the addition otherwise peculiar to Montpellier, var.7 in Andrieu on a detail of practice ‘et ut ventum fueri ad Agnus Dei-to name but two.¹⁹³ This suggests that Tours did not correct Collection A, as Andrieu supposed, but that the text was already corrected previously, very early in the ninth century. While writing in ‘better Latin’, these scribes did not all write in perfect Caroline minuscule, as they did at Tours.

If we add the Sankt Paul im Lavanttal fragment, and estimating based on the number of words to a line, the manuscript consisted of:

¹⁹¹ Ibid., p.363.
¹⁹² Andrieu,*Les Ordines*, vol.IV, pp.608-609.
(? Lost folios—probably including OR I and OR XI)

Regensburg folio 1, OR XXVII, nn.47-54

1 lost folio

Regensburg folio 2, OR XXVII nn.69-76.

(? Lost folios, with possibly OR XLII and certainly OR XXXIV, nn.1-12)

St Paul im Lavanttal 749 fol.1: OR XXXIV, nn.13-19

Regensburg, half fragment OR XXXIV, nn.19-22.

Fol 1* of Munich Clm 14659: OR XXXIV, nn.22-27

6(?) lost folios

Fol 2* of Munich Clm 14659: OR XXXIV, nn.42-45, and beginning of an Ordo Romanus of Maundy Thursday

(? lost folios)

Fol. 42 of Munich Clm 14655. Name list.

The scribe of the second Regensburg folio wrote in Anglo-Saxon minuscule, and, on this account, Bischoff located the manuscript most probably to Murbach. Alongside him, at least two other scribes wrote in early Caroline minuscule: Regensburg folio 1 who has a squat rounded script, with unusual abbreviations for pontifex, tunc and fontes and two-c a form, and the scribe of Munich Clm 14659, who uses extended ascenders and descenders and rare ligatures (ti hi ci ni). Our other two examples of OR XXXIV, both as part of Collection A, did also come from monastery, and the ordo for Maundy Thursday would certainly suit such a location. Murbach, just like Lorsch and Tours, was also patronised by the Carolingians, and is located in Alsace, in the Upper Rhine where the ordines

romani certainly circulated. Charlemagne himself was abbot for a time, after Abbot Sindbert (who may also have been a bishop of Regensburg) died while accompanying him on campaign against the Avaars in 791.\textsuperscript{195} Dated in the Katalog to the 8\textsuperscript{th} /9\textsuperscript{th} century divide, contemporary to Lorsch’s example Vatican Pal.lat.487, it likewise testifies to Collection A’s early circulation in monasteries. But Collection A had an extra piece added, here as in both our other examples. Again, just like in Lorsch, a new piece of Holy Week was added. The idea that the attraction of Collection A’s text was straightforwardly their pure Roman-ness collapses even further. It is difficult to tell how the monks of Murbach would have used OR XXXIV (as for the monks of Lorsch), but they clearly did not see any problems placing it alongside an ordo for Holy Week that was extremely accessible and made no claims to Roman-ness at all. Thus, the addition of OR XXIX to Palat.lat.487 and OR XV to Montpellier 412, non Roman ordines to the so-called Roman Collection, seem to represent an observable pattern in the treatment of Collection A.

\textbf{Part 4: Variant Accounts of Holy Week in Paris BnF Lat.12405 and BAV Palat.lat.47\textsuperscript{196} and Ordination in Paris BnF lat.2449}

There are a few manuscripts which present single ordines from Collection A copied into spare or guard folios. Two, which each offer a version of OR XXVII, present very striking re-imaginings of the Holy Week ordo. The first is Paris BnF lat.12405. Like a number of manuscripts, this example was dated rather too late by Andrieu, who saw it as a tenth-century manuscript, which Bischoff corrected to the mid-ninth century.\textsuperscript{197} It is primarily a Collection of sermons, written at Saint-Germain-des-Prés, as is attested by the scribe’s monograph ‘Hunc ego Gundoinus Germanus tibi offero’, found also in two other manuscripts in Paris (lat.5234 and lat.11863).\textsuperscript{198} The sermons are primarily patristic, John Chrysostom, Maximus the Confessor, Augustine of Hippo and so on, and are

\begin{footnotes}
\item 196 Digitised at \url{http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Pal.lat.47}
\item 198 Paris BnF lat.12405, fol.4r ‘This I, Gundoinus, offer to you, Germaine’.
\end{footnotes}
arranged according to the cycle of the year. But it seems the scribe, probably Gundoinus himself, found that there was space left between Christmas and the feast of Saint-Stephen and undertook to copy a particular version of OR XXVII into this space. Given that the *ordo* is of Holy Week, the immediate relevance to its surroundings is not obvious, and it is likely that its presence here was primarily motivated by the desire to preserve the *ordo*. The sermon collection is a book that could have seen use in a liturgical context, so the *ordo* might well have remained a reminder of correct liturgy, even if it pointed ahead to the Holy Week section of the book. Gundoinus did take the trouble to add extra folios to the manuscript at this point to contain the whole *ordo*.

Andrieu treated this recension only briefly, again relegating the variations to footnotes. As he describes it, the text is ‘of an independent line’, and shows no obvious affiliation with the other manuscripts, not even those of Collection A. But what singles it out most are the ‘interpolations’ that pepper the text, bringing it in line with the practice for Holy Week as it is detailed in the Gelasian Sacramentaries of the Eighth Century. Firstly, the text cuts off the entire second half of OR XXVII (n.67-94), which contained the confusing narrative of Roman Easter Week Vespers. It seems the editor recognised this section as being of a different character. This deletion is an immediate signal that the primary aim of these edits was for the usefulness of the text. As Van Dijk commented, these Holy Week Vespers were not only somewhat muddled in this version, they were highly specialised to the Roman milieu, with Greek chants. The additions of this Saint-Denis editor firm up the conclusion. He corrects the title to the more accurate ‘*noctibus ac diebus*’ rather than just *noctibus*. In general, he adds reference to rituals that were present in the Gelasian Sacramentary for Holy Week, but which OR XXVII did not narrate. In adding a completely new mention of the reconciliation of penitents during Maundy Thursday, he refers explicitly to the Sacramentary of

---

199 Van Dijk, pp.354-355.
Gelasius (undoubtedly one of the books under the title Gelasian Sacramentary of the eighth century):

n.21, var.4 Feria V caenae domini, hora tertia **diligenter reconciliatione poenitentum sicut in sacramentorio Gelasii habetur et eorum missa peracta, ingressi sacrarium induuntur dalmaticis tam pontifex quam...**  

He added mention of the blessing of oil for the sick in the middle of the Maundy Thursday Mass, giving specific details about how that would unfold. Again unmentioned by OR XXVII, this ceremony was described in the Gelasian. (n.25, var.8)

‘Sed antequam dicitur, Per quem haec omnia, benedicitur oleum ad infirmos tacite ac deinde peragitur secreta. Sequitur Pater noster, Libera nos usque ad communionem’.  

That evening, a mass is specified not mentioned in OR XXVII, ‘**sero uero agatur missa publica**’ (n.34, var.3), wording which is close to the title of that mass in the Phillips Sacramentary, **AD MISSAS SERO**.  

On Good Friday, he indicates that the adoration of the Cross should take place around the time of the ninth hour, as in the Gelasian, in place of being delayed until evening, as in OR XXVII (n.40, var.4), with a comment that speaks volumes to his priorities: ‘**Sed melius est propter incommoditatem populi ut simul haec omnia fiant hora nona**’. This was a version of OR XXVII to be performed for the people, perhaps in Paris itself.

---

201 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.352: ‘On Maundy Thursday, at the third hour, the reconciliation of penitents as is found in the Sacramentary of Gelasius and their mass having been completed diligently, when they have entered the sacristy both the pontiff and the deacons put on chasubles’, in the Sacramentary of Gellone Dumas (ed.), Gellonensis, 588-596, pp.76-78; Angoulême, Saint-Roch (ed.), Engolismensis, 598-606, pp.81-83.  

202 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.353: ‘But before he says ‘Per quem haec omnia’, he blesses the oil for the sick quietly and then the secret is performed. There follows the Pater Noster, Libera nos until the communion.’; Dumas (ed.) Gellonensis, 618-619, p.82 ‘Item ultimo, antequam dicat: Per quem hec omnia domine, benedecis oleum pro infirmis siue pro populo’.  


204 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.357: ‘But is it better on account of the untimeliness of the people that exactly all these things should be done at the ninth hour’; in the Sacramentary of Gellone, Dumas (ed.), Gellonensis, 641, p.86: ‘Hora nona procedunt omnes ad ecclesiam et ponitur sancta crux super altare...’
On Holy Saturday, the litany prescribed by OR XXVII is prolonged by further chant, including an antiphon and psalm (n.55, var.4). Again our compiler is drawing together information from multiple liturgical books, here adding perhaps an antiphoner and psalter.

Finita letania, incipit pontifex antiphonam: Lava me, domine, ab iniquitate mea et a peccato mea munda me. Et canunt psalmum Miserere mei deus.\footnote{Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.360 ‘When the litany is finished, the pontiff begins the antiphon ‘Lava me ab iniquitate mea et a peccato mea munda me. And they sing the psalm ‘Miserere mei deus’ (Psalm 51).}

Also, vespers are to be said on Holy Saturday which were not specified in OR XXVII (n.64, var.9).\footnote{Ibid., p.361: ‘Missa expleta, canonunt vespertas’.

Finally, a marginal note discusses the prayer \textit{in primis pro ecclesia dei}. The note basically states that what the \textit{ordo} prescribes only applies ‘if the prayers are said by us (nostris) on Wednesday’.\footnote{‘si a nostris dicuntur fer.quarta’ Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.351, n.14, var.15.} In Amalarius of Metz, ‘nostris’ are the self-conscious Franks, aware of the differences with their own liturgical usages from the Roman, but quite able to present both in good faith. Amalarius himself tells us that the Franks were accustomed to say these prayers on Good Friday, not Wednesday. He had seen that the \textit{libellus ex romana consuetudine} (i.e. his \textit{libellus of ordines romani}) told him they were done on Wednesday, and remarked that ‘we are accustomed to do them on Good Friday’.\footnote{Amalarius, Liber Officialis, I.11, Hanssens, Opera Omnia, vol.II, p.60: ‘Intimat supradictus libellus ex romana consuetudine debere eodem die ante publicum officium orationes, quas sollemus in sexta feria agere, recitari’; Theodor Klausner, ‘Eine stationsliste der Metzer kirche aus dem 8.Jahrhundert wahrscheinlich ein werk Chrodegangs’, Ephemerides Liturgicae, 44 (1930) reprinted in Gesammelte Arbeiten zur Liturgiegeschichte, kirchengeschichte und christlichen Archäologie (Munich, 1974), pp.21-45, here pp.36-37 shows some signs of Metz’s adaptations of this custom: ‘Statio mane prima ad sanctum petrum infra episcopato. Tunc caelebrandae orationes sollemnes et tunc conveniunt omnes presbiteri ciuitatis in eadem ecclesia aut quomodo tunc pontifex agit orationes sollemnes sic et ipsi presbiteri. Sexta feria faciant unusquisque ad uesperum in titulo suo statio ipsa die ad missas in eadem ecclesia ad nona’, which suggests priests said the prayers on their own on Friday, while everyone did them together on Wednesday.}

Tellingly, Amalarius makes absolutely no judgement on either practice; and advocates for neither. The marginal note, when our compiler himself knew Amalarius, seems to present a similar equivalence. One might follow the \textit{ordo} here if one chose to say the prayers on Wednesday, but one need not do so absolutely.
All of these small interpolations are self-evidently attempts to make OR XXVII closer to the practice of the locale in which it was written, and the authority of the Gelasian Sacramentary of the eighth century in this locale was overpowering. The Gelasian of the eighth century has been termed a ‘Frankish prayer book for the use of Frankish churches’.  

While scholarship had once consigned the Gelasian of the eighth century to oblivion not long into the ninth century (our only complete examples of the text are around 800), in fact these texts undoubtedly continued to influence practice for a very long time afterwards, and were perhaps more influential than the Gregorian in certain places. The same tradition touches many of the ordines romani manuscripts closely, something Andrieu could not treat at length since, when he wrote, editions of the three important surviving examples were not yet published. Here, their tradition even influences an ordo from Collection A.

Finally, there is one longer interpolation that the editor inserts at the very beginning of Holy Saturday (n.51, var.1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paris lat.12405, fols.51r-v</th>
<th>Gellone 667, 675, Angouleme 730</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| In vigilia pashe et pentecostes et lectiones et universa officia secundum Librum officialem Amalariiagi debent, quia in Gregorii missali similiter continetur. Sabbato sancto mane reddant infantes symbolum et post hec catecizantur ipsi infantes. | REDDITIO SYMBOLI IN SABBATO SANCTO  
Sabbatorum die mane, reddunt infantis symbolum.  
Prius catecizas eos....  
SEQUITUR ORDO QUALITER SABBATO SANCTO AD VIGILIAS INGREDITUR  
Primitus enim octava hora diei medieante, procedunt ad ecclesiam et ingrediuntur in sacramento et induent se |

Eodem vero die, hora die octava mediante, veniunt omnes ad ecclesiam et ingreditur clerus in sacarium et induunt se vestimentis sicut mos est. Et incipit


211 Dumas (ed) Gellonensis, CCSL 149; Saint-Roch (ed.), Engolismensis, CCSL 149C; Heiming (ed.), Augustodunensis, CCSLB 149B.

212 Dumas (ed.), Gellonensis, pp.90-95.

This interpolation is thus a brief summary of some rites that took place during the entrance to the church on Holy Saturday, including the blessing of the Paschal candle. Again, these were not given in detail in OR XXVII, but are found in the Gelasian of the eighth century. As Andrieu notes, the summary added here is in fact composed from a set of rubrics, which resemble very closely those found in the Gelasian Sacramentary of the eighth century, notably the Angoulême and Gellone.

---

214 ‘On Holy Saturday everyone comes into the church and then two candles, held by two notarii, are lit, one on the right side of the altar and the other on the left. During the vigils of Easter and Pentecost, both the whole office and the readings ought to be done according to Amalarius’ Liber Officialis, because in the Missal of Gregory the same things are contained. On Holy Saturday in the morning the children give the symbol, and after that these children are catechized. Now on the same day, at the eighth hour, everyone goes to the church and the clerics enter the sacristy and put on their vestments as is the custom. And the cleric begins the litany and the priest proceeds from the sacristy with his orders. They come before the altar, standing with head inclined until when they say ‘Agnus Dei qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere. Then, rising from prayer, the priest goes behind the altar and sits in his seat. Then the archdeacon coming before the altar, also takes from the light which on Friday was left and making the sign of the cross over the candle in his hand and lighting it, completes in this way the blessing of the candle. And then readings and prayers are done from the Paschal Vigil, as in the Sacramentary.’

215 ‘THE GIVING OF THE SYMBOL ON HOLY SATURDAY, on Saturday morning, they give the symbol to the infants. First you must catechize them. CII HERE FOLLOWS THE ORDO HOW ON HOLY SATURDAY YOU SHOULD ENTER TO THE VIGILS. But first on the eighth hour of the day, they process to the church and enter the sacristy and cloth themselves in sacred vestments, as is custom. And the clerics begin the litany and the priest processes from the sacristy with his orders. They come before the altar, standing with head inclined until when they say ‘Agnus dei qui tollis peccata mundi, miserere. Then, rising from prayer, the priest goes behind the altar and sits in his seat. Then the archdeacon goes before the altar, taking light from that which was left on Friday, and making the sign of the cross over the candle and lighting it, and he completes in this way the blessing of the candle. After this, rising from his seat, the priest then says for the vigils of Holy Saturday, as they are contained in the Sacramentary.’
copies, although also present in the so-called ‘Old Gelasian’, and not in the Phillips. In the Sacramentary, these rubrics are placed between sets of prayers, so the editor has specifically gone to gather them. His efforts do then fit in completely with his general endeavour, filling in gaps in OR XXVII, to adjust it to the Sacramentary tradition. His other priority is visible in the reference to both Amalarius’ *Liber Officialis* and the Missal of Gregory, as supporting authorities for both that day and Pentecost vigil, which followed the same script. Again, this manuscript is mid-ninth century, so the redaction of OR XXVII may have been written soon after Amalarius’ death (c.851). At Saint-Germain, it seems that his book provided an actual guide for ceremonies. The Missal of Gregory refers to the Gregorian Sacramentary, which had a far more comprehensive account of Holy Saturday, including readings listed by *incipit* with the prayers that followed them. It is telling to see the same text referring to both Gelasian and Gregorian Sacramentaries openly; our compiler has looked at both for guidance and selected pieces depending on what made sense to him. A few running marginal headings in the manuscript itself alongside this *ordo*, suggest areas which were of particular interest to Amalarius himself too: *De igni excutiendo cena domini, de cereo et agnis, de nudatio altaris*. The invocation of Amalarius situates this recension in the lively discussions of its age. Amalarius, too, looked between Sacramentary and *ordo romanus* to chart a path that made sense of the conflicting traditions.

The second manuscript, Vat.Pal.lat.47, is a ninth-century Gospel Book, which preserves a partial copy of an idiosyncratic rendering of Holy Week on its final folio, fol.156v, after the end of the Gospel of John. Bischoff suggests that the main Gospel text is from the second quarter of the ninth century.

---

219 ‘Concerning the New fire to be struck on Maundy Thursday, concerning the wax and lambs, concerning the devestling of the altar’
century, and ‘Franco-Saxon’, perhaps from Saint-Bertin. 221 It is regrettable that the text is incomplete, because the pieces it gives are highly interesting and individual. What we have covers the very end of Maundy Thursday, the whole of Good Friday (IN PARASACEVEN), and the opening of Holy Saturday (QUE FACIENDA SINT IN SABBATO). The script is much rougher than the main script of the Gospel, and far more abbreviated. If after the main script, it probably falls towards the end of the ninth century. While its briefer description of Thursday and Saturday bear absolutely no relation to it, Andrieu notes the commonality of the Good Friday part with OR XXVII, supposing it was incorporated into an original ordo of a separate character, though really only the parallel comes from OR XXVII, nn.35-45. 222 Andrieu also ignored the changes made to OR XXVII’s Good Friday narrative in this process, arguing that they are ‘of mediocre value and it is useless to make them clear here’. 223 However, they are illustrative of the active process of working out correct liturgical practice in a particular locality, and how the Franks actively received Roman texts. The ordo represented here is of a much simpler character. What is given for Maundy Thursday:


The word ‘gloggas’ for bells is a striking form in Old High German, and is written with uncial Gs seemingly to highlight it. 225 OR XXIX had a variant form ‘cloccas’, as does another document from Lorsch, the letter of Theotroch, and the Murbach manuscript. In the course of the text for Good Friday, which parallels OR XXVII (nn.35-45), a few changes are illuminating:

223 Ibid., p.338: ‘elles sont d’intérêt mediocre et il est inutile d’en faire ici le relevé’.
224 Ibid., p.335: ‘all the bells ring. The three subdeacons prepare themselves with tunics(?). Similarly also the deacons with chasubles, and they do not say ‘Flectamus genua’. They carry candles and incense we bless the lord…’
OR XXVII, n.39: ‘Tunc veniant (sic.) pontifex uel presbiter’ \(^{226}\) OR XXVII n.42: ‘Veniat pontifex sive presbiter et adorans eam deosculatur’ \(^{227}\)

Far from being of mediocre value, these small indications show the adaptation of the *ordo* to celebration by a simple priest rather than a ‘pontiff’. At n.42, an original reference to an oratory was also erased, which suggests a somewhat simpler church than that envisaged by the other examples. \(^{228}\) This is a somewhat less expert reimagining than that in the Paris manuscript (in many other cases, the reference to priest as an alternative celebrant is not added), but, like it, reveals that the *ordines romani* were models for celebration in a range of contexts and could even be rewritten to reflect their new environment better. This implies a process of working out the mechanism of that performance, of asking questions and interrogating the Roman originals, of creative and self-conscious editors working in and for their own localities. At n.45 Andrieu judged that the text of Good Friday became too divorced from OR XXVII and presents it separately in a footnote, but the additions are of a similar character to some we have seen earlier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vat.Palat.lat.47 fol.156v</th>
<th>OR XXVII, n.45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


\(^{227}\) *Ibid.*, p.357: ‘Then comes the pontiff or the priest and, venerating, he kisses it…’


\(^{229}\) *Ibid.*, vol.III, p.358 nota: ‘Abhinc in cod.E discerepat textus, qui sic prosequitur’; ‘Therefore while the people greet the cross, the antiphons “Ecce lignum” “Dum fabricator” and “Crux fidelis” are sung. When it has been greeted and replaced in its place, then the priest when he has saluted the cross descends before the altar and says “Oremus. Praeceptis salutaribus. Pater Noster. Liber nos quaesumus”. And when they say Amen, he takes up a piece of the Host, and puts it in the chalice, saying nothing, and they all communicate in silence and everything is finished’.

\(^{230}\) *Ibid.*, p.358: ‘But the pontiff sits while the people all greet the cross. But, while the pontiff and the people greet the cross, always the antiphon is sung “Ecce lignum crucis in quo salus mundi perpendit. Venite adoremus.” He says psalm 118. When the cross has been greeted and replaced in its place, the pontiff...
Firstly, the celebrant is once again a priest, not a pontiff. Secondly, three antiphons are provided instead of only one, again implying the consultation of an antiphoner and filling in of relevant information from it. Seemingly, this responded to a need arising from performance whereby the single antiphon provided was not long enough to cover the people’s veneration of the cross. The syntax is quite awkward again. Holy Saturday follows:

‘QUA FACIENDA SINT IN SABBATO SANCTO Primitus legantur XII lectiones cum singulis collectis et cantentur tractus. Post novissimum tractum, sequuntur collectae II. Deinde letania, deinde Gloria in excelsis deus, deinde collecta ad missam, deinde epistola. Post epistolam Alleluia. Confitemini. Deinde tractus Laudate. Deinde evangelium et presbiter alta voce...’

A number of lines were cut off from the page (at least six), so it is unclear how the text proceeded and if it actually covered the baptism as well, for example. If we can assume that the compiler of this ordo had OR XXVII, it is clear he found its narratives of Holy Saturday and Maundy Thursday inadequate. For Holy Saturday he has generally added a better account of the sequence of twelve readings and prayers, and the chanting which followed, which is treated extremely cursorily in OR XXVII. This again follows the scheme of the Supplement to the Gregorian.

These two unique testimonies, with the Murbach ordo, witness to a variety of Frankish Holy Week ordines independent from, but brought into dialogue with, the ordines romani tradition of OR XXIV, XXVI and XXVII. This was a legitimate outworking of the Carolingian programme, far from an aberration or deception. Given the references to Gelasius and Gregory in Paris 12405, and the incorporation of Pope Hadrian’s recommendations into OR XXIX, it did not seem that these authors viewed these new texts as any less correct, or as any less in line with what they wanted to receive.

descends before the altar and says Oremus. Praeceptis salutaribus.’ And there follows ‘Pater Noster. Libera nos quaesumus’. And when they say ‘Amen’, he takes up a piece of the Host, and puts it in the chalice, saying nothing. And they all communicate in silence and everything is finished’.  

231 BAV Pal.lat.47, fol.156v: ‘WHAT SHOULD BE DONE ON HOLY SATURDAY. First of all they read XII readings, each one with a collect and then a tract is sung. After the last tract, there follow two collects. Then a litany. Then ‘Gloria in excelsis deus’. Then the collect of the mass. Then the epistle. After the epistle ‘Alleluia. Confitemini. Then the tract. Then the gospel and the priest out loud (says/reads)....’
from Rome. OR XXVII was no less an ordo romanus for these changes. Indeed, by bringing the ordo romanus into the monastery or simple church context, it seemed that something of Rome came with it: Rome altered the space, as the space altered the Roman text.

Finally, in the same vein, it is useful to briefly note one example of OR XXXIV, the Roman ordo of ordinations, subject to similar treatment. Roger Reynolds discovered a particular recension of part of OR XXXIV (nn.14-45) in the manuscript Paris BnF lat.2449, dated to the ninth/tenth century boundary, and probably from Lyons, which was edited for the use of that city. The text covers only the episcopal ordination, but Reynolds pointed out two changes from every other manuscript ‘which fit the Lyonese circumstances: the word archiepiscopus is substituted for domnus apostolicus and aulam sanctis matris ecclesiae is used rather than aulam beati petri’.

This is a process that we have seen several examples of already, but is the only witness to OR XXXIV being adapted in this manner. The manuscript is not a liturgical one. Instead, as a whole it discusses the position, prestige and responsibility of the bishop, in dialogue with several of the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals, and reflecting Lyonais discourse surrounding the problem of chor-bishops. This shows a use to which a liturgical source (OR XXXIV-adapted for Lyons) could have in a non-liturgical book, here building up a picture of what it meant to be a bishop. The text also shows how the pattern of the Roman service could be adapted by overlaying the vocabulary appropriate to Lyons.

Chapter Conclusion: Purposes of Manuscripts of Collection A

It is clear that the label of “Roman” as Andrieu had intended to apply it to Collection A, was entirely inadequate and misleading. Labelling the Collection as the “Roman” Collection should be avoided, as the label has too many modern associations with a uniform Rite or tradition. The


Carolingians, however, would have recognised the Collection as a “Roman” Collection (but one among a plethora of potential varieties of how that might look), within their own understanding of what that meant, as the dialogues with Pope Hadrian and the copying of Roman details which had little or no obvious reference to the performance of ritual would suppose. But that understanding was necessarily fluid and complex and, in each manuscript, was carefully interrogated and reinterpreted, and left space for significant material which did not arise in the Roman Church, as well as the editing of material that was Roman. Furthermore simply because a text cannot be perceived as helping directly in the performance of a ritual in a Frankish context, does not mean it had no usefulness in this context. Before we can reflect on what this meant more broadly, as well as ask what use these manuscripts actually had, we must examine many more manuscripts which further process the ordines romani, but some interim thoughts are helpful. Principal among them is the different manuscripts in which the Collection, or pieces of it, are to be found. Of the witnesses here, we have three originally complete accounts of the Collection. Pal.lat.483 is an unornamented and short codex, added to by different hands, the Murbach fragments are somewhat tidier, grammatically, but vary in script types, while Montpellier 412 is a stately and ornate manuscript, very well-written, where the ordines follow on from Augustine. In the Holy Week manuscripts, individual ordines are found in the context of manuscripts which had liturgical functions, while OR XXXIV shows up in a manuscript from Lyons to illustrate something about bishops. This variety does not suggest a simple or straightforward reception of the ordines or the whole Collection in one single way, as Andrieu’s edition would encourage them to be read. Is the Montpellier manuscript more removed from direct liturgical performance because of its richness (and the presence of Augustine)? Can the manuscript be regarded as a more prestigious example of the texts? These dynamics must be taken into account, as well as the purely textual variations between manuscripts.
Chapter 2: Collection B of the *Ordines Romani*

**Introduction**

Collection B of the *ordines romani* was created from Collection A, with the addition of significant other texts. For Andrieu, this recreation is presented as an inevitability arising from attempts by Franks to put *ordines romani* into practice. As above, however, particularly in the Holy Week examples, Collection A could itself be repurposed in individual ways. Collection B, while more systematic, is not fundamentally different. Some of its smaller additions were signposted in the interventions of manuscript Montpellier 412, for example in the addition of chants and readings to the narrative of the liturgical actions in *ordines*. The most striking difference is the number of manuscript witnesses. Six manuscripts which once contained the complete Collection B survive from this century: Verona Biblioteca Capitolare XCII, Cologne Dombibliothek 138, Munich Staatsbibliothek Clm 14510, Zurich Zentralbibliothek Car C 102, Paris BnF lat.14008 and St Gallen Stiftsbibliothek 446. It is surely remarkable that testimonies to the so-called ‘Gallican Collection’ outnumber the ‘Roman Collection’ so significantly. However, there is again no evidence that a ‘Gallican Collection’ was what the compiler of Collection B aimed to create, nor that his various compilers recognised the text as in any way ‘Gallican’. While our understanding of the pre-Roman Western liturgical traditions of Gaul (if one can even speak of pre-Roman traditions given that the influence of Rome never ceased) is fragmentary, it is a mistake to see the Gallic Church’s traditions as a ‘rite’, in opposition to Rome. Collection B itself proves that some indigenous traditions were received as perfectly coherent alongside purely Roman texts. Furthermore, while Andrieu’s understanding that the compiler of Collection B aimed to create a version of the text oriented towards actual liturgical use by a bishop is borne out by the evidence, the idea that he saw his project as ‘Frankish’ in opposition to ‘Roman’ cannot be supported. In fact, his own work and the responses of copyists equally reveal

---

235 Claussen *The Reform of the Frankish Church*, p.158; Jeffrey, ‘Rome and Jerusalem’, p.234.
that this Collection resonated with Roman associations just as Collection A did. Andrieu supposed that Collection B was created somewhere in the Rhine valley, and its earliest manuscripts are to be found in a broader area surrounding that potent nexus, namely Northern Italy and Bavaria.236 While the creator of Collection B certainly had *ordines romani* as the heart of his initiative, he also added a significant extract from the Gelasian Sacramentary of the eighth century, which Andrieu barely acknowledged.

Andrieu saw that many of the additions made to Collection A in Collection B appear to orient the text further towards use by a Frankish bishop. He therefore called a number of the manuscripts ‘*petits pontificaux*’ or ‘*pontificaux embryoniques*’, that is, they anticipate the bishop’s books that became a basic resource in the later Middle Ages.237 Importantly, for Andrieu, this meant they also prefigured what he saw as the *Pontifical Romano-Germanique*. At the same time as the edifice of the *Romano-Germanique* has crumbled, the variable nature of manuscripts which have been called pontificals has come to light. A pontifical is not a simple, single thing.238 Even defined as a book containing the episcopal functions, as the Collection B manuscripts do, there were ideological and political resonances to the construction of such books, which accrued power as symbols of episcopal authority.239 Monks and canonical communities even wrote their own, for their own purposes. The Collection B manuscripts, if they can be termed ‘*pontificaux*’ of some sort, are enmeshed in these complex dynamics. The evidence of personalisation of each manuscript of Collection B reveals that these dynamics were real to the compilers who brought them together and the bishops through whose hands they passed. No manuscript of Collection B is identical to another. In these differences,

---

it is possible to discern the individual needs and priorities of the bishops for whom the manuscripts were intended, and some dynamics of the sees in which they were incumbent. They enact the peculiar view of liturgy desired by these highly educated bishops who were immersed in the Carolingian liturgical programme, but they also propagandise for it.\textsuperscript{240} They are simultaneously an ideal, and a means of reaching that ideal.

Given this range of manuscript witnesses, it is important to be very clear about the different stages in the development of Collection B. The earliest manuscript witness to the Collection is Verona XCII (814-817), which I will discuss in depth afterwards. The scribe of this manuscript will there be referred to as the scribe of Verona XCII, or the Veronese scribe. This manuscript is an indisputable \textit{terminus ante quem} for the creation of the Collection as a whole. But Verona XCII is clearly not the ‘original’ text of Collection B, as it was first brought together, and its scribe was not the original creator of Collection B. Comparing Verona XCII to other manuscripts of the Collection (principally Munich Clm 14510 and St Gallen 446), it is clear that they did not copy from Verona XCII, since this manuscript includes liturgical material that they do not possess; Andrieu’s philological work yields the same conclusion.\textsuperscript{241} Verona XCII, Munich 14510 and St Gallen 446 all copied from previous exemplars, which descended, at a greater or lesser distance, from the very first example of Collection B, the hypothetical ‘original’, which Andrieu had under the sign $\beta$. We cannot be certain that all of the processes that separate Collection A from Collection B were carried out at once, by the same hand, but, by examining what all the manuscripts share, we can reconstruct what this original, $\beta$, looked like, and what were the things that separated it from Collection A. This hypothetical reconstruction, $\beta$, is therefore a witness to a particular response to Collection A, and the edits made to Collection A were passed on to each of the Collection B manuscripts, then each of those manuscripts responded to this original in different ways. In this discussion, the changes and

\textsuperscript{240} Donald Bullough, ‘Roman Books and Carolingian \textit{Renovatio’} Carolingian Renewal: Sources and Heritage (Manchester, 1991), p.9: ‘ordines lent themselves to conscious propagandizing in a way sacramentaries and other liturgical books did not’.

additions made to Collection A in order to create an original which underlies all the Collection B manuscripts will be referred to as \( \beta \). While \( \beta \) may represent the work of one scribe or many, this activity is separate from each of the scribes of the individual manuscripts of Collection B, who then had their own priorities independent from it.

**The Frankish Mass and B’s OR I**

Primarily noteworthy is the adaptation of the rituals to a Frankish context, either by addition of new rites or the suppression of some, but certainly not all, the details specific to Rome. We have already seen evidence of this in some of the Holy Week *ordines*. OR I, the premier example of a ‘pure’ Roman ordo, was edited in the process of the creation of \( \beta \), Creation B’s original, but many of the most characteristic citations of the city are kept in place, such as the dialogue on the seven regions. Firstly, \( \beta \) added a number of interpolations that are only found in the manuscripts of Collection B. A number are taken directly from the text OR III. This is the supplement addressing gaps in the narrative of OR I. In some manuscripts, it is presented separately and following *OR I*, but here brief extracts are inserted. First, the subdeacons *de scola* (the subdeacons in the choir) are to lift their *planetas* (chasubles) at the introit, at OR I, n.44 and at OR I. n.54, where the deacons and other subdeacons lift their *planetas* too.\(^{242}\) This is from OR III, n.5.\(^{243}\) At OR I, n.58, a new prescription is added about what should occur if there was no deacon to do the reading, that a priest should read the Gospel instead.\(^{244}\) This is from OR III, n6.\(^{245}\) The notes added to OR I by the scribe are of


\(^{245}\) OR III, n.6: ‘Ad completionem Alleluia vel respons., parant se diaconi ad evangelium legendum. Si autem diaconus ibidem non fuerit, presbyter sicut diaconus stat iuxta pontificem, sed non relevata planeta. At ubi evangelium legere debet, ibi se parat ubi et diaconus; sed, statim ubi perlegerit evangelium, venit ante altare, revestita planeta, et ornat altare sicut diaconus’, *Ibid*, p.133.
indisputably Frankish origin; it suffices to note the prescription for the absence of a deacon that would never have arisen in the papal city, which famously had its seven deacons. 246

Collection B also has some details in OR I which no other ordo romanus attests. Andrieu wondered if he had another text to use as a source here, perhaps a libellus for the guidance of acolytes, detailing the movement of candles. It may also have been another supplement of OR I. Whatever its nature, it was also perhaps employed by the author of a Frankish ordo text OR IV. 247 In Collection B its influence is found in three places, again absent in every other recension of this text. First, at OR I, n.52, the acolytes put the candles in a horizontal line across the church. 248 At OR I, n.54, the acolytes move the candles again, now into a vertical line. 249 At OR I, n.66, the acolytes now put the candles behind the altar. 250 Preoccupation with the movement of candles is something of a constant in the supplementation of ordines romani by Frankish scribes, as is also found in Lorsch’s OR XXIX. This testifies to the symbolic importance of light in the Frankish liturgy, something stressed by Amalarius and other anonymous expositions. The lack of specificity about the candles, their position, and particularly how many there were, was one particular area where Frankish Carolingians found Roman sources inadequate. Here, β is responding to symbolic as well as practical needs Of these unique details quoted above, many also show up in Amalarius’ narrative of the mass ordo. 251

In addition, some details were erased. One of the most substantial pieces removed is the entirety of OR I.98. 252 This section details that the Roman dignitaries such as the nomenclulator and

246 Ibid., pp.121-133.
248 OR I, n.52: ‘Et continuo accoliti ponunt cereostata in pauimento ecclesiae, tres quidem in dexteram partem, et tres in sinistram, unum uero in medio, in spatio quod est inter eos’ Ibid., p.84.
249 OR I, n.58: ‘Et tunc tolluntur cereostata de loco in quo prius steterant, ut ponuntur in una linea per medium ecclesiam’ Ibid., p.85
250 OR I, n.66: ‘Ceteri uero accoliti sumentes cereostata ponent ea retro altare per ordinem’ Ibid., p.90
were to be invited to the table of the Pope after the Mass. Andrieu claims that this piece was suppressed because 'its claims were applicable only in Rome'. There is a whole host of other Roman details in OR I, including several mentions of these same papal dignitaries, that were not similarly suppressed, but perhaps this piece was simply too specific. The above changes made to OR I sufficiently what β’s version of OR I looked like compared to that found in Collection A: the Roman edifice remained largely intact, but certain, particularly striking examples of Roman practices were erased and some additions were made from separate texts which offered details OR I did not originally possess. The text of β, or Collection B in all manuscripts, shows that respect for Roman texts did not preclude some reworkings of that text, principally by clarifying some ambiguities that occurred outside Rome: what were exactly the number of candles and what shape did they make, and what happened if there were no deacon present? To those reading our hypothetical original β, and those copying it into the manuscripts we have, no conflict arose in principle between the correct Roman source and correctness in larger terms: symbolic, in the case of the candles, or hierarchic, in the case of the deacon’s replacement by the priest. Hence, we can perceive the desire to supplement and bring texts together, even texts of different origins. Such work would bring out what was implicit in texts when they came to be performed.

OR XI and the Baptismal Liturgy in Collection B

The next ordo in the collection was OR XI. Here, the Roman text could comfortably accommodate some radical changes. The scribe’s wiping away of the details most peculiar to Rome is even more evident. OR XI originally afforded the option that the family of the baptised child would speak Greek. Judging by liturgical books which copy the Greek Creed, some Carolingian clergy certainly did say the Greek Creed as well as the Latin in the scrutiny, in imitation of Rome. But our

nomincolatorem, sive ad vicemdomini per notarium ipsius; quorum nomina ut conpleverint, descendent ad invitandum’.

253 Ibid, pp.98-99: ‘parce que les prescriptions qu’elle contient n’étaient applicable qu’à Rome.’

original of Collection B, \( \beta \), now was rid of any mention of Greek-speaking families. From \( \beta \) was also cut the entire last section of OR XI, from n.89 onwards, which narrates the rite of baptism itself as it took place on Holy Saturday. In Collection A, baptism was repeated twice, as it also occurred in the Holy Saturday narrative in OR XXVII (nn). Since \( \beta \) had its own version of this ordo, OR XXVIII, immediately after OR XI, there was no need for baptism to be described here also.

Collection A had only supplied incipits for the extensive catechetical homilies on the Lord’s Prayer and the four Evangelists that were said during the third, and most elaborate of the scrutinies, the scrutiny ‘in aurium apertionum’. In this form, the ordo would have necessitated the use of an accompanying Sacramentary. In \( \beta \), these homilies were expanded to their full length. The words used to expand them are found in the Gelasian Sacramentary of the eighth century, the sacramentaries of Gellone (Paris BnF lat.12048), and Angoulême (Paris BnF lat.816).\(^{255}\) When the Creed is said by the priest, in Latin, at n.65, \( \beta \) has the full Creed.\(^{256}\) But there is one striking change. The Roman custom was to say the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, as is seen in one manuscript of OR XI, Wolfenbüttel 4175 but also in the Old Gelasian Sacramentary and the Gelasian of the eighth century.\(^{257}\) Collection A represents the same.\(^{258}\) Here, however Collection B has the shorter, simpler Apostle’s Creed. This is demonstrative of the variety of baptismal rites which Susan Keefe discussed; which Creed one used during baptism could vary, so long as one was said.\(^{259}\) The Carolingians tended to prefer the Apostle’s Creed, Theodulf and Amalarius offer it as part of the baptism they described to Charlemagne, and Charlemagne told Garibald of Liège that godparents should know it.\(^{260}\) Thus,


the narrative of OR XI would suffice to perform the rite itself, intact. Unlike in Collection A, one would not need to look across to a Sacramentary to find the words of the catechetical homilies. But the text would also not be overburdened by details that were obviously extraneous, the repetition of baptism twice in two different recensions, or the Greek material. By removing the baptismal component of OR XI, and saving it for OR XXVIII’s narrative means the collection becomes a coherent narrative of this crucial part of the liturgical year, Holy Week following on from the Lenten Scrutinies, and Holy Saturday at the end, rather than baptism showing up between the Scrutinies and Holy Week, then repeated again, as had happened in Collection A. In OR XI, β even more clearly was adapted to be used in performance. The seven-scrutiny format of OR XI was certainly followed in Italy, Paulinus of Aquileia imposed it at the Council on the banks of the Danube in 796.261

The Structure of the Liturgical Year in Collection B, OR XIII and OR XXVIII

OR XIII was a part of Collection A originally, and is here still entitled the ‘order of how the catholic books are placed for reading in the holy Roman church’. These were the non-Gospel readings, i.e. the Old Testament, Epistles, Revelation and Apocrypha. However, in β, and thus in all the manuscripts of Collection B, were certainly added the readings for several Frankish feasts, such as the Throne of St Peter on the 22nd February, and some feasts which were lacking in the original: Purification, Annunciation, Ascension, Pentecost and the Nativity of John the Baptist (June 24th).262 A note was also added that homilies could be read on most great feasts, without specifying which ones

---


exactly. The endings to certain readings were also given, making the text a more comprehensive and useful account. This new recension therefore becomes OR XIIIIB in Andrieu’s numbering.

OR XXVIII, the new *ordo* for Holy Week, presents some of the more drastic differences in Collection B from Collection A where numerous different sources were combined towards an even more complete account of Holy Week. The skeleton remains OR XXVII itself. Added to this were the non-Gospel readings for the Triduum, taken from the earlier own account of the readings, OR XIIIIB: Maundy Thursday (n.9) for Good Friday (n.29), and Holy Saturday (n.49). There are also numerous borrowings of details from another *ordo romanus*, OR XXXA, a completely independent account of Holy Week only found in the manuscript Brussels 10127-10144.  These occur at OR XXVII nn.7-10 (details of the Maundy Thursday matins and chant), 29-30 (details of Good Friday matins), 48-49 (Vespers on Good Friday in private and the monastic meal and Holy Saturday matins), 58 (vesting of priests and deacons at Holy Saturday) and 87-88 (chant of Easter Vespers and list of psalms sung at nocturnes during the week after Easter ‘*infra albas paschae*’). These additions tend to surround Office and community matters, applicable either in a monastery or in a canonical cloister attached to a cathedral. The final borrowing from OR XXXA, the Frankish account of the

---


269 OR XXVIII n.7-10 at *Ibid.*, pp.392-393, again with the addition of the bell ‘tangitur signum; et post haec non tangitur nisi in nocte sanctum paschae ad matutinum’; nn.29-30 at pp.397-398; nn.48-49 at p.401; n.58 at p.403; and nn.87-88 at pp.410-411.
Vespers of Easter Week at OR XXVIII nn.87-88, replaces definitively OR XXVII nn.67-94, the Roman account of those Vespers. Unlike the Roman account, the Frankish one has psalms only in Latin. It is much more concise than the Roman, and is not as confused or as muddled as the edited version of that found in Collection A’s OR XXVII. As in OR XI, Roman material has been removed for a more concise and useful ritual narrative. Again, such an intervention appears to be aimed towards practicing Holy Week in Frankish lands, using an entirely non-Roman *ordo* OR XXXA.

Additionally, since Collection B no longer had an account of baptism in OR XI, it was necessary that the rite of baptism described in Holy Week be sufficient for purposes on its own. But baptism as described in OR XXVII was far shorter than it was in OR XI, and lacked some crucial details. Therefore, these details had to be re-inserted into this narrative. A great part is taken directly from the part of OR XI erased in β (OR XXVIII nn.54-57, 69-72 and 80-84). Some critical details are taken from an *ordo* somewhat like the baptismal *ordo* in the Sacramentary of Gellone, therefore they were from the Gelasian of the eighth century which our compiler used. Andrieu suggested they are identical to Gellone, but there are actually some important differences.\(^{270}\) These include OR XXVIII n.53, with the renunciations of Satan and anointing of the shoulders and chest with oil, given with a prayer in full ‘*ego te lineo oleo salutis*’ that is not seen in Gellone.\(^{271}\) Also text was added at OR XXVIII, n.73-75, which comprises the actual process of baptism, including the threefold interrogation during immersion. These are again given in full but in a slightly different order from Gellone.\(^{272}\) Neither of these processes were described in OR XI, so the compiler has again gone to his Sacramentary to complete them, just as he added in the full catechetical homilies from the Sacramentary to OR XI itself. Additionally, the two source texts of OR XXVII, that is OR XXIV and OR XXVI, were also used in the process of creating β, and details erased from them to make OR XXVII were put back in.\(^{273}\) At OR XXVIII n.48, the final blessing said by the bishop after Good Friday was

---


added from OR XXIV, n.39 and at OR XXVIII n.37 a detail as added from OR XXIV, n.28, on how the priests of urban and suburban churches would return to their own to do Vespers on Maundy Thursday, naming the bishop in their intercessionary prayer.²⁷⁴ Both were details erased by OR XXVII, but the creator of OR XXVIII, who clearly had many different liturgical texts before him, saw them as useful to add to the completeness of his own account of Holy Week. Finally, there are some pieces added to the Holy Week narrative for which Andrieu could not find an analogue, among the most notable is the text for the blessing of the Paschal Candle, at nn.58-63, which appears to be an independent ordo created for the purpose.²⁷⁵ As Andrieu noted, ‘we have here a complete description of the blessing of the paschal candle in a Frankish church’.²⁷⁶ It refers to the sacramentary (n.60) for the prayer, but also describes how the consecration of the candle was to be chanted ‘like the canon of the Mass’, reflecting again the grades of modulation which the Franks constructed.²⁷⁷ At n.15, was added a special mention of the blessing of oil for the sick on Maundy Thursday, a key part of the ceremony which OR XXVII did not clearly distinguish.²⁷⁸ These additions give space for customs which, to the Franks, would have been conspicuously lacking in the narrative of Holy Week. Keefe calls the image of a Carolingian compiler working from numerous texts a ‘provocative one’, but, if we see these additions to OR XXVII as the work of a single scribe, they were clearly drawn from a range of liturgical texts including Roman and non-Roman sources.²⁷⁹ The minds behind them had access to numerous copies of the ordines romani and employed them.

²⁷⁵ Ibid., pp.403-404.
²⁷⁸ Ibid., pp.394-397: ‘Antequam dicatur ‘Per quem haec omnia’ benedictit oleum pro infirmis quod populus offert’.
²⁷⁹ Keefe, Water and the Word, vol,1, p.129.
The Ember Days and OR XXXVII

OR XXXVII is first attested in Collection B. It originated indisputably in Francia itself. This ordo portrays the Frankish rituals for the Ember Days, seasonal periods of three days’ fasting which became the focus for the ordination of the higher clergy. They were a feature of the Roman Church’s practices, from early in the history of that liturgy, and had mysterious origins. They came to be one of the most crucial instances where compliance with the Holy See was enjoined outside Rome, in Anglo-Saxon England, at Clovesho in 747 as well as on numerous occasions in Carolingian Francia. They were a key feature of the Roman stational liturgy, enjoined in comites and Sacramentaries. According to these, Monday would take place at Santa Maria Maggiore, Wednesday at Santi Apostoli and Saturday, the most venerable, at Saint Peter’s; Baldovin recognised how these locations affected the choice of readings for each day, something the Franks could have seen as well. The Saturday acquired an ancient title ‘IN XII LECTIONES’, because six readings were each read in Greek and Latin. At the Carolingian Council of Mainz (813) proper observance of the Ember Days was demanded, Amalarius of Metz and anonymous expositiones probed their meaning and function. These Frankish writings show the same disposition of the Ember Days as the first part of OR XXXVII nn.1-4 describes. This was clearly the common, Frankish practice: the first on the first week of March, second in the second week of June, the third in the third week of September.

---

282 Baldovin, The Urban Character, on the stational liturgy at Rome, pp.109-166.
283 Baldovin, The Urban Character, pp.155-156.
284 MGH Concilia II.2, p.269: ‘Constituimus ut quattuor tempora anni ab omnibus cum ieiunio observentur, id est in Martio mense ebdomada prima, feria IIII et VI et sabbato veniant omnes ad ecleiasiam hora nona cum laetanias ad missarum sollemnia; similiter et in mense Iunio ebdomada II., feria IIII et VI, et sabbato ieiunetur usque ad horam nonam et a carne ab omnibus abstineatur; similiter et in mense Septembrio ebdomada III, et in mense Decembrio ebdomada, que fuerit plena ante vigiliam natalis Domini, sic est in Romana ecclesiae traditum’; Germain Morin, ‘Un opuscule de l’époque carolingienne sur la raison-d’être des Quatre-Temps’ Revue Bénédictine, 36 (1913), pp.231-234, copied at Saint-Emmeram; Hanssens, Opera Omnia, vol.II pp.197-209; Walafrid Strabo only mentions them, Harting-Correa (ed.) Libellus de exordiis, pp.138-139, ‘nisi quattuor per anum diebus, quibus lectinum XII numerus adimpletur’.
and the fourth and final one in the fourth week of December, but always before Christmas. This was not how the Romans placed the Ember Days.

Amalarius himself discovered this, as he recounted in a letter to Abbot Hilduin of Corbie. Amalarius relates how he had always believed that the Spring Ember day, the first, was to be properly fixed to the first week of March. However, his companion on his sojourn in Constantinople in 813, Abbot Peter of Nonantola, argued that the spring Ember day was properly in the first week of Lent, thus moving through the year, and this was the custom of Rome. Amalarius, notably, complains to Hilduin that he had believed that his own usage, the one which he had read in Francia, was secundum romanum usum. Equally, the second Ember Day in Rome was the week after Pentecost, not the second week of June, and therefore also moved, the third was between the 16th and 27th of September, while the last was after the third week of Advent. Indications of these Roman dates were found in the Gregorian Sacramentary, as it passed to Charlemagne, but they did not seem to have strongly touched the actual practice of the Franks. Despite his discussion with Peter, Amalarius’ Liber Officialis, written some years later, repeats the Frankish custom. The third part of OR XXVIII, nn.12-13, separated by the title ‘SABBATO PENTECOSTEN IN XII LECTIONES, statio ad sanctum Petrum’ is indeed an explanation of what would happen when the Ember Day of Summer clashed with Pentecost. The Saturday of Pentecost already had its own ceremonies including baptism, as it is described in the Gregorian and Gelasian Sacramentaries. If the clash occurred, the Summer Ember Day’s ceremony would take precedence, this ordo demands. In indisputably Roman texts, this clash between Pentecost Saturday and the Summer Ember Day would never have taken place. In the Gelasian sacramentary, for example, the Summer Ember Day is clearly fixed, to fall between the

289 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.IV, pp.237: ‘SATURDAY IN 12 READINGS, the station at Saint Peter’s.’
mass of Pentecost and its octave, eight days afterwards.\textsuperscript{291} The evocation of the station at Saint Peter’s in the title nevertheless attaches the narrative to the systemic taking up of Roman norms. The Ember Days, no matter how far they spread, were anchored firmly to Rome. The Ember Saturday never lost the title ‘at Saint Peter’s \textit{in XII lectionibus},’ in all the Carolingian testimony.\textsuperscript{292}

OR XXXVII, nn.5-11, the middle part of the \textit{ordo} is a description of the ordination ritual itself which took place on Saturday, that of deacons and priests. The climactic moment is the clothing of the new ordinands in their vestments by the archdeacon. This is, notably, a separate tradition from the one promoted in the \textit{ordo de sacrificis ordinibus} also in Collection B, for which see below. Yet it is, once again, a Frankish description of a ceremony as it was done in Francia. For example, calling the canticle of David by the name \textit{Benedictio} (n.8), as it is here, is a title attested in some of our oldest witnesses to the so-called Gallican tradition, and also found in the Gelasians of the eighth century.\textsuperscript{293}

At n.6, the reading is done \textit{‘in sensu lectionis’}, again one of the Frankish modulations of liturgical speech.\textsuperscript{294}

The Frankish and Roman Consecration of Churches, OR XLI and OR XLII

The next \textit{ordo}, OR XLI, has a very complex story, which Andrieu somewhat disguises. It details the consecration of a church by a bishop. Andrieu provides a more detailed list of its Frankish features, proving it was not Roman.\textsuperscript{295} Writing the alphabet twice across the sides of the church with one’s staff is one characteristic example. Anointing the altar with oil and chrism is witnessed by old Frankish writers, by Caesarius of Arles, Pseudo-Dionysius, and the \textit{Missale Francorum}.\textsuperscript{296} In Collection B, the \textit{ordo} opens with a \textit{denuntiatio}, a liturgical speech, which is entitled ‘AD RELIQUIAS

\begin{footnotes}
\item[291] Ibid., p.220.
\item[292] Ellard, \textit{Liturgist}, p.20.
\item[295] Ibid., p.334.
\item[296] Ibid., pp.324-326; on the \textit{Missale Francorum} (Reg.lat.257); Smyth, \textit{La Liturgie Oubliée}, pp.104-107.
\end{footnotes}
DEDUCENDAS’ as if it were to take place when relics were deposited, which was, in fact, a rite of different character. It was not original to this particular text, as we shall see.

Complication arises from Andrieu’s analysis. OR XLI is not quite the same as the other ordines in Collection B. They circulated independently and primarily in collections with other ordines romani. Ancient rubrics which were components of OR XLI are found in the Old Gelasian Sacramentary, Vat.Reg.lat.316, of c.750, describing the anointing of the altar with wine and water, and censing with incense, with appropriate prayers.¹⁹⁷ These rubrics are also found in the Sacramentary of Angoulême, but this text also adds a near-complete account of the ceremony itself ‘Ordo consecrationis basilicae nouae’, to which OR XLI is clearly indebted.¹⁹⁸ The text is also given in full in the Paduensis Sacramentary (Padua Biblioteca Capitolare MS D. 47).¹⁹⁹ Thus, OR XLI is more like the consecration and ordination rituals attached to Collection B, than a text like OR I, which is never transmitted in a sacramentary. Since the Collection B scribe took those ordinations and consecrations from an example of the Gelasian of the eighth century, might he not have taken OR XLI too? Andrieu considers the possibility briefly, but bizarrely dismisses the idea that OR XLI existed in any real form before the creation of Collection B: ‘nothing permits me to decide either way’.³⁰⁰ Langlois took Andrieu to task for this, demonstrating that the example of OR XLI found in a single early manuscript, Wolfenbüttel 4175, here entitled Item ordo antiqua ad ecclesiam dedicator, was in fact a pre-existent version of the ordo, and Collection B had interpolated and changed the ordo in a number of ways.³⁰¹ Andrieu had supposed it was the other way around, Wolfenbüttel’s example being an interpolated example of mediocre value in his eyes. Langlois still viewed the ordo within the limitations of Andrieu’s paradigm. He declared that OR XLI, as Andrieu edits it, is of mediocre value.

¹⁹⁷ Eizenhöfer et al. (eds), Liber Sacramentorum, 689-702, pp.107-110; Chavasse, Le sacramentaire Gélasien, pp.36-59.
¹⁹⁹ Martimort, Les Ordines, p.36; Alcestis Catella, Ferdinandus dell’Oro and Aldus Martini (eds), Liber Sacramentorum Paduensis, Monumenta Italiae Liturgica, III (Rome, 2005), pp.403-405, here the Denuntiatio cum reliquae sunt ponendae and the necessary prayers follow.
Teasingly, Langlois revealed that he rediscovered four manuscripts containing OR XLI which Andrieu deliberately chose not to include, and found an additional four new texts, of which one was a fragment. But he did not give any indications which they were. I have not been able to find any trace of this scholar’s publication beyond this single article, let alone whether his work on OR XLI continued. Niels Krogh Rasmussen wrote that he corresponded with Langlois concerning the manuscript now in Paris, BnF lat.1217 which that scholar analyses as one of his ‘pontificaux de haut moyen age’. That manuscript also contains a version of OR XLI. Presumably this is one of Langlois’ ‘rediscoveries’. Two further manuscripts Rasmussen analysed, Leiden Bibliothèque de l’Université Codices Bibliothecae Publicae 111.2, which Andrieu himself read once, and Vat.lat.7701, also contain a witness of OR XLI. Additionally, the two Pontificals which Metzger edited, Freiburg im Breisgau Universitätsbibliothek 363 and the manuscript once known as Donaueschingen Fürstliche Fürstenbergische Hofbibliothek 192, each offer an example, as does Baturich’s Kollektar-Pontifikale now in Vienna. The Pontifical of Sens, Saint-Petersburg Q.V.I.N.35, has both OR XLI and XLII. Moreover, these are only the ninth-century witnesses, and countless other pontifical texts from the tenth century and later also offer versions of OR XLI. Reading Andrieu’s analysis, one would have not the slightest idea that these manuscripts even existed, and the obscurity of Langlois’ work does not help matters.

Returning to Collection B itself, Langlois provides an account, in reverse, of what differentiates the Collection B family from what he calls the ‘antique family’ comprising Wolfenbüttel 4175 and his eight witnesses. The presence of the Denuntiatio is one. This text entered Collection B via the Gelasian Sacramentary of the eighth century, as Angoulême also presents it at

---

303 Rasmussen, Les Pontificaux, p.221; he quotes correspondence from Bischoff to Langlois on the dating of the manuscript.
305 Max Metzger, Zwei karolingische Pontifikalen vom Oberrhein (Freiburg, 1914), pp.25*-34*; the Donaueschingen manuscript was sold at auction to an unknown collector, Vogel, Medieval Liturgy, p. 241, n.214 (Sotheby’s, Auction date, June 21 1982, lot 5); Unterkircher, Das Kollektar-Pontifikale, pp.114-118.
the beginning of its dedication *ordo*. Among the changes are several additional switches from second-person in W to third-person in all the Collection B manuscripts, at n.7, and at n.12.\(^{307}\)

Second-person rubrics tend to represent the oldest layer of liturgical material in the sacramentary tradition, as Chavasse discussed.\(^{308}\) This change supposes that the writer was trying to make his text look more like the other *ordines* he presented, which are third-person. Despite the fact that B’s testimony to OR XLI is disparaged by Langlois, it shows an attempt to adapt a foreign body, probably a direct extract from the Gelasian Sacramentary, to look more like the other contents of the Collection.

The very last *ordo* in the collection is OR XLII. It serves as a companion piece to OR XLI, but could not be more different in terms of its origin. This is the Roman rite for the deposition of relics in a church and is copied directly from Collection A. This rite, of course, could only be performed by a bishop. It is quite likely that both *ordines*, one Frankish, the other Roman, were, in practice, combined into one single ceremony, as in OR XLIII and other examples where ‘the Gallican emphasis on blessing and consecration of the church structure and the Roman emphasis on deposition of relics’ were harmonized.\(^{309}\)

For neither OR XLI nor OR XLII do the majority of the witnesses of Collection B provide the full prayer texts, but only incipits: in most cases, the Sacramentary would have to be employed too. What is obvious and striking are the varying origins and nature of the *ordo romanus* texts that Collection B contains, and the varying treatment applied to each.

**Material from the Gelasian of the eighth century: Consecration, and Ordination**

OR XLI is followed, in every witness of Collection B, by yet more borrowings from the Gelasian Sacramentary of the eighth century, yet Andrieu almost entirely ignores them. We can see these additions as being part of the hypothetical β original. These texts are crucial to interpreting

---

\(^{307}\) Langlois, ‘Le manuscrit W’, p.56.


not only the original compilation of the Collection, but its circulation and subsequent influence. I shall be referring principally, here, to the Sacramentaries of Gellone (Paris lat.12048) and Phillipps (Berlin Staatsbibliothek Cod.Phillipp.1667).

Firstly, all the Collection B manuscripts share a set of prayers and very short rubrics for the blessing of sacred objects: *benedictio calicem, patenem and chrismale* (chrism vessel), which the complete examples of the Gelasio of the Eighth also possess.\(^{310}\) The same core of three prayers, that is the blessing of chalice, paten and chrism vessel, are also to be found in all the ninth-century manuscripts discussed by Rasmussen and Langlois. Their consistent attachment to OR XLI suggests they were also taken to be part of the church dedication rite, in its most expansive sense. At OR XLI, n.27, the bishop was to bless the vessels and linens of the new church.\(^{311}\) In general, the Gelasion Sacramentaries tend to bisect these benedictions with a *benedictio ad omnia in usum basilicae*, not present in the manuscripts of Collection B. The Sacramentary of Gellone, however, has this blessing *ad omnia* separately, and thus relates these three consecrations in the same format.\(^{312}\)

The last component is usually to be found after OR XXXVII, the *ordo* for the Ember Days. Suitably, it describes the ordination rituals of nine ecclesiastical grades in order of seniority from psalmist to bishop. These rubrics are first seen as nine canons in the fifth-century Gallican collection called the *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua*.\(^{313}\) They entered the Gelasion Sacramentary via the Old Gelasion, Reg.lat.316, but they are also found in another early Sacramentary, the *Missale Francorum*, treated differently.\(^{314}\) In these Sacramentaries, the rubrics were given suitable prayers and the whole set was entitled ‘*ordo de sacris ordinibus benedicendum*’.\(^{315}\) Within this format, each grade is given a

---

\(^{310}\) ‘blessing of chalice’ ‘blessing of paten’ and ‘blessing of chrism vessel’.


\(^{312}\) Dumas (ed.), *Gellonensis*, 2430-2435, pp. 364-365.


\(^{315}\) Dumas (ed.), *Gellonensis*, p.381: ‘The *Ordo* of the Blessings, for the Sacred Orders’.
single rubric, and a number of prayers (in most of the lower grades simply two, a prefatio and a benedictio). In the text I have called β, these texts were actively chosen to be inserted, in the place of an actually Roman ordo romanus of ordination, OR XXXIV, found in Collection A. At some point in the creation of Collection B, a deliberate choice was made for a Frankish ritual of Gallo-Roman canonical origin laced with prayers from the Gelasian tradition, over a complete testimony from Rome. It is worthwhile stating from the outset that the almost complete triumph of the ordo de sacris ordinibus as the practised Frankish ordination rite across the Empire is clear from the manuscripts treated by Rasmussen, Metzger and so on, which universally copy this text from the Gelasian of the eighth century.\(^{316}\) This is one more way in which that Sacramentary defies the usual treatment of it as moribund after 800.\(^{317}\)

Andrieu did himself print the text of the nine rubrics as an appendix to OR XXXIV. But he offered them in the form as in the Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua, rather than how they are found in even a single one of the ordo romanus manuscripts he edited.\(^{318}\) As with the ordines romani themselves, his priority was to find the antique exemplar and present it to a reader as the singular, most important recension. His own manuscripts presented significant variations, and, over 200 years from the creation of the Statuta, these texts evolved significantly. In the Statuta, as in the Old Gelasian Sacramentary, the nine grades are presented from highest to lowest, episcopus to psalmista. Collection B has a reversed order of the rituals from this original like the Gelasian of the eighth century: thus from the lowest order, psalmista to the highest, episcopus. Nor does the Statuta include any prayers to be said during the rites. In our manuscripts of Collection B, the ordo de sacris ordinibus is presented in the same manner as the ordines romani which Andrieu officially edited.


Nothing clearly distinguishes them, and they are not set apart. Amalarius of Metz examined them in exactly the same manner as he did the prescriptions for Andrieu’s *ordines romani*.\(^{319}\) The texts make up the constituent parts of several later ordination rituals Andrieu does view as *ordines romani*, OR XXXV, XXXVA and so on. Finally, upon entering the Sacramentary, these rubrics also came to accrue two highly significant insertions which referred to Rome.

The first interpolation is a smaller, self-contained *ordo* of distinctive nature from the other rubrics, found encased within the larger framework. It is found just after the acolyte, and just before the subdeacon, opening a new phase of the ordination rite. It begins:

```
ORDO QUALITER IN ROMANA SEDIS APOSTOLICAE ECLESIAE SUBDIACONI, DIACONI UEL
PRESBITERI ORDINANDI SUNT Mensis primi IIIIti, VIImi et decimi, sabbatorum die in XII
lectiones ad sanctum petrum ubi missae caelebrantur, postquam antiphonam ad introitum
dixerint, data oratione, adnuntia pontifex in populo dicens ad omnes:\(^{320}\)
```

The interpolation then continues with the prayer *Auxiliante Domine Deo* and a litany, *kyrie* and the ordinands ascending to the *sedem pontificis* where he blesses them. The text is set on the Ember Saturday ‘in 12 readings’ and it mentions the Basilica of Saint Peter’s, it discusses the ‘election’ of the proposed candidates, which was a phase of the Roman rite which was not described in OR XXXIV. Chavasse argued that the text is an approximation or observation of Roman customs, but is inaccurate because it did not account for the Wednesday and Friday parts of the Ember Saturday, where the candidates were examined, and there are liturgical differences with Roman *ordines*, XXXIV and the later testimonies, XXXVI and XXXIX, as well as an issue, which Chavasse saw as the error of the compiler, where the ordinations are placed improperly right after the first prayer and before the readings (when they were supposed to be at a much later point in the ceremony-this was the result

\(^{319}\) *Ibid*, pp.596-599.

\(^{320}\) ‘The Order how in the Roman Seat of the Apostolic Church, Subdeacons, priests, deacons and priests are to be ordained. In the first month (March), the fourth (June), the seventh (September) and the tenth (December), on Saturday in 12 readings at Saint Peter where mass is to be celebrated, after they have said the antiphon ad introitum, and given prayer, the pontiff announces to the people saying to all’.
of the ordo combining originally separate material).\textsuperscript{321} One Gelasian of the eighth century, that of Angoulême, preserved a version where Wednesday and Friday were given as moments of examination, which Chavasse saw as a correction to the original, also by a Frankish compiler.\textsuperscript{322} In any case, the Collection B manuscripts align with the other Gelasian Sacramentaries by missing this sentence about Wednesday and Friday, and thus the text has some differences with the Roman testimony. The Gelasians of the eighth century all integrate this ordo qualiter into the set of ordinations exactly, exactly as Collection B does, again showing the influence of the Gelasian of the eighth century upon Collection B. The Gelasians of the eighth century offer a second interpolation following this one, generally called the Capitulum Sancti Gregorii, which Collection B also contains. While the title appears to represent the extracts as two works of Pope Gregory the Great, in fact only the first belongs to him, from his Epistle to Gallican Bishops.\textsuperscript{323} The second extract is actually from a decretal of Pope Leo I, and quotes from Paul’s letter to Timothy.\textsuperscript{324}

The text then continues with the actual rubric for the subdeacon and the prayers for his ordination. The ordo qualiter presents itself as the practice of the romana sedis apostolicae ecclesiae, with two writings attributed to Gregory the Great immediately following. The situation, as it is presented in these manuscripts, therefore would certainly seem to imply that the aura of Roman authority enveloped the whole set. This arrangement goes back to the Gelasian of the eighth

\textsuperscript{321} Chavasse, Le sacramentaire gélasién, pp.22-27: ‘ne peut donc passer pour un ordo d’origine romaine. Il s’inspire certes des rites observés à Rome, mais, avec les anomalies qu’il présente, il n’a pu être rédigé à Rome’.

\textsuperscript{322} Saint-Roch (ed.), Engolismensis, p.316 ‘Mensis primi quarti septimi et decimi feria III et sexta scrutandi sunt ipsi electi secundum canones, si sint digni hoc onus fungi. Sabbatorum die in duodecim lectiones...’; Chavasse, Le sacramentaire gélasién, p.23, n.19 ‘le sacramentaire d’Angoulême...a tenté de “corriger” le texte du Reginensis’.


\textsuperscript{324} ‘PAULUS APOSTOLUS PRAECEPIT TIMOTHEO Manus cito nemini imposueris, neque communicaueris peccatis alienis. Quid est nemini manum imposueris nisi ante aetatem maturitatis ante tempus examines ante meritum laboris ante experientiam disciplinae. Sicut beni operis conportat fructus, qui rectum seruator ineligendo sacerdotem iudicium. Ita graue semetipsum efficit damnum qui in sue dignitatis collegium sublimat indignum’; PL, LIV, col.647, 658.
century, and is thus the work of a compiler other than the scribe of β. But as found in B and the
Gelasian sacramentaries, the texts would certainly seem to be among those ordines whose claim to
romanitas necessarily nuances that title. There is great significance in the very first line of the ordo
qualiter, that the ordination of the higher clergy, subdeacon upwards, must take place on the Ember
Saturday. Just as the scrutinies represented, as Keefe argued, the foundation of the ordo romanus in
baptism, so too did ordaining on the Ember days, and only on them, guarantee one’s fidelity to the
ordo romanus in ordination. Viewed in this manner, the ordo qualiter is the true heart of the ordo de
sacris ordinibus, and explains its incorporation in Collection B. It did not matter unduly that the
manuscript of β, and the following manuscripts of Collection B dependent on it, actively replaced OR
XXXIV, a true ordo romanus of unquestionable fidelity to the apostolic see. It still presented a Roman
pattern of ordination, focused on Saint Peter’s and the time of year. Around this heart of the text,
his copyists found the freedom to change the prayers significantly, according to their own concerns.

The original of Collection B only had one-line incipits for the prayers, so the sacramentary
would be required. Based on the majority of early manuscripts (Cologne 138, Verona XCII, St Gallen
446) it looked like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORDO DE SACRIS ORDINIBUS-Collection B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psalmista (Instructed by the priest, without knowledge of the bishop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostiarius (Given keys by bishop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefatio ostiarii ‘Deum Patrem’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictio Ostiarii. ‘Domine sancte pater’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lector (Given book by bishop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictio Lectoris ‘Domine sancte pater’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exorcista (Giving of libellus by bishop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefatio exoristae ‘Deum patrem’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictio Exoristae. ‘Domine sancte pater’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accolitus (Given candlestick and empty cruet by archdeacon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Domine sancte pater’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordo qualiter in romana sedis apostolicę ecclesię presbyteri diaconi uel subdiaconi eligendi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sunt ‘Mensis primis IIII, VII et Xmi sabbatorum...’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitulum sancti gregorii pape,...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdiaconus (Given paten and chalice by bishop, cruet and towel by archdeacon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefatio subdiaconi ‘Oremus dilectissimi deum’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictio Subdiaconi ‘Domine sancte pater’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is clear that Collection B was here quite close to the Gelasian of the eighth century. The Old Gelasian Sacramentary places the ordinations from the highest grade to the lowest, thus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ordination</th>
<th>Latin</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diaconus</td>
<td><em>Diaconus</em> (Laying of hand by a single bishop)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictio diaconi</td>
<td><em>Oremus dilectissimi</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alia</td>
<td><em>Alia</em> ‘Exaudi domine’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecratio</td>
<td><em>Consecratio</em> ‘Adesto quae sumus’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyter</td>
<td><em>Presbyter</em> (Laying of hand by a bishop, priests put their hands over it)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictio Presbiterii</td>
<td><em>Dict pontifex Oremus dilectissimi</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequitur</td>
<td><em>Sequitur</em> ‘Exaudi nos’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecratio</td>
<td><em>Consecratio</em> ‘Domine sancte pater’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopus</td>
<td><em>Episcopus</em> (Two bishops hold the Gospel book over the head of the candidate, other bishops lay hands)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictio Episcoporum</td>
<td><em>Oremus dilectissimi</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecratio</td>
<td><em>Consecratio</em> ‘Deus honorum omnium’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oratio ad missa</td>
<td><em>Deus honorum omnium</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Super oblata</td>
<td><em>Super oblata</em> ‘Haec hostia’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infractione</td>
<td><em>Infractione</em> 325 ‘Hanc igitur oblationem’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Communionem</td>
<td><em>Ad Communionem</em> 326 ‘Haec nos communio’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That manuscript also notably lacks the blessing for an acolyte that β shares with the Gellone and Phillips. The *Missale Francorum* has the same order, running from ostiarius to episcopus, but places the prayers apart, in a separate section, and lacks the *ordo qualiter* interpolation. However from the deacon upwards, Collection B begins to ignore the Gelasian. Those sacramentaries grew more and more elaborate, with four, five and six prayers for each of the ascending grades. In Collection B we find only three prayers for each grade. In each case, these are actually the prayers found in the Gregorian Sacramentary, but with the Gelasian rubric attached to them. The Gregorian in its *Hadrianum*

---

325 Strictly this should be *Infra actione*, a specific title for a prayer. However, the Sacramentary of Gellone uses the abbreviated form INFRA, which was clearly copied by the Collection B compiler since it is found in Cologne 138/St Gallen 446, and expanded by Munich Clm 14510 into INFRACTIONE. Gellone has the INFRATIONE form elsewhere, e.g., Dumas (ed.) *Gellonensis*, p.318. Best seen as a scribal error.

326 In both Cologne 138 and St Gallen 446. This was clearly erroneously expanded from *AD COM*, which should be *AD COMPLETA* as in the Gregorian, in the course of the creation of Collection B. Also probably resulted from someone far more used to the Gelasian, where the prayer is *POST COMMUNIONEM*.

327 Eizenhöfer et al. (eds), *Liber Sacramentorum*, 140-148, 737-778, pp.24-26, 115-123,

format, only offered prayers for the deacon, priest and bishop, and had no rubrics.\textsuperscript{329} This was the only ordination ritual available in that text, and clearly inadequate. Benedict of Aniane’s Supplement added the minor orders from the Gelasian of the eighth century, i.e. those taken directly from this same \textit{ordo de sacris ordinibus benedicendos}, to his Gregorian. \textbeta took prayers from the original Gregorian and slotted them into the suite of ordinations he had in his Collection B, in the process actively replacing the Gelasian prayers.\textsuperscript{330} But, unlike Aniane, scribe \textbeta also kept the rubrics for the higher clergy in place. Obviously, he viewed these rubrics as important in their own right. The mass which follows the bishop’s ordination (the last four prayers) is not exactly the same as the Gregorian, but differs completely from the Gelasians of the eighth century too. The Gregorian mass in the same place has only three prayers, \textit{Super Oblata, Praefatio} and \textit{Ad completa}.\textsuperscript{331} \textit{Super Oblata} and \textit{ad Completa} both represent the same text as the Collection B manuscripts. Here, there is no equivalent to what is called an \textit{Oratio ad Missa}. Given that this last has the same \textit{incipit} as the \textit{Consecratio}, copying seems to have gone wrong here too. However it is unclear why the \textit{Infra actione} title, a feature of Gelasian masses, was used instead of \textit{Praefatio}. This title may have been supplied from consulting one of them.\textsuperscript{332}

The other great difference is the presence of the \textit{psalmista} in Collection B. No Gelasian Sacramentary of the Eighth Century offers the psalmist in its list of grades. Nor do any of the so-called Pontifical manuscripts, with one significant exception, the \textit{Kollektor-Pontifikale} of Baturich of Regensburg, which I shall explain in due course.\textsuperscript{333} This position was a Frankish anachronism, and


\textsuperscript{331} Deshusses, \textit{Le sacramentaire grégorien}, p.94.

\textsuperscript{332} Dumas (ed.) \textit{Gellonensis}, p.326.

\textsuperscript{333} Unterkircher, \textit{Kollektor Pontifikale}, p.103: ‘Psalmista id est cantor potest absque scientia episcopi sola iussionе presbiteri officium suscipere cantandi, dicente sibi presbitero: uide ut quod ore cantas corde credas, et quod corde credis operibus probes’.
tended, in practice, to be ignored or absorbed by the post of the lector.334 Someone in the transmission of the text to Collection B, perhaps the scribe of B himself, seems to have gone back and looked at the Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua, and put the text back. This is not entirely unlikely, since the Statuta continued to be circulated in the Carolingian era with false attribution to the Council of Carthage, and were also integrated, as such, into the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals. Here, perhaps we catch a glimpse of the B scribe as a true corrector, checking an original source, the Statuta. Collection B contributed directly to the survival of this rubric for the psalmist. The tradition keeping this psalmist among the grades eventually overcame the version of the ordo de sacris ordinibus which erased it; the Pontifical Romano-Germanique manuscripts, for example, tend to contain the psalmist.335

Laudes Regiae

Collection B probably offered a set of laudes, ritualised acclamations to be sung on high feast days, invoking the aid of God, Christ and saints on the Emperor, Pope, armies of the Franks, or Franks and Romans. Kantorowicz discussed them with the term ‘Franco-Roman’.336 Cologne 138 and Munich 14510 both give a rubric specifying how they would be performed (moisture damage has erased this rubric from Verona XCII).


336 Kantorowicz, Laudes Regiae, p.102
INCIPIUNT LAUDES FESTIS DIEBUS Quando laudes canenda sunt expleta oratione a pontifice antequam lector ascendat in ambone pronuntiant duo diaconi siue cantores. Responde illis scola hoc modo

Of the manuscripts of Collection B mentioned, Verona XCII gives three different sets of laudes (of which one is the original, two were added later), while Munich Clm 14510 and Cologne 138 give one set each. Zurich Car C 102 and Paris 14008 have each lost the section that could originally have contained these texts, while St Gallen 446 does not offer them. One eleventh-century manuscript of Collection B, Rome Biblioteca Nazionale Sessorianus S2, is also helpful here, and its laudes were edited by Morin. This set of laudes was, in fact, originally composed in the ninth century, and the manuscript, therefore, was copied directly from a ninth-century version of Collection B. The Pope is here given as Nicholas and the Emperor as Louis, which can only mean Pope Nicholas I (858-867) and Emperor Louis II (844-875). This gives us the regnal years of Nicholas as a date range for the composition of the text from which Sessorianus copied. With these four testimonies, it is likely that the laudes were a part of the transmission of Collection B early on, but they may not have been original to it. While some manuscripts edit these laudes, it is easy to reconstruct which were the pieces in the original that they all used. There was a highly significant middle section in which these laudes summarise the Carolingian ideal of church and society divided neatly into its orders, just as Reichenau divided its list of amici viventes. Each ordo or grade of significance (the laity are excluded) is prayed for with a saint to whom that ordo might look to for guidance and intercession.

337 Cologne Dombibliothek MS 138, fol.44r: ‘HERE BEGIN THE LAUDES ON FEAST DAYS. When the laudes are to be sung. After the prayer by the pontiff is finished, but before the lector ascends to the ambo, two deacons or cantors pronounce them. Meanwhile, the scola respond in this manner’; Munich Staatsbibliothek Clm 14510, fol.39v has: ‘IN FESTIS DIEBUS QUANDO LAUDES canende sunt. Expleta oratione a pontifice antequam lector ascendent in ambonem. Pronuntiat duo diaconi siue cantores. Respondente illis scola hoc modo’; Finally, Rome Biblioteca Nazionale Sessorianus S2 has: ‘LAUDES IN FESTIS DIEBUS. Expleta prima oratione a pontifice antequam legatur apostolus pronuntiant duo cantori hoc modo’.


The Pope stands first, alone, only Christ (salvator mundi) intercedes for him. The Virgin Mary is called on for the Emperor (all manuscripts). The sons of the Emperor, regibus, receive intercession from Saint Peter (all manuscripts). The army of the Franks (francorum) look to Saint Theodore (Cologne, Verona, Sessorianus). The orthodoxis catholicis pastoribus et rectoribus nostris, i.e. the clergy, are given to Saint Martin of Tours, in two manuscripts (Munich, effaced in Verona). Fratribus nostris must look to Saint Benedict, who will give them ‘perfecta opera et uita’, again in two manuscripts (Munich, Verona). This suggests monks may have sung the laudes originally, with Benedict as their patron.

Meersemann et al, using only Verona XCII, asserted that the Theodore invoked was Theodore of Verona, a shadowy bishop of the city.340 Much more likely would be Saint Theodore of Amasea, a Greek soldier saint who was martyred in the fourth century. He was the former patron of Venice before the legendary arrival of Saint Mark in the city in 828. This Saint Theodore was, in fact, venerated in Verona, and more widely in Italy. He appears in a Verona martyrology, Verona Biblioteca Capitolare CVI, in fact written by the same hand as Verona XCII, with his feast day of the 9th November.341 It is to him, also, that the church of San Teodoro behind the forum in Rome is dedicated. Furthermore, a military saint would be a more obvious choice to intercede for the army. Martin of Tours, too, was one Frankish saint venerated in Italy (and in Verona, which also celebrated his translatio on the fourth of July).342 Some Italian cities seem to have held Martin as a model for a bishop.343 These two names appear to suggest that the laudes, and the manuscripts which contain them, had peculiar resonance in Italy. Prior to Collection B, laudes regiae are found only in psalters, as in the Montpellier Psalter, Montpellier, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine, H.409 (to which

340 Giles Gerard Meersemann, E. Adda and Jean Deshusses (eds), L’orazionale dell’archidiacono Pacifico e il corpusum del cantore Stefano: Studie e testi sulla liturgica del Duomo di Verona dal’ IX all XI sec. (Freibourg, 1974), p.65.
341 Meersemann et al, Pacifico di Verona, p.144: ‘9 id.nou.sci Theodori’.
they were added prior to 794) and the so-called Psalter of Charlemagne, from 795-800, Paris BnF lat.13159. What is certain is that laudes entered the Collections of ordines once they had become irrevocably tied to the episcopal mass, and this alone. They are yet another text in Collection B which was only practised by or around bishops, and they praised bishops alongside the Emperor and in a class above the clergy. Their setting in Collection B’s ‘pontificals’ was logical, and intensifies these very dynamics.

In the course of the creation of Collection B, envisaged here as this hypothetical original I have called β, however that was compiled, Roman texts were encountered and dealt with in numerous ways. Generally, interpolations were added to clarify points of confusion, or to fill in what was expected to be there. Sometimes, Roman texts were simply replaced by an alternative. The inclusion of OR XLI signals that its dominance as the single Frankish church dedication ritual had been assured before Collection B was gathered. This was probably a product of the Merovingian period, as well as revealing the respect in which the Gelasian of the eighth century was held. Again, we must take account of the symbolic power of OR XLI, with its multiple blessings, lustrations of the church and people, censings and the tracing of the alphabet, symbolizing ‘the rudiments of doctrine’. This is the exact argument Keefe uses to explain the presence of OR XLI in a number of what she deems to be educational manuscripts, for the secular clergy who could not perform the rite themselves. OR XLI was itself subject to exposition, in the text entitled Quid Significet Duodecim Candelae found in a ninth-century manuscript from Lyons by Salmon (BAV Regin.lat.598), so intellectuals interested in the liturgy could find great meaning in it, particularly by analogy to the rite of baptism also contained in Collection B. Brand also highlighted the power of the church

344 Kantorowicz, Laudes Regiae, p.33.
345 Ibid. p.87-88; Meerssemann et al, Pacifico di Verona, pp.62-63.
dedication rite, with the translation of relics in OR XLII, as a statement of episcopal prestige (he focused on Tuscany), which further enhances the orientation of Collection B towards bishops’ power.349

The choice of the ordo de sacris ordinibus over the Roman OR XXXIV, which was available in the creation of Collection B since Collection A was a source, seems to have been motivated by similar concerns.350 In the ordo de sacris ordinibus, each grade is given something which makes their function absolutely clear, a book to the lector, candles and napkins and vials to the acolyte. For the deacon, the symbolic meaning of the gesture is even openly explained.351 Choosing the more obviously symbolic option was not arbitrary or a sign of some kind of ritual decadence, but provided an obvious opportunity for education, making clear to the person involved, and to the people observing, the importance of the rite, the change in state it entailed, and the appropriate responses to it.352 The responses of the laity remain opaque, yet the consistent addition of commentary about bells to Holy Week rituals (as at OR XXVIII n.7-10, OR XXIX, n.8 and the unique ordines of Murbach and Palat.lat.47) is interesting in light of Bullough’s comment about the ‘proliferation’ of belfries and bell turrets in Carolingian Francia.353 But those clerics who had the required literacy to perform liturgical ritual, to whom were primarily targeted many of the improving endeavours of the Carolingians, were obviously expected to be able to find a ‘correct’ meaning in the gestures and rituals the ordines describe. The many manuscripts Susan Keefe examined reveal countless copying and re-copying of expositions of the baptism ritual, including Amalarius’ letter and other responses

349 Brand, Holy Treasure and Sacred Song, pp.9-18; Barrow, The Clergy, p.335.
to Charlemagne’s dossier, which were directed for the education of the clergy.\textsuperscript{354} It was the bishops, moreover, who were expected to supervise, in their own dioceses, the education of their clergy.\textsuperscript{355} All the great episcopal rites, baptism, ordination, consecration provided an obvious chance to make plain certain ideals. For example the \textit{ordo de sacris ordinibus}, apart from its function as ordination ritual, made clear in text the ecclesiastical hierarchy and the function of each grade. This was something Carolingians were, judging by the ubiquitous copying of texts like the \textit{Ordinals of Christ}, highly interested in fixing and getting right.\textsuperscript{356} Many of the choices the Collection B compiler makes are explicable in this regard. He was firmly engaged in the endeavour of liturgical \textit{correctio}.

\textbf{Part 1: Verona Biblioteca Capitolare XCII}

\textit{In the school of Pacificus}

Verona Biblioteca Capitolare MS XCII is the earliest example of Collection B, and the one closest to the hypothetical original have discussed. Andrieu presented the evidence that the manuscript was created between 814-820 and within Verona where it has remained to this day.\textsuperscript{357} This would have been during the 799/802-840 bishopric of Ratold, who was from Alemannia or Francia, and educated in the famous monastery of Reichenau.\textsuperscript{358} Ratold was also chaplain of King Pippin of Italy’s court in Verona, until the latter’s death in 810, and liturgy performed in the royal chapel probably had an exemplary nature, as at Aachen.\textsuperscript{359} Afterwards, he was a notable supporter of Louis the Pious in both the rebellion of Bernard of Italy, and the successive conflicts of the sons of

\textsuperscript{356} Roger Reynolds, \textit{The Ordinals of Christ from their Origins to the Twelth Century}, (Berlin, 1978), pp.69-83.
Louis against their father. The famous Versus di Verona and other literary compositions witness to a cultural flourishing in the city at the time.\textsuperscript{360} It is surely significant to note here that Ratold’s predecessor and possibly uncle, Egino and his successor Noting, were also educated in Reichenau, which demonstrates clearly that the arrival of someone from Alemannia succoured in the famous cloister at the ancient see and royal residence was no accident, but part of a deliberate policy.\textsuperscript{361}

Liturgy, as we shall see, had a role to play in that policy.

The manuscript contains three separate sets of \textit{laudes}, witnessing to several strata of editing.\textsuperscript{362} They imply the manuscript was engaged with ritually for some time, decades at least. All three sets were edited by Meersemann et al.\textsuperscript{363} Unfortunately the last pages of the manuscript have suffered from humidity, and there, the first half of each page is lost, but enough has survived to provide significant complexities. The final pages of the manuscript, fols. 70v-71v present the earliest set of \textit{laudes}. They were contemporary to the writing of the \textit{ordo} collection and in the same hand, 8th/9th century, but have suffered two major losses. The first loss is by humidity. This is the intercession for \textit{nostro electo pontifice}, the bishop of the city. Ratold himself may have been named here. The other deletion is the more immediately interesting. Originally, this text seems to have invoked Saint Paul for the aid of the Empress, Judith, wife of Louis the Pious. This entire clause was subsequently deliberately erased. At a later date a new hand, strikingly less formal in lettering and more cursive, wrote in its place the name of Ermengard \textit{imperatrici}, wife of Lothar, rewrote \textit{Exaudi Christe} and the name of Saint Paul. Obviously this hand intervened after Lothar’s marriage in 821.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{361} Meerssemann et al., \textit{Pacifico}, pp.3-4; Uwe Ludwig, \textit{Transalpine Beziehungen der Karolingerzeit im Spiegel der Memorialüberlieferung : prosopographische und sozialgeschichtliche Studien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Liber vitae von San Salvatore in Brescia und des Evangeliiars von Cividale} (Hanover, 1999), pp.130-1.
\item \textsuperscript{362} Andrieu, \textit{Les Ordines}, vol.I, pp.372-373.
\item \textsuperscript{363} Meersseman et al., \textit{Pacifico}, pp.188-190.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
However it was almost certainly some time later, only after the rebellion of Lothar against his father and Judith, in 830, that there would have been sufficient justification to warrant the erasure.

The second set of laudes, in both position and place, at fols.68v to 69v, is an almost perfect copy of the third and earliest, but by a different hand, and consequently fills in some of the lost text. But this new set was written in, once circumstances had been changed by the crowning of Lothar as Emperor in 817. Here the Emperors are two, hludoucio et hlothario augustis a deo coronatis. For two emperors, originally there were two empresses, imperatricibus, Judith and Ermengard. Again, here, Judith’s name has been erased, and the end of imperatricibus was also removed to make it singular. Obviously the editor was a partisan of Lothar’s claim above that of his half-brother Charles. The writer of the third and the latest set of laudes (fols.67r-68v) firmly anonymised the texts. The emperor and empress (singular) are both ille and illa. This may mean the third set was written between the death of Louis the Pious in 840 and the crowning of Louis II as Emperor in 850, the period when Lothar was sole emperor. Here is preserved what was almost certainly the original prayer for the bishop in the earlier two sets, again anonymised, nostro ille a deo electo pontifici, for whom was asked intercession of Firme, Proculo and Zeno, Verona’s three most significant local saints. One other change is made, the army is no longer exercitu francorum but exercitu christianorum. Decreaux has shown this change was an observable phenomenon across liturgical texts, which, he argued, reflected deeper anxiety about the place of the people chosen by God while the Frankish Empire convulsed. These revisions of the laudes, to take account of current circumstance suggest that the contents of the manuscript remained relevant and continued to be actively employed in the cathedral of Verona for decades.

Now, since Bishop Ratold of Verona was a great supporter of Louis the Pious, and of Empress Judith, for he was among those who liberated her from imprisonment at Tortona in 834, these edits were undoubtedly not made under his command or pen. From that time until his retirement from

---

his see to Ratolfzell at Reichenau in 840, Ratold was in exile from Verona by command of Lothar himself. At the time, it seems that the *scola sacerdotum*, or clerical community in Verona, were against Ratold and for Lothar against Louis the Pious, and so we can certainly attribute the erasure of Judith to someone in that community at the time of Ratold’s exile, made, as a significant repudiation of their own bishop’s policy. Supposedly, the administrator of the see during this time was Pacificus of Verona, the archdeacon (who died, according to his epitaph, in 844). Pacificus was, among many talents, famed as a scribe and Venturini discussed Verona XCII as being among a number of manuscripts produced at his time in the Verona *scriptorium*.\(^{365}\) Meerseman, Adda and Deshusses treated Verona XCII as among the liturgical manuscripts ‘certainly written’ in Pacificus’ hand. They comprise Verona *Biblioteca Capitolare* XCI (An authentic *Hadrianum* Gregorian Sacramentary with votive masses added), CVI (an orational and martyrology) and XCII itself (deemed to be ‘*un pontificale embrionale, uno dei primi tentative del genere*’).\(^{366}\) The authors highlighted the links with Reichenau’s Sacramentary traditions in a number of these books, unsurprising if it was Ratold, an alumnus of that monastery, overseeing the work.\(^{367}\) However, Cristina La Rocca demonstrated that at least some of Pacificus’ incredible achievements were exaggerated if not invented, and he may even have actually been exiled to Nonantola after the revolt of Bernard in 817, which he and the local clergy of the *scola sacerdotum* probably supported against his own bishop Ratold.\(^{368}\) Pacificus’ autograph is found in two documents of 809 and 814, so he was certainly writing in Verona at the time our manuscript was composed.\(^{369}\) However he was not the main hand responsible for Verona XCII. Venturini had been extremely cautious not to directly attribute Verona

\(^{365}\) Teresa Venturini, *Ricerche Paleografiche intorno all’Archidicono Pacifico* (Verona, 1929), p.85, 125.


XCII to him personally, but was nevertheless misinterpreted in the Meerssemann et al. volume. The manuscript was still certainly part of a group of manuscripts produced in Pacificus' time in Verona, and can be related to them, but Pacificus' role may have been more of an overseer and, as we shall see, a corrector, than as the original scribe of the *ordines romani*.

**Collection B in Primitive Form and the Gregorian Additions**

As I suggested above, the *ordines* of Collection B seem to preserve the primitive state of the collection most completely, and it is the earliest of the manuscripts, which is to say in the order:

- Fols.1r-5r OR XIII
- Fols. 5v-21v OR I
- Fol.21v OR III (supplement to OR I-added later)
- Fols.22r-36v OR XI
- Fols.38r-48v OR XXVIII
- Fols.49r-52r OR XLI
- Fols.52r-54r OR XLII
- Fols.54v-55r Gelasian consecration of objects
- Fols.55v-57v OR XXXVII
- Fols.57r-59r Gelasian ordination sequence (*ordo de sacris ordinibus benedicendos*)
- Fols.67r-71v *laudes regiae*. 
Rasmussen pondered briefly whether Verona XCII represented a fusion of *libelli*, but he offers no evidence, and there is no codicological reason. In fact, Collection B was a carefully planned unity from the outset. In its original format, the apparatus surrounding the text is minimal, but a carefully placed yellow tint behind certain words, particularly at the opening of new sections in an *ordo* or at the beginning of each new feast day, is undoubtedly an attempt to aid the comprehension of the book, and allow for the quick location of the relevant pieces. In OR XIII, for example, each new feast day is highlighted, and each new reading within it, in OR I, each *feria* in the week leading up to Easter are highlighted, and in OR XI, antiphons and responsories are similarly treated, as well as numerous openings to new ritual actions begun by *Item, Postquam, Deinde or Et*. The small additions add to the fineness of the book, and the script is of very good quality, copied in several grades of a carefully maintained hierarchy. Particularly significant is the stark *capitalis* in the style of a Roman inscription on the first page, opening *OR I*. It is generally well-copied, but it is not decorated to the extent that Sacramentaries are, such as Verona LXXXVI, which has ornamented initials, and is much larger. Along with its size, Verona XCII is the smallest of the Collection B manuscripts at 183x120 mm, this suggests the book was intended from its inception for repeated use. Meerseman et al suggest that it was ‘easily transportable for the master of ceremonies who would accompany the bishop on a journey’, implying that this *cerimoniere* was Pacificus himself.

The additions made by the Veronese scribe to the original Collection B are of significant importance. One must note from that he left a significant portion at the end of the manuscript blank, from 65r (the end of his *orationes defunctorum*) to 70r (his set of *laudes*). Again, this supposes that the book was conceived from the start as an ongoing project, in use at the cathedral for some time and perhaps for the entire length of Ratold’s episcopacy. The *ordo de sacris ordinibus* appears

---

here much as it was in the original Collection B. While the damage from humidity is again unfortunate, Cologne 138 helps us reconstruct exactly what this looked like, and the surviving portions make it plain that the two manuscripts were identical, save for a few missteps of transcription.

```
| Verona Biblioteca Capitolare XCII fols.59v-60v | Cologne Dombibliothek 138 fol.35v |
| ORDINATIO DIACONI | ORDINATIO DIACONI |
| Diaconus cum ordinatur solus episcopus qui eum benedicit manum super caput illius ponat quia non ad sacerdotum sed ad ministerium consecratur; | Diaconus cum ordinatur solus episcopus qui eum benedicit manum super caput illius ponat quia non ad sacerdotum sed ad ministerium consecratur |
| ... | ... |
| BENEDICTIO EIJUSDEM Dicit pontifex Oremus dilectissimi | ALIA Exaudi domine |
| ALIA... | ALIA... |
| ....omnipotens | CONSECRATIO Adesto omnipotens deus |
| ... | ORDINATIO PRESBITERI |
| ...cente et ...>nentem etiam omnes presbiteri ...>nt manus suas iuxta \ma/373nu episcopi super caput illius teneant | Presbiter cum ordinatur episco eum benedicente et manum super caput eius tenente etiam omnes presbiteri quam presentes sunt manus suas iuxta manum episcopi super caput illius teneant |
| ITEM BENEDICTIO Dicit pontifex. Oremus dilectissimi | ITEM BENEDICTIO Dicit pontifex. Oremus dilectissimi |
| SEQUITUR Exaudi nos domine deus | SEQUITUR Exaudi nos domine deus |
| CONSECRATIO Domine sancte pater | CONSECRATIO Domine sancte pater |
| ORDINATIO EPISCOPI | ORDINATIO EPISCOPI |
| Episcopus cum ordinatur duo episcopi teneant et ponant euangeliorum librum super ceruicem eius et unus fundat benedictionem. Reliqui omnes episcopi qui adsunt manibus suis caput eius tangant. | Episcopus cum ordinatur duo episcopi teneant et ponant euangeliorum librum super ceruicem eius et unus fundant benedictionem. Reliqui omnes episcopi qui adsunt manibus suis caput eius tangant. |
| BENEDICTIO EPISCOPORUM Adesto domine | BENEDICTIO EPISCOPORUM Adesto domine |
| SEQUITUR Propitare domine | SEQUITUR CONSECRATIO Deus honorum omnium |
| CONSEC<...> | ORATIO AD MISSA Deus honorum omnium |
| ORATI<...> | SUPER OBLATA Haec ostia |
| SUPER<...> | INFRACTIONE Hanc igitur oblationem |
| I<...> | AD COMMUNIONEM Haec nos communion |
| 
```

Note the rubrics with ‘*dicit pontifex*’ on deacon and priest which are not a feature of the Gregorian or Gelasian traditions, additions made which highlight the role of the bishop in the

---

373 Added above the line.
ceremony. Significantly, the prayers given here are the very prayers found in the Hadrianum copied at the same time in Verona, Verona Biblioteca Capitolare XCI.\textsuperscript{374} There is complementarity between the two manuscripts of Verona, one could refer across to the Sacramentary, XCI, for the full prayers, since the Pontifical, Verona XCII, offered only incipits but had the rubrics the Sacramentary lacked.

The Veronese scribe also added a number of Sacramentary prayers wholesale to the text, which are given complete. Some are taken straightforwardly from the Gregorian. Immediately following his Gregorianised ordinations for the bishop, he added a selection of material relevant for ordination from the Gregorian. In the Gregorian, however, these texts were entirely separate from the ordination prayers above, so he had to have gone looking for them purposefully, but they are all given in exactly the same order as that Sacramentary.\textsuperscript{375}

Fol. 60v ORATIO AD CAP<….> Fully AD CAPILLATURUM.\textsuperscript{376}

Fols..60v-61r ‘AD CLERICUM FACIENDUM’\textsuperscript{377} This prayer (whose title obviously relates it to ordination) ends in the midst of the damaged portion of folio 61r. There follows something not found in the Gregorian of Deshusses:

Fol.61r’ ….mi hereditatem meam <…>gloria. ITEM ALIA Haec est generatio quaerentium domine. TERCIA Hic accipiet benedictionem et gloria.’Cologne 138 again offers a complete account of what was originally said here. This manuscript informs us that the scribe of Verona 92 has added two antiphons ‘Tu es domine qui restitues mihi hereditatem meam’ and ‘Haec est generatio quaerentium domine’ with a verse ‘Dominus pars et gloria’, all under the rubric ET DUM TONDIS EUM DICIS ANTIPHONAM. There is no trace of these antiphons or the rubric in the Gregorian Sacramentary. In fact, he found these further details in a copy of the Gelasian of the eighth century (which was

\textsuperscript{374} Meersseman et al, Pacifico di Verona, pp.29-43.
\textsuperscript{376} FOR HAIR CUTTING.
\textsuperscript{377} FOR THE MAKING OF A CLERIC.
probably very close to that one in use at Reichenau). He only wished to take the Gregorian prayer, but added rubrics to make it more comprehensible, as Collection B’s compiler had done before him.

Fol. 61r AD BARBAS TONDENDAS A prayer for the cutting of the beard, follows here as in the Gregorian.

Fol. 62r AD <...> Again, Cologne 138 must fill in the space here, and again we see an attempt to supplement an original Gregorian prayer with an ordo and ritualised action. The text begins with a small ordo entitled AD DIACONAM FACIENDAM, beginning ‘Episcopus cum diaconam benedicit...’.

This is therefore an ancient rite for the mysterious order of female religious known as deaconesses. The rite describes how the bishop places an orarium or stole over the woman’s shoulder and leads her to the church. This rubric was not taken from the Gelasian of the eighth century that we now possess. It must be of Roman origin, for the deaconess originated there. The prayer that follows, again found in full in Verona XCII ‘Exaudi domine preces nostras’ is found in the Gregorian. Here, again, therefore he supplemented his prayer with a rubric to make it part of a ritual.

Fol. 62r ‘AD ANCILLAS DEI UELANDAS’ This is the title of a short prayer found in the Gregorian Sacramentary ‘Famulas tuas’. This very prayer is also given in Verona XCII, under a subtitle ORATIO EIJUSDEM. But again a rubric has been inserted before it:

‘Cum autem ad consecrationem sui episcopi offertur in talibus uestibus adplicetur qualibet semper uisitura est professione et sanctimoniae aptis.’

---

381 FOR CONSECRATING NUNS.,
382 ‘But when at her consecration, she is offered to the bishop in such clothes as would behove her always to be seen in for profession, and suitable for canonesses’; Rubric and tradition discussed in René Metz, La consecration des vierges dans l’eglise franque du Ville au IXe siècle (Strasbourg, 1954).
As Andrieu himself noted, this very rubric is found in the fifth century *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua*, in fact right after the rubrics for the ordinations which are also found above in this very manuscript! It was taken up by the Old Gelasian alongside them and thus this rubric is seen in both the Gellone and Phillips Sacramentaries. Again, the prayers that follow in the Gelasian are different from the Gregorian prayers seen in Verona XCII, making it plain the scribe extracted only the rubric to apply it to a prayer of Gregorian origin.

Fol.63r <...>marum eligimus <...>persequere, ut te largiente, cum ipsa tibi nostra electione placeamus. Per. This is the final piece of the Gregorian prayers directly harvested by the scribe of Verona XCII. It is the text of the Gregorian *ORATIO AD ABBATEM FACIENDUM UEL ABBATISSAM*.\(^{385}\)

This is the extent of a direct extract from the Gregorian. Verona XCII shares this with Cologne 138. From here on, Verona XCII is unique. The work of the Veronese scribe is entirely fascinating here. It is clear he found these prayer texts in the *Hadrianum* Gregorian Sacramentary copied in Verona at the same time. There, they are presented in exactly the same order, with the exact same titles. But they were not complete without rubrics to guide ceremony. For these, he seems to have gone to a Gelasian of the eighth century. The two dynamics by which Vogel characterised formation of the pontifical (adding rubrics to prayers, and prayers to ordines) are therefore visible in a single manuscript.\(^{386}\) Furthermore, most of these texts deal with religious communities; one possible application of the deaconess’ prayer was to canonesses, and the initiation prayers for tonsuring and cutting a beard could well have welcomed a man into a community of canons like the *scola sacerdotum* which Ratold himself founded in 813.\(^{387}\)

---


\(^{385}\) ‘PRAYER FOR THE MAKING OF AN ABBOT OR ABBESS’.


Following his assiduous borrowing from his own Gregorian Sacramentary, the Veronese scribe then changed tack. He wanted prayers for various special occasions a bishop might encounter, but they were found in his copy of the Gelasian of the eighth century, and not his Gregorian. Perhaps inspired by the Gelasian prayers for paten, chalice and chrism vessel, dutifully presented just as they were in Collection B, he began with texts for the blessing of a place the bishop would visit:

Fol.62r ‘BENEDICTIO DOMUS’. The first of three prayers found under this title in Gellone and Phillips.

Fols.62r-62v ‘BENEDICTIO SALIS \et aqua/ AD SPARGENDUM IN DOMO’. The prayer itself has suffered from humidity once again. Enough has survived, however, to reveal that this and the following prayer for the same need, entitled ITEM ALIA, are those found only in the Sacramentary of Gellone.

Fols.62v-63r ‘BENEDICTIO AD OMNIA QUE UOLUERIS’ Having lost its second half, this is nevertheless identifiable as both the two prayers found under this title in both Gellone and Phillips.

Fols.63r <ORATIO AD UISITANDOS FRATRES> Just visible under the humidity damage, this is the first of two prayers ‘Adesto domine supplicantibus nostris’ found in Gellone and Phillips.

Fols.63r-63v ORATIO AD UISITANDAS ANCILLAS DE Just as in the two Gelasians of the Eighth Century, this prayer for a visit to nuns follows that for the male ‘brothers’. Once again,

---

388 BLESSING OF A HOUSE.
390 Added in margin.
391 BLESSING OF SALT FOR SPRINKLING AT HOME.
393 BLESSING FOR ANYTHING YOU WISH.
395 PRAYER FOR VISITING BROTHERS.
397 PRAYER FOR VISITING NUNS
these selections show a marked taste for prayers involving religious communities, a fact that is of interest in the light of Ratold’s activities in Verona.

Having extracted liberally from his Gelasian of the eighth century, and reaching the prayers for visitation, the Veronese scribe again changed books. The prayers that follow on visiting the sick were in fact Gregorian, and again presented in much the same order which the Gregorian found in Verona gave them. As with the ordination prayers, the scribe here seems to be gathering all the visitation prayers from both traditions to allow a more complete account of his bishop’s duties.

Fol.63v ORATIO AD UISITANDUM<sup>399</sup> Continuing ‘Deus qui famulum tuum ezechie’, there are two prayers visible here for visiting the sick. Both are present in the Hadrianum Gregorian Sacramentary in this order.<sup>400</sup>

Fol.64r ‘<...>pristinam sanitate<...>corporis que precepta gratiarum tibi, in ecclesia tua referent actionem. Per.’ This is obviously another prayer for the sick, and resembles most closely the first prayer in the missa pro infirmis found in Gellone and Phillips, and the Old Gelasian, and taken up by Benedict of Aniane in the Supplement.<sup>401</sup> Most probably, therefore, it was found in the copy of the Gelasian of the eighth century in Verona as a variant reading, meaning he has changed books again here, having reached the theme of sickness.

Fols. 64r-64v ‘ITEM ORATIONES DEFUNCTORUM’<sup>402</sup> The manuscript moves logically from sickness to prayers for when the bishop had occasion to pray for the dead, but again changes book. Two prayers follow, both among the last things in the Gregorian Sacramentary as it stood, unsupplemented.<sup>403</sup>

---

<sup>399</sup> PRAYER FOR VISITING.
<sup>400</sup> Deshusses, _Le sacramentaire Grégorien_, vol.1, 987-988, p.338.
<sup>401</sup> Heiming (ed.), _Augustodunensis_, 1900, p.239; Dumas (ed.), _Gellonensis_, 2882, p.458; Deshusses, _Le sacramentaire Grégorien_, vol.1, 1392, p.455; Eizenhöfer et al (eds), _Liber Sacramentorum_, 1539, p.222.
<sup>402</sup> THEN PRAYERS OF THE DEAD.
<sup>403</sup> Deshusses, _Le sacramentaire Grégorien_, vol.1, 1015-1016, p.347.
Fol.64v <...>peccata in mondo <...>uerissime pietatis absterge. Per dominum. This prayer is the last in a set IN AGENDA MORTUORUM, which begins ’Tibi domine’. It was one of three prayers found at the end of the Gregorian Sacramentary written in Verona (Verona Biblioteca Capitolare XCI), not as a part of the Hadrianum itself, but in the Votive masses added only to this manuscript at the end, in a very limited attempt at supplementation. All three were likely visible in Verona XCII before the humidity damage. This makes it plain once more that the scribe was copying directly from the Gregorian found in Verona.

So, the Veronese additions to the Collection B, both those unique to this manuscript and those shared with Cologne 138, are clearly a focused extraction from larger books, the Sacramentaries, with respect more to use and type than to the genres of modern liturgical scholarship. It was certainly inspired by the same difficulties which gave rise to Benedict of Aniane’s work, and independent from him. It was, of course, on a much smaller scale. The usual narrative which had Benedict’s Supplement as the single, influential Gregorian Supplement must be nuanced by the possibility that other centres, like Verona, came up with their own solutions. One of the other liturgical manuscripts produced in Verona at the time of Pacificus, the orational Verona Biblioteca Capitolare CVI, is also an ‘abbreviation’ of a Sacramentary of a different nature, showing multiple attempts at Verona to reckon with this ‘cumbersome’ genre at the same time as full sacramentaries were also copied there. Verona XCII, which extracts some critical pieces from the Gregorian and supplements them with rubrics and prayers from a Gelasian of the eighth century, may be considered one attempt to reckon with how to use the Gregorian Hadrianum. Useful in itself for widening our conception of how the Gregorian might be employed, this long excursus also helps to interpret the ordo romanus content of Verona XCII. Those compiling the work clearly saw

---

405 On these, Meersseman et al, Pacifico, p.32.
406 Decreaux, Le Sacramentaire de Marmoutier, pp.95-163.
407 Ellard, Liturgist, pp.118-120.
408 Meersseman et al, Pacifico di Verona, pp.43-56: ‘Era dunque opportune scratare tutte le parti inutile per creare un sacramentario abbreviato’.
Collection B as a full episcopal liturgy, and required that it should also contain additional material from Sacramentaries in use in Verona, to be a more complete account of a bishop’s specialised activities. With the focus on religious communities, one is additionally tempted to view this manuscript as responding directly to Ratold’s work in Verona. They made sure that, through ceremonies of visitation and initiation, his new communities were linked firmly to him. Collection B must have responded very well to what Ratold wanted an episcopal liturgy in Verona to look like. Educated in Reichenau, he perhaps brought it to Verona originally, where it was copied by the a scribe in the school of Pacificus and supplemented using a very early Hadrianum, which was perhaps also brought by Ratold, and a Gelasian of the eighth century which may have already been in use in Verona before them both. Was the Collection specifically designed in order to bring Frankish usages to an Italian see? The inclusion of an Italian local patron Theodore in the laudes alongside Frankish Saint Martin of Tours (himself venerated in Italy), and the strict monastic divide from the clergy implied by the invocation of Benedict as separate from him, is deeply suggestive of an attempt to integrate the kingdom of Italy into thinking about liturgy like the Carolingians did. Ratold had also brought the institution of the scola sacerdotum to Verona, clearly an intervention along the lines of the Council of Aachen for the separation between monks and canons. As noted above, Ratold was head of the palace chapel, and close to both King Pippin, and, subsequently, Emperor Louis the Pious. The latter made the separation of monks and canons the focus of his Aachen decrees. Ratold’s liturgical activities were, then, especially pertinent to these imperial edicts, and may have served as an example of how to put them into practice for other Italian bishops.

Pacificus’ Marginal Corrections

As seen above, the consistent updating and mutilating of the laudes prove that this manuscript was used in Verona for many years, up until at least after 830. While Meerseemann et al associated

---

409 Witt, Two Latin Cultures, pp.38-39; Brand, Holy Treasure and Sacred Song, pp.39-48, with a parallel case in Arezzo involving Charles the Bald himself.
the laudes with him, Pacificus likely left Verona after the 817 rebellion of Bernard of Italy, in which the Veronese clergy revolted against Ratold (who supported Louis the Pious). La Rocca found evidence that Pacificus was sent to Nonantola as punishment for this sedition.\footnote{La Rocca ‘A Man for all Seasons’, p.250.} The erasure of Judith from the laudes show that the Veronese clergy were not entirely cowed after the failure of Bernard’s rebellion, and continued to pursue a course against the support of their bishop for her and Louis. Their choice to erase Judith implies that the manuscript functioned as more than a guide to ceremony, but also made a certain political statement (whether the laudes were performed or not). But Pacificus was not the one who wrote these laudes. He did, however, intervene in our manuscript in numerous ways, and we can probably therefore situate this activity before 817. Pacificus’ marginal notations have been identified in numerous manuscripts from early ninth-century Verona.\footnote{I must thank David Ganz for providing a list from Bischoff’s Katalog where Bischoff noted with “Marginalien von Pacificus” a number of examples, e.g. Bischoff, Katalog, vol.II, p.242, 3077 for Munich Clm 6407. A definitive list is found in the new index volume, Bernhard Bischoff, Katalog der festlandischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen) vol.IV, Gesamtregister Birgit Ebersperger (ed.) (Wiesbaden, 2017), p.158.} Among them, some are more easily available: here will be used Berlin Staatsbibliothek Phillipps 1829 (a manuscript of Eusebius/Jerome) and, more extensively, Munich Staatsbibliothek Clm 6407 (Alcuin’s De Rhetorica and some theological works).\footnote{Berlin Phillipps 1829 is in colour \url{http://bvmm.irht.cnrs.fr/consult/consult.php?mode=ecran&panier=false&reproductionId=4559&VUE_ID=993508&carouselThere=false&nbVignettes=tout&page=1&angle=0&zoom=petit&tailleReelle=}; Munich 6407 (from microfilm) at \url{http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00036088/images/index.html?seite=00001&l=de}; Also Berlin Phillipps 1727, a manuscript of Sedulius, which is less amply supplied with notations (e.g. fol. 3v) and from a poorer reproduction: \url{http://bvmm.irht.cnrs.fr/consult/consult.php?mode=ecran&panier=false&reproductionId=4515&VUE_ID=987124&carouselThere=false&nbVignettes=4x3&page=4&angle=0&zoom=moyen&tailleReelle=}; A large collection of manuscripts have also remained in Verona, seen in CLA, vol. IV, e.g. p.25, with plates showing Pacificus’ notes on Verona Biblioteca Capitolare XXVIII and XXXIII.} Verona XCII is also full of marginal notations. Are these in the hand of Pacificus like those manuscripts?

To help answer this, what are Pacificus’ priorities in these marginal notations, and secondly what does his hand look like? Pacificus generally seems to guide a reader (or himself) through the texts. Munich Clm 6407 is full of notes saying Item exemplum (fols. 6v, 7r, 8r, 8v, 9v etc.), showing

\footnote{http://bvmm.irht.cnrs.fr/consult/consult.php?mode=ecran&panier=false&reproductionId=4559&VUE_ID=993508&carouselThere=false&nbVignettes=tout&page=1&angle=0&zoom=petit&tailleReelle= ; Munich 6407 (from microfilm) at \url{http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00036088/images/index.html?seite=00001&l=de}; Also Berlin Phillipps 1727, a manuscript of Sedulius, which is less amply supplied with notations (e.g. fol. 3v) and from a poorer reproduction: \url{http://bvmm.irht.cnrs.fr/consult/consult.php?mode=ecran&panier=false&reproductionId=4515&VUE_ID=987124&carouselThere=false&nbVignettes=4x3&page=4&angle=0&zoom=moyen&tailleReelle=}; A large collection of manuscripts have also remained in Verona, seen in CLA, vol. IV, e.g. p.25, with plates showing Pacificus’ notes on Verona Biblioteca Capitolare XXVIII and XXXIII.}
where Alcuin illustrates a point with an example and he also numbers the paragraphs on several page (e.g. fols.18v-19r, 35r). Most useful for us, Pacificus also gives short notes in the margin showing what Alcuin is saying at a certain point:

Munich Clm 6407, fol.14v ‘qualiter ordinanda est oratio causae’.414

Munich Clm 6407. Fol.22v ‘EXP(lanatio) de hoc quod nolens consentiat’.415

Munich Clm 6407, fol.30r ‘qualis oportet uerbum esse coniunctio’416

Munich Clm 6407, fol.33r ‘quid et inonesta locutio sit cauenda’.417

In the Eusebius-Jerome chronicle, Pacificus notes points of interest more generally. Fascinatingly, he seems particularly concerned with astrological phenomena (Berlin Phillipps 1829 165v and 163v ‘stella comitis’, 165v ‘signum duo soles’, 170v ‘defectus solis’, 165r ‘luna fuscatur’ or on 171v simply portenta.) but also gives the deaths of Emperors (fol.166r, ‘Valentinianus occiditur imperator’ and ‘Maximus imperator occiditur’, fol. 157r ‘Theodosius moritur’). To identify this hand in our manuscript, Pacificus offers some telling characteristics. Munich Clm 6407 fol.31r has a particulary illustrative example. Here, Pacificus uses an nt ligature in the middle of a word ‘pronuntiatur’ (with a pro abbreviation), and the second n is an uncial form. He also uses the two-c a form, but the normal minuscule a form has a pronounced slant (Berlin 165v, compare stella with main text). Rather than using the caroline minuscule d consistently, Pacificus often uses the sloping uncial d, as fol.14v of the same manuscript on ordinanda (also has an uncial n on the first n), where the second d is a particularly striking almost straight diagonal on the ascender (also on Theodosius in Berlin, fol.157r). His gs are quite flat-topped. When in ligature, his rs go below and above the line (as in oratio in examples above with an ra ligature).

414 ‘How a speech of cause is to be ordered’.
415 ‘Explanation of that which, not being willing, one should consent’.
416 ‘how a verb should be conjugated’.
417 ‘Why dishonest speech should be avoided’.
Now, what are the marginal additions in Verona XCII? Certainly, one priority was ‘correcting’ the faults in the text. One good example, with an extensive example of the marginal hand, is fol.4r, where the original scribe had made a mistake which was rubbed out and missed the end of OR XIII, nn.28-30; ‘homeliae sanctorum’ to ‘Augustini leguntur’.\(^{418}\) On Augustini is a flat g, on apostolorum (abbreviated) a two c a and on secundum (abbreviated) de and eundem, is a diagonal slanting d. The nt ligature on the last word leguntur (which also has an eg ligature) or on ascendebant can be compared to Munich Clm 6407’s pronuntiatur, while the et on Petrus or continet for example, can be compared to that manuscript’s et on 33r. Both have a nub in the horizontal stroke. On rex the note draws back the x almost to the beginning of the word as in notes in Berlin Phillipps 1829, fols.158v ‘ataulfus rex’, or 159v-160r ‘ualice rex’ and ‘theodoricus rex’. Between fols.27v-28r the marginal hand fills in two pieces of OR XI that was missing, where he uses an uncial n on legendum, ascendit and unus.\(^{419}\) The en ligature can be compared to Pacificus’ in Munich Clm 6407, fol.22v, ‘consentiat’.

We can see the same on fol.29v.\(^{420}\) The capitals here, which are half-uncial, can be compared to Berlin, Phillipps 1829, fol.158v ‘ALARICUS rex ROMAM INGREDITUR’, particularly the T which dips in the middle and the A which ends in a hook at top and bottom of the vertical stroke. On 39v an addition is made to OR XXVIII, again filling a piece missed by the original writer.\(^{421}\)

On OR I, there are some other extensive notes. Sometimes these fill in left out pieces again.\(^{422}\) On 19v the marginal noter adds a d (in Pacificus’ style) to tendentibus, and on 21v a missing et. But there are several notes which concern high Roman dignitaries, the primicerius, the regionarii

\(^{418}\) The text is seen in Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.II, p.506.


\(^{421}\) Verona XCII 17v bottom margin ‘et salutat altare’; 18v ‘argentea (sic.) cereostata aurea’ and some interlinear corrections.
and so on.\textsuperscript{423} These were the very parts which were removed from OR I in the process of creating Collection B. They are absent from other manuscripts of Collection B, Munich Clm 14510 for example, and they were also absent in the original exemplar from which Verona XCII was copied, but they are filled in by note from what must have been an additional example of the same text. To further this conclusion, the pieces which were added to OR I (on the candles, or from OR III), are discreetly noted by having a line drawn around them, e.g. on 14v, or 16r, in ink very similar in colour to that used by the marginal noter.

Helpfully, some of the other notes help us to identify exactly what this additional example of \textit{ordines} looked like. For example, ‘\textit{pro scrutiniis}’ is added to the title of OR XI on fol.22r.\textsuperscript{424} The scribe intersposed ‘\textit{alis}’ to the title of OR XLII on fol.52r, seeming to separate it from the preceding OR XLI and used a cross to mark it\textsuperscript{425} On fol.57r, he added the ‘\textit{ad benedicendum}’ to the original title for the ordination grades, which was simply ‘\textit{ordo de sacris ordinibus}’. One of the marginal notes on OR I, on 15r, somewhat faded, is identifiable as a piece of OR I describing the blessing of the deacon by the bishop before the gospel only found in a handful of manuscripts and not in the Collection A ones.\textsuperscript{426}

On 21v, the opening of OR III, which was the supplement to OR I, was added following that text, in a somewhat neater style.\textsuperscript{427} This undoubtedly continued on an extra folio supplied. The uncial n on \textit{Natalis} and \textit{pentecosten} drops below the line as it does in Pacificus’ note, Munich Clm 6407, fol.5r, on \textit{romano}. OR III was among the sources for the original Collection B interpolations in OR I, here these were then separated out. Finally, on fol.66v, an extra text was added, much obscured by the humidity, what is visible now is ‘\textit{benedicit et hic est ordo}’. These additions all point only to a single \textit{ordo romanus} manuscript, Cologne \textit{Dombibliothek} 138.\textsuperscript{428} As we will see, that manuscript did contain

\textsuperscript{423} Verona XCII, fol.16r ‘tunc ascendent ad sede primicerius et secundicerius et primicerius defensorum uni ominibus regionariis et notariis’; 21r ‘annuente eum primicerio cum manu sub planeta’.
\textsuperscript{424} Andrieu, \textit{Les Ordines}, vol.II, p.417, OR XI Title var.3.
\textsuperscript{425} Andrieu, \textit{Les Ordines}, vol.IV, p.397.
\textsuperscript{427} Verona XCII, fol.21v ‘In diebus autem festis id est pascha pentecosten sancti petri natalis domini per has IIIlor sollemnitates habent colligendas…’; the text is found at Andrieu, vol.II, p.131.
Collection B, but extensively intervened in it. The additions to the titles of OR XI, OR XLII and the
ordo de sacris ordinibus are found only in this manuscript. OR I is given there exactly in the form the
corrector of Verona XCII must have seen it, that is, with the interpolations B had given it removed,
and the Roman pieces placed back in. Cologne 138 also had OR III, coming after OR I, exactly as it
was added in Verona XII. The note ending et hic est ordo was undoubtedly the special interpolation
made by that manuscript’s compiler to the Ember Day ritual, here added on a spare folio.429

Apart from correction, the notator interacts with the text in other ways too.430 This is most
noticeable in the ordo for the scrutinies, OR XI. Every time an action of the ritual is performed in the
narrative, or a speech is said by someone, a new hand has added in the margin who it would be
done by, be it a diaconus, presbyter, accolitus, alius accolitus or tertius accolitus. An uncial d is
favoured on diaconus. In a practice that can also be seen Berlin Phillipps 1829, these often have a
line drawn on the side facing the text. So too does marginal note added to fol.40v, on OR XXVIII, with
the instruction hic alat in ampullam olei, added to the margin exactly where this action, breathing
into the vessel of oil, is prescribed in the text. As in Pacificus’ work on Alcuin, these notes allow you
to locate certain points in the text which might be of interest (was this for preparing the different
people named for their roles in the service?). On fol.31r he uses a signum which Pacificus extensively
used in Berlin Phillipps 1829, a version of an anfibolum that signals an obscure point, here referring
to a place in the catechetical homily on the creed.431 Finally, on fol.64v, the same marginal hand
added canon 46 of the Council of Laodicea.

429 OR XXXVIIIB, nn.5-7, Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.IV, p.250: ‘Et si uigilia natalis domini in sabbato euenit, in
antecedente ebdomada suprascriptum ieiunium die sabbati celebrator, quando XII lectiones leguntur et cum
missas et oblationibus ipsa ieiunia consuntur; et tunc sacris ordines in aeclesia romana de eis qui dicuntur
cardinales tradi consuerunt. DE PARROCHIANIS Et in ipsa quattuor suprascripta mensium tempora,
qualcumque die dominus apostolici uoluerit, ad sacros ordines parrochianis clericos per omnes aecclesias, si
necessita fuerit, benedicit. Et hic est ordo.’
430 Mariken Teeuven ‘Three annotated letter manuscripts: scholarly practices of religious Franks in the margin
unveiled’, in Meens et al.(eds), Religious Franks, pp.221-240, for the ideas and impulses of marginal
interaction.
‘Concilium laudicense titulus XLVI. Quod oporteat eos qui ad baptisma (sic.) ueniunt symbolum discere et V feria septimane maioris episcopo aut presbiteris reddere’

This prescription, as Amalarius himself noticed, contradicts OR XI, which had the Creed said on Holy Saturday. Amalarius tells us that certain people followed it, while those he knew followed the ordo romanus and said the Creed on Holy Saturday. A certain Carolingian baptismal exposition openly appeals to the same decree. This is therefore, an alternative usage our scribe has noted. Laodicea was, of course, one of the councils which Charlemagne renewed in his Admonitio Generalis of 789. Once more, this addition has the characteristics of Pacificus’ hand, and is another particularly good example for comparison, with an nt ligature on ueniunt, the diagonal d on ad and quod and laudicense and multiple two c as, and the r ligatures on reddere that go above and below the line, particularly usefully compared to the note on Munich Clm 6420, fol.30r.

There is here sufficient evidence to attribute these notes to Pacificus. Given the time the manuscript was written, and given his activity in other Veronese manuscripts, he is simply the most likely author. I have demonstrated numerous palaeographical similarities. This suggests that after the manuscript was completed, Pacificus had occasion to go through it. He made numerous corrections to the scribe’s work, a number of which fill in pieces missed by the original scribe (which supposes that Pacificus was invested in the manuscript being a correct and complete guide to ceremonies). Further corrections and some substantial additions were seemingly based on another version of Collection B also available in Verona. Given the time scale, Cologne 138 (dated to the first quarter of the ninth century) quite plausibly is the very manuscript. This manuscript was seen to be

---

435 MGH Legum, II.1, pp. 52-62, Laodicaea is quoted on p.55.
‘more correct’ and Verona XCII was adjusted to be more like it. Desirable were the Roman notes in OR I in Cologne 138, OR III and the hic est ordo addition, which suggests Pacificus intended to underline the manuscript’s connection with Rome. The further apparatus around OR XI, in particular, aided in reading that text as a record of who would do what in the course of the scrutiny ceremonies, in keeping with general Carolingian interest in baptism and education. But Pacificus was not merely an overseer of manuscripts, he was also Ratold’s archdeacon, and thus had a significant liturgical role in Verona cathedral, as the ordines romani themselves describe. Noticeably, one of Pacificus’ corrections based on Cologne 138, on fol.20v, returns the archdeacon a role in the Mass which was (deliberately?) lost in collection B, that of giving wine to the Pope. This might hint at what else was at stake for Pacificus as he read and pondered Collection B. Might the notes in OR XI be actually intended to assist him, as archdeacon, in setting up such ceremonies? Such a suggestion implies that a book like Verona XCII might have been passed between the bishop and his assistants and discussed, rather than simply being carried around in a cathedral in the course of a service itself. In such an environment, we can begin to see how the Collection B manuscripts could vary to such an extent. Clearly Verona had at least two versions of Collection B. Pacificus had cause to study these closely, and note the differences, deciding that Cologne 138 represented a ‘preferable’ version. He also noted (in the same manuscript) the Laodicea canon which was another alternative to the ritual given in OR XI. Like Amalarius of Metz, Pacificus was thus knowledgable about and invested in the possibilities of liturgical variation.

Part 2: Cologne Dombibliothek 138

Another Veronese Manuscript?

Cologne Dombibliothek MS 138 is somewhat less easy to date and localise precisely, since its only set of laudes are very general and avoid specific names of saints, Popes or Emperor. On palaeographical grounds alone, however, it can be dated to the first quarter of the ninth century. Bischoff made it clear that the script was Italian. Since it was used at Verona perhaps just before 817, this is not at all surprising. Verona is, itself, a quite plausible place for it to be written, given its obvious relationship with Verona XCII. In general, the manuscript is far more skilfully conceived than Verona XCII. Its scribes make few of Pacificus’ errors and its systems of rubrication has advanced by leaps and bounds over Pacificus’ manuscript, with every title and rubric now in red, as are the abbreviations for new antiphons, responsories, and the beginning of new sections in texts. Initials are also in alternating red and black. The scribe used rustic capitals for the opening of OR XIII, at the very beginning of the manuscript, and an uncial Bischoff calls ‘Italian’ throughout for the opening of other ordines. The more significant initials are ornamented in a style that has been called ‘Merovingian’. While larger than Verona XCII at 240x195mm, and more extensive, a development of the previous manuscript in every way, it still comprises only 44 folios, and therefore presents itself, much like the other, as an easily transportable volume. Signs of its use include underlined words, such as super column in calice on folio 14r, and also marginal annotation noting where antiphons were to be sung with abbreviated ant in the course of OR XLI.

The ordo de sacris ordinibus is exactly that of Verona XCII, but the Cologne 138 editor made a typical step of correcting the somewhat uncertain grammar of the title by adding ‘ad benedicendum’, added also by Pacificus to Verona XCII. Another change will recur again and again: the options given for both singular and plural ordinations. Cologne 138 begins to offer singular and plural wording of prayers, with the plural option inserted just above the line for the words which


would be changed: *uestri* above *tui, tis* to make *agnoscatis* from *agnoscas* and so on. These are, noticeably, only found in the ordinations of lector and exorcist. Since Cologne 138 only offers incipits and not full prayers, the scribe does not have much chance to develop this apparatus further. Still, it suggests the possibility that the text was being edited for its actual recitation at ordination ceremonies, and addressed actual problems encountered in those ceremonies. From *ORATIO AD CAPILLARA* (fol. 36r) to *ORATIO AD ABBATEM FACIENDUM ET ABBATISSAM* (fol. 36v), it has the exact same sequence of prayers as Verona XCII does, including the rubrics which that text had added to its Gregorian prayers, here marked out in red. Given the time scale, it is quite likely to be Verona XCII itself that our copyist drew on. This would refine the dating of the manuscript in the first quarter of the ninth century to 814-c.825. Nevertheless, the scribe of Cologne 138 reordered the manuscript, by bringing ordination somewhat forward. For him, the ordinations immediately follow after OR XXVIII, Holy Week. Thus, he has:

OR XXVIII, OR XXXVII, the Gelasian ordinations, then OR XLI and XLII, and then the Gelasian consecration of objects.

In Verona XCII, the sequence went:

OR XXVIII, OR XLI, XLII, Gelasian consecration of objects, OR XXXVII and the Gelasian ordination sequence last.

This change may have been motivated by some of his more significant additions to Verona XCII. Finally, in the *laudes*, the Cologne 138 manuscript offers almost exactly the text of the Verona XCII text, but the scribe makes two significant changes.\(^{442}\) Firstly, he erased the *laudes* for *pontifice nostro*, for *fratribus nostris* and for *orthodoxis pastoribus*, i.e. those invoking local saints, Saint Benedict and Saint Martin of Tours. This would seem to remove the text from the more specific community context, perhaps the *scola sacerdotum* of Verona. Given the papal material appended, as

\(^{442}\) Kantorowicz, *Laudes Regiae*, p.106.
we shall see, it is possible that these changes brought the manuscript out of the community and more directly into the hands of the bishop. Secondly, his intercession for the army offers *exercitu francorum et romanorum*, a politically significant advance on the ‘army of the Franks’ in Verona XCII.

**Addition and Recovery of Details peculiar to Rome**

As I noted above concerning the editor of Verona XCII’s borrowing from this very manuscript, the scribes of Cologne 138 took *OR I* back to the form it had originally taken within a particular manuscript close to Collection A, much like Albi 42. That was certainly one of the books the scribe had before him as he worked, adding the missing sentences and removing B’s additions. Since he also added OR III, the noteworthy supplement to *OR I*, from which some of these additions were originally taken, only minimal information was actually lost in the editing process. The scribe did not simply prune back additions to the Collection, he actively added and edited the text. Cologne 138 substantially overhauled OR XXXVII, on Ember Days, to the extent that Andrieu separated this particular redaction out into a discrete edition as XXXVIIIA. The original therefore became XXXVIIIA.\(^{443}\)

The scribe here removed much of the central ordination ritual with the vesting by the archdeacon and so on, perhaps because the ordination ritual as found in the *ordo de sacris ordinibus* was sufficient. His narrative only describes the entrance and antiphon, and has the litany begin immediately afterwards (n.8), then the opening prayer begins. After this the *ordo* ends, so it also cuts away the extra discussion of the Summer Ember Day and Pentecost. This perhaps left space for the *ordo de sacris ordinibus* ceremonies to be inserted, but also meant the ritual was more fully in line with the *ordo qualiter* interpolation, an alternative version of the Ember Saturday rite.

He also added some very distinctive interpolations, at nn.5-6

> Et si uigilia natalis domini in sabbato euenit, in antecedente ebdomada superscriptum ieiunium die sabbati, *quando XII lectiones leguntur et cum missas et*

oblationibus ipsa ieiunia consumantur; Sacros ordines in aecclesia romana de eis qui
dicuntur cardinales tradi consuerunt.\footnote{113}

And directly after it:

DE PARROCHIANIS Et in ipsa quattuor superscripta mensium tempora, qualecumque die
domnus apostolicus uoluerit, ad sacros ordines parrochianis clericos per omnes aecclcsias, si
necessita fuerit, benedicit. Et hic est ordo: In sabbato...\footnote{114}

These are clearly of Roman origin, referencing two distinctive Roman institutions, the
cardinal priests and the parrochiani, clerics from the suburban churches. These additions are, rather
like the opening of OR I, of interest primarily as records of Roman practice, their usefulness to a
Frankish cleric is ambiguous, and yet the scribes went to quite some trouble to record them. Both
interpolations are to be found in another manuscript of Verona, the eleventh-century Carpsum of
Stephen the Cantor (Biblioteca Capitolare, XCIV), and follow there from OR XXXVII’s advice for
locating the Ember Days (OR XXXVIIB, nn.1-5), thus in exactly the same format as Cologne 138.\footnote{115}
We can best assume that the Carpsum took them from something very like Cologne 138, and placed this
ordo into its calendar of the liturgical year, at the Ember Saturday of Advent.

The scribe also edited OR XXVIII, the ordo for Holy Week, and here he went back to some of
the original sources for this text, namely OR XXVI and OR XXIV, detailing Day and Night Office
respectively, which were combined into Collection A, but circulated independently in manuscripts

\footnote{113} Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.250: ‘And, if the vigil of Christmas on that Saturday should fall, in the
preceding week the aforesaid fast is celebrated on Saturday, when the 12 readings are read and with masses
and offerings that fast is accomplished; and then the holy orders in the Roman church are held to be handed
by those who are called cardinals’

\footnote{114} Ibid. p.250: ‘ABOUT THE PARROCHIANI And in those four above said times of the months, on each day the
lord apostolic wishes, he consecrates to the sacred orders the parrochiani clerics for all the churches, if there
should be necessity. And here is the ordo: On Saturday...’

\footnote{115} Meersseman, Pacifico, pp.222-223: ‘Dies uero sabbati, quando XII lectiones leguntur, et cum missa et
oblationibus ipsa ieiunia consumuntur, sacros ordines in ecclesia romana de eis, qui dicuntur cardinals, tradi
consueverunt. Et in ipsa quattuor superscripta mensium tempora, qualecumque die domnus apostolicus
uoluerit, ad sacros ordines parrochianos clericos per omnes ecclesias, si fuerit necessitas, benedicit. Et hic est
ordo’.
like Albi 42. Andrieu noted that the editing of Cologne 138 seems to be inspired, also in \(OR\ I\), by a manuscript very similar to the Albi example, though obviously an earlier incarnation of it.\(^4\) So it is likely he found his copies of OR XXIV and XXVI in that same manuscript. He used them to add some Roman details which were erased by the scribe of Collection B and thus did not appear in OR XXVIII.

At OR XXVIII, n.4, he describes how intercessory prayers ‘\textit{Deus a quo et Iudas}’ were to be said on the Wednesday of Holy Week, including for the emperor.\(^4\) This is taken from OR IV, nn.1-4.\(^4\) At OR XXVIII, n.7, he describes how the candles were extinguished in the church on Maundy Thursday.\(^4\)

This is from OR XXVI, nn.13-14.\(^4\) At OR XXVIII, n.63, he describes how the paschal candle was blessed only in suburban churches of Rome, but in the Lateran, the wax was made into lambs to be given to the people on the octave of Easter so that they could scent their homes.\(^4\) This was taken


\(^{450}\) Andrieu, \textit{Les Ordines}, vol.III, pp.392-393, n.7, var.4: ‘Feria V, caena domini, media nocte surgendum est non tangitur campanae signum usque in sabbato sancto paschae ad missam. Ecclesia uero omni lumine decoretur et more solito. Lumen autem ecclesiae ab initio cantus nocturnae inchoatur extingui; hoc tamen ordine, ut ab introitu ipsius ecclesiae incipient paulatim tutare, ut, ueri gratia, peracto primo nocturno uideatur eorum pars tertia esse extincta; medio nocturno, iterum tertia; tertio uero expleto, exceptis septem lampadibus nihil luminis relictur, quae in matutino hoc ordine extinguantur; initio psalmi primiti sit custos semper paratus in loco dextrae partis ecclesiae prope lampadibus; ad, ubi audierit ant., tenens kannam in manu sua, tutat lampadam unam, in finem psalmi ipsius alienae sinistrae partis; sic, una ex parte sua, alia ex alia, tantantur usque ad evangelium. In evangelio uero, tutatur medis lampadia. Et hic ordo agitur cena domini mane; sic et in sabbato sancto, sicut in isto die taxauimus, ea scilicet ratione, feria VI, excutiat igne de lapide sicut diximus et ab archidiacono portetur; sic et in sabbato sancto ab episcope reportetur’


\(^{452}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p.404: Inde uero accenduntur in duobus candelabris duo cerei et de ipso igne accedunt in omni domo, qua omnis anterior extincti debet. Et hic ordo ceresi benedicendi in forensibus ciuitatis agitur. Nam in catholic ecclesia infra ciuitatem romanum non sic benedicitur. Sed mane primo Sabbato sancto venit archidiaconus in ecclesia. Et fundit cerea in usum mundum maiore et miscitam ibidem oleum et benedicet cerea et ex ea fundit in simuludine agnorum et seruat eos in loco mundo. In octabas uero paschae, dantur ipsi ab archidiacono in ipsa ecclesia post missas et communione populo et ex eis faciunt in domos suas incensum accedent in suumignandum pro quelcumque tribulatione eis euenere necessitas. Similiter et in forensibus ciuitatis, similiter de cereo faciunt. Nam, quod intermisimus, accipit mansionarius prior candela in manu sua inluminata in canna, prosequeant eum populo cum supplici silentio, ita ut summitas candela quae inluminatur altare uersa inclinata respiciat illum ecclesiam quam sunt ingressuri, qua eam prian abscire lumine erit, praeparatis ante altare septem lampadibus ita compositae, ut absque ulla impedimenti ciusque recordatione manu mansionarii eadem candela possit accendi. Ac deinceps, praeparatis custodibus, omne lumen decorat ecclesiam et sic permaneat inluminata usque ad vigilia.
from OR XXVI, n.6-10. These were three of the most distinctive Roman aspects of Holy Week. They had been erased by the β compiler, and now they are returned, in keeping with Colgone 138’s desire to give the ordines a form close to their Roman originals.

Cologne 138 also added some ordines romani which were not found elsewhere. Firstly, there is Andrieu’s OR XL DE ORDINATIONE ROMANI PONTIFICIS. As its title states, this is a short text describing the ordination of the Pope by the bishops of Ostia, Porto and Albano, something which, once again, we cannot see having any conceivable use in any church outside Rome. It is accurate to what we know of that ceremony. OR XL itself had a long afterlife in the manuscripts called the pontifical romano-germanique. There is also another text that Andrieu did not count among his ordines romani. Within the admittedly broad definition of ordo romanus, there is no reason to exclude it. It is even entitled ORDO ROMANUS QUALITER CONCILIUM AGATUR, which is perhaps a sign that ordo romanus had begun to have a special meaning independent of actual ‘Roman-ness’ by this period, perhaps by association with collections like this one. Munier and then Schneider for MGH, as his ordo 7, have each offered an edition of this text, directly from the Cologne 138 manuscript. This is, once again, the earliest example of a text which had an afterlife in several of the Pontifical Romano-Germanique manuscripts. Munier made it plain that this council was certainly not of Roman origin, but Frankish. He found several of the prayers in the the Visigothic ordo for councils contained in the Hispana Gallica, a lightly interpolated Frankish version of the Collectio Hispana. The text in question was widely circulated in Francia. Schneider dated the original redaction around the year 800, and noted some interesting liturgical similarities with another ordo romanus, OR XII. According to Schneider, Archbishop Arn of Salzburg (c.750-821), also had the text

453 Ibid., pp.326-327.
457 Schneider Ordines, pp.52-53, transmitted in Vat.lat.7701, also an Italian manuscript.
and created a new version, 7B. He also saw one relationship with the pre-Hadrianic Gregorian Sacramentary in Trent, *Museo Provinciale d’arte del Castello del buonconsiglio* Cod.1590, specifically through the prayer, *Da quaesumus ecclesiae tuae misericos deus, ut spiritu sancto congregate secura tibi devotione servire mereatur*, a prayer that is only preserved in the Trent example. This sacramentary could have been written in the realms of Aquileia, as Gamber believed, or in Trent itself, as Bischoff suggested. The Cologne 131 *ordo* provided the procedure for a small, provincial council with a single metropolitan, in contrast to the PRG’s version which has several metropolitans. Does this indicate that Cologne 138 was created for a metropolitan see? Is Aquileia a possibility, or Milan, or even Ravenna? These were the three Italian metropolitans, apart from Rome, recorded in the *Notita Galliarum*. Rasmussen notably struggled with the idea that this metropolitan conciliar *ordo* would be copied for a non-metropolitan see, but, as the presence of OR XL for the ordination of the Pope in this very manuscript indicates, liturgical texts certainly did not have to fall into the direct jurisdiction of the person reading or even using the manuscript. A conciliar *ordo* might have any number of other uses, as models for smaller councils, as guidelines concerning the responsibilities and rights of metropolitans, even as souvenir for a council the reader had attended. In any case, Cologne 138 probably copied it from elsewhere, perhaps from a record from Aquileia.

**Masses, Antiphons and Denuntiatii added to the Collection**

As I noted above, Cologne’s folios 36r to 36v comprise the sequence of Gregorian ordination prayers with rubrics from Gelasian found in Pacificus’ own manuscript. However Cologne 138 added four further pieces that come before them, immediately after the *ordo de sacris ordinibus*, which are all to do with the consecration of women religious. While many of these prayers are found in the Old

---

Gelasian and the Supplement to the Gregorian, their format makes it clear that Cologne 138 has taken these texts from a Gelasian of the eighth century.

Fols. 35v-36r ‘SANCTIMONIALIS UIRGO CUM AD CONsecrationem sui episcopi offertur in talibus uestibus applicetur qualibus se postura est professione et sanctimoniae aptis.’ This is the exact copy of the rubric from the Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua and the Gelasian of the eighth century which Pacificus had appended to the Gregorian prayer AD ANCILLAS DEI UELANDAS. However, he had got rid of the opening ‘Sanctimonialis uirgo’, probably referring to canonesses. Of course, this rubric in the Pacificus form is then also found in Cologne 138, repeated directly on the next page. Obviously, the creator of Cologne 138 found the original rubric and decided to add it a second time, more accurately represented.

Fol.36r ‘BENEDICTIO UESTIMENTORUM UIRGINUM UEL UIDUARUM Exaudi nos omnipotens deus.’ In all the Gelasians of the Eighth Century, a prayer for the blessing of clothes for both virgins and widows follows the above text. None of the extant copies offer exactly the prayer to which this incipit belongs, and it is unfortunately rather too generic to locate elsewhere. The Gelasians of the Eighth Century circulating in Italy were not necessarily identical to those we still possess, all from other regions.

‘ITEM BENEDICTIO UESTIMENTIS UIDUE Deus aeternorum.’ This is the prayer that immediately follows the rubric in the Gelasian of the eighth century, and there is applied to both virgins and widows.

‘CONSECRATIO SACRE UIRGINIS QUAE IN EPIPHANIA UEL IN SECUNDA FERIA PASCHE AUT QUANDO APOSTOLORUM NATALIS CELEBRATUR Familiam tuam domine. ITEM ORATIO Deus

---

464 ‘OF THE HOLY VIRGINS WHEN TO her consecration, she is offered to the bishop in such clothes as would behave her always to be seen in for profession, and suitable for canonesses’
465 As in the Institutio Sanctimonialum, MGH concilia II, 2 pp.422-56; De Jong ‘Carolingian Monasticism’, p.632.
466 ‘BLESSING OF THE CLOTHES OF VIRGINS AND WIDOWS Exaudi nos omnipotens deus’.
467 ‘THEN THE BLESSING OF THE CLOTHES OF WIDOWS Deus aeternorum’
castorum corporum." This rubric details when exactly virgins could be consecrated, it is therefore wholly in line with the general preoccupation with settling an exact time of year for ordination ceremonies. The rubric occurs, with the second prayer Deus castorum corporum in the Old Gelasian, but there the first prayer is a different reading from here ‘Respice propitius domine’. The same arrangement exactly occurs in the Phillips Sacramentary, but there is no sign of this rubric in Gellone at all. The prayer ‘Familiam tuam domine’, resembles a prayer in the Gregorian for the Day of Saint Peter, which would be appropriate.

From there, the prayers continue with AD CAPILLARIA and return to the exact disposition of Verona XCII. Essentially, the compiler Cologne 138, for all his clear favour towards Roman papal liturgy elsewhere, has returned to the Frankish Sacramentary par excellence to fill in what he deemed some gaps left by Pacificus in that manuscript’s account of the consecration of women religious. This is again a gesture towards a complete account of ceremonial, irrespective of the ‘type’ of book from which the texts might have come.

However, Cologne 138 also offers much more highly developed accounts of the other ceremonies, showing a meticulous scouring of the Sacramentary for the most important and relevant texts that might accompany the ordines romani he had before him. On folio 26v, immediately at the end of OR XI, which described the scrutiny ceremonies, he has filled in three complete missae, that is, accounts of three scrutiny masses found in the Old Gelasian Sacramentary, to be said on the third, fourth and fifth Sundays of Lent. These texts were themselves employed in the construction of OR XI. As Andrieu explained, OR XI itself expanded the number of scrutinies to

---

469 ‘THE CONSECRATION OF HOLY VIRGINS WHICH IN EPIPHANY OR IN THE SECOND WEEK OF EASTER OR ON THE FEAST OF THE APOSTLES ARE CELEBRATED Familian tuam domine. THEN THE PRAYER. Deus castorum corporum’: Apostles refers to SS Peter and Paul on the 29th June.
seven, reflecting a later Roman usage, but in fact the second, fourth, five and sixth were simply formalities, comprising brief exorcisms that were identical to those pronounced at the first. The text at, OR XI, n.81, even offers a numerological justification, arguing that the number reference the sevenfold gifts of the spirit.\textsuperscript{475} Cologne 138 had only the three Sunday Masses to supplement its narrative, but took them not from the Old Gelasian, as Andrieu presented it, but a Gelasian of the eighth century like the Sacramentary of Angoulême, or Phillips.

‘\textsc{incipit missa qua pro scrutinio electorum celebratur.}’\textsuperscript{476} Repeated almost verbatim at OR XI nn.34-35, this text included rubrics for the recitation of the names of the children received at the scrutiny. Angoulême and Phillips offer it almost exactly as Cologne 138 does here, and with the same title which removed the Old Gelasian specification that this take place on the Third Sunday.\textsuperscript{477}

‘\textsc{item alia missa pro scrutinio.}’\textsuperscript{478} While both Angoulême and Phillips offer this \textit{missa}, much as Cologne 138 does, the latter has the exact same title, while Angoulême yet specifies that this is the \textit{scrutinio secondo caelebratur}.\textsuperscript{479} The ambiguity of Phillips could allow this mass to be celebrated at any of the seven scrutinies of OR XI, rather than tying it to the three Sunday scrutinies which the Gelasian tradition represented.

‘\textsc{item missa pro scrutinio die in aurium apertionem.}’\textsuperscript{480} \textit{Aurium Apertionem} was an ancient Roman name for the special, third scrutiny. Even in OR XI, which has seven, the third scrutiny was of the most importance, it was the scrutiny at which the long catechetical homilies on the Creed and Four Evangelists were taught to the catechumens. In the Gelasian, this would take place on the fifth Sunday in Lent. In OR XI, it was held in the course of the fourth week of Lent.\textsuperscript{481} Of all the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{475} \textit{ibid.}, p.442: ‘septem scrutinii esse debant, secondum formam septem donis spiritus sancti’
\item \textsuperscript{476} \textsc{here begins a mass which for the scrutiny of the candidates is to be celebrated}
\item \textsuperscript{477} Saint-Roch (ed.), \textit{Engolismensis 417-423}, p.56; Heiming (ed.), \textit{Augustodunensis}, 397-403, pp.46-47.
\item \textsuperscript{478} \textsc{then another mass for the scrutiny}
\item \textsuperscript{480} \textsc{then the mass for the scrutiny of the day in aurium apertionum}
\item \textsuperscript{481} Andrieu, \textit{Les Ordines}, vol.II, p.388, OR XI, n.39-75.
\end{itemize}
Gelasians of the Eighth Century, only Angoulême includes a mass which unfolds like this one, with this title: *MISSAE QUAE PRO SCRUTINIO TERTIO IN AURIUM APERCIONE CAELEBRATUR*. Again, Cologne 138 or the Gelasian used has therefore removed the specification that this was the third scrutiny.

The redactor of Cologne 138, drawing on the Gelasian of the eighth century in a form we do not now possess, has attempted to complete further the narrative of OR XI with additional material. The Gelasians of the Eighth Century, books produced by Franks, witness to multiple attempts to make sense of what the mixed inheritance from Rome was saying, were there three or seven scrutinies? These three masses were found in the rigid schema of the Gelasians, where they were placed in their original setting in the course of the liturgical year. By removing them from that structure, Cologne 138 makes a further stride towards integrating them into the seven-fold mass structure of OR XI. The attention to the scrutiny masses accords with Susan Keefe’s insight that the scrutinies were central to the performance of baptism *secundum ordinem romanum*. In fact, it may not have particularly mattered if one performed three, or seven, so long as they occurred.

Continuing in this pattern, are yet more borrowings from the Gelasian of the eighth century. Between folios 32v and 33r, a single folio has been lost. This covered the very end of OR XXVIII, and the conclusion of the baptismal ceremony. Visible on the opening of the next page, are some interesting accompaniments to this *ordo*:

Fol.33r ‘...potestatem inimici et ipsum inimicum eradicare et explantare cum angelis suis apostotaticis. Per dominum.’ This is an exorcism formula for water ‘*Exorcizo te creaturam aquam*’ found in the Gregorian Sacramentary.

---

'ALIA Deus qui ad salutem humani generis...’ Another exorcism formula for water. It only follows the above formula in the Gregorian. Both could be said during the baptism ceremony.

Following on from them, as an opening to OR XXXVII, are two formulae:

‘DENUNTIATIO MENSIS PRIMI QUARTI SEPTIMI DECIMI Annua nobis est dilectissimi ieiuniorum celebandra festiuitas quam mensis illius sollemnis...’ This is another genre of liturgical text, a denuntiatio, or ritualised announcement to the people, like that which opens OR XLI. Cologne 138 seems to copy that pattern by opening his version of OR XXXVII with a denuntiatio for this occasion, the Ember Days. This denuntiatio, fascinatingly, is found only in the Veronense Sacramentary, Verona LXXV (80), something Andrieu did not recognise.

‘ITEM INVITATIO PLEBIS DE IEIUNIO MENSIS QUARTI SEPTIMI ET DECIMI Hec ebdomadae nobis mensis illius sunt recensenda ieiunia...’ Another ritualised speech for the occasion, again found only in the Veronense, some pages later. Both forms of address are ancient and Roman.

The Veronense Sacramentary, Verona LXXV (80), of the seventh century, is more accurately a 'libelli missarum’, a booklet of masses, rather than a true Sacramentary. Formulae from this collection of masses do circulate in Gaul and Italy, independent of the manuscript, so it is possible that Cologne 138 took these speeches from such a source rather than the Veronense as we know it. Nevertheless, our compiler now shows clear affinity with three manuscripts copied at Verona, Verona XCI, Verona XCIV and Verona LXXXV. Again, these additions enhance the completeness of the account of the rite our manuscript offers.

485 Announcement of March, June, September and December
487 Then the Invitation of the People of March, June, September and December.
488 Ibid., p.114.
489 Vogel, Medieval Liturgy, pp.35-46.
The diversity of texts and sources employed to do this is further enhanced by another liturgical addition, of a nature entirely its own:

Fol.40r **ANTIPHONAE PER AD RELIQUIAS DEDUCENDAS** 490 This is a list of eleven antiphons, from ‘ecce populus custodiens’ to ‘ambulate sancti dei ad locum’. These were clearly antiphons to be sung while relics were carried during the rites just preceding this, OR XLI and XLII. Andrieu suggested that the title should probably read *Antiphonae per uiam ad reliquias deducendas*, but he offered no identification of the antiphons themselves. 491 Examples of antiphons with that title can be found in many antiphoners: Paris lat.17436 (of Compiègne, 860s), Paris lat.12050 (of Corbie, 853), Paris *Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève*, 111 (of Senlis, 9th C) and Einsiedeln *Stiftsbibliothek* 121 (Einsiedeln, 960s). But in none are they presented in the same list as Cologne 138. Compiègne and Senlis each have nine, but differ in exactly which nine, Einsiedeln has eight with neums, while Corbie has only two. 492 Antiphons are also given for the ceremonies in OR XLI and XLII, but they are different from those on our list. Of the twelve antiphons they specify, only one ‘Cum iocunditate exibitis’, found at OR XLI, n.2, is also found in our list. It seems the compiler of Cologne 138 had a different antiphoner from that used by the original creator of both texts, and decided to add these instead. Around the text of OR XLI itself, he has put ‘antiphon’ in the margin, every time an antiphon was sung during the ceremony, evidence of his close attention to these chants. The use of an antiphoner here clearly adds to the stock of texts which were carefully sifted through to bring about a manuscript which offers a highly comprehensive liturgy in a markedly efficient and sufficient way. What follows is not liturgical however:

Fol.43r **DENUNTIATIO SEU INVITATIO SANCTI PAPAE GREGORII PRO SEPTIFORMIS LAETANIA.** 493 This is the announcement that was given by Pope Gregory the Great in 603 on the occasion of his institution of his ‘Sevenfold Litany’, that came to be identified with the Great Litany

---

490 **ANTIPHONS FOR THE CARRYING FORTH OF RELICS**
492 René-Jean Hesbert, *Antiphonale Missarum Sextuplex* (Brussels, 1935), n.212a, pp.218-220
493 **THE ANNOUNCEMENT AND INVITATION OF POPE SAINT GREGORY FOR THE SEPTIFORM LITANY**
of the 25th April. Amalarius of Metz reproduces the same text in book four of his Liber Officialis. He stated that he found it in a collection of Gregory’s letters, so perhaps the compiler of Cologne 138 found it in one such collection too. Gregory’s speech evokes Rome’s topography. As it describes, everyone gathered at Santa Maria Maggiore, and divided up amongst themselves: clerics went to the church of John the Baptist (the baptistery of the Lateran), laymen went to St. Marcellus, monks to SS John and Paul, nuns to SS Cosmas and Damian, married women to the church of St. Stephen (Rotondo), widows to San Vitale, while the poor children went to the Saint Cecilia. This could be used to reconstruct a litany like Gregory’s, or at least to divide up the populace into groups, but the greater part of it is dedicated to instilling the need for penitence and repentance the litany was intended to bring about. Perhaps the bishop in whose hands Cologne 138 passed might have read it aloud to the people listed here to guide them to this mindset. In any case, the text would also provide a Roman template for another set of important ceremonies whose direction fell to a bishop and was of evident interest to Carolingian liturgical legislators; the penitential litanies, including the Letania Maior. They present a kind of alternative to the ordo romanus for that occasion, OR XXI, which was clearly not widely circulated and found only in a single manuscript.

But there were certainly further resonances here; whether this denuntiatio was read aloud to the people or perhaps perused by the bishop alone, this text obviously encouraged both the people and the bishop to see their liturgical practices, in the light of the Roman, papal past. Placing an ordination of the Pope, OR XL, at the opening of the ordination sequence could only have been for similar reasons. This would undoubtedly associate the authority of Rome and that of Pope Gregory with the liturgy of the manuscript, and, by extension, also enhance the authority of the bishop who bore and used it. Later pontificals were repositories of statements of authority and

---

history, such as the signatures pledging obedience to the archbishop in the Pontific of Sens, Saint Petersburg Q.v.1.n.35. Almost every copyist of OR I began copying a long discourse on the seven ecclesiastical regions of Rome. Thus, the work of Cologne 138 is not fundamentally different from the work of the ordines romani copyists throughout the ninth century and across the Carolingian church. Cologne 138’s gathering from the Gelasian of the eighth century to enhance the ordines towards sufficiency is entirely in the tradition of the Collection originally, though he goes further than that by adding full missae, plus the Leonine texts, and antiphons from outside it. There were signs of such interventions from the beginnings of Collection A. Such liturgical texts certainly spoke on different levels. These manuscripts might also record an ‘ideal’ liturgy, in one sense a record of actual Roman ritual, but in practice somewhat more expansive than that. A set of rituals of varying origin gathered together gained coherence and authority by its alignment with broader movements surrounding ‘correctio’. The vigorous attempts of Cologne 138’s scribe to bring OR I back to its most original format, insofar as he could find it, severing it from OR III which became a separate whole, and recording it with exactness, in grammatical terms, meant he was certainly aiming for a wholly Carolingian vision of correctness.

This is the single ordo romanus manuscript which had the most influence upon later traditions. A scribe in Verona used it to correct Pacificus’ work. Another later, and partial example of Collection B, Paris 14008 preserves many of its more interesting features. Furthermore, many manuscripts in the so-called Pontifical Romano-Germanique tradition mined from it extensively, somewhere in their history. The consistent presence of OR XL and the ordo romanus qualiter concilium agatur, both texts found only here, would be enough to show resemblance, but those extremely rare Leonine formulae, the denuntiatio and invitatio for the Ember Days, also show up in a

498 Albrecht Diem ‘The Carolingians and the Regula Benedicti’ in Meens et al. (eds), Religious Franks, pp.243-261 on the parallel case of the Rule of Benedict, p.258: ‘there are aspects to be followed; aspects monks and monasteries should strive to follow at their own discretion; aspects that are inapplicable; aspects that are not sufficiently addressed and need to be expanded upon; and finally, topics that are crucial to a good monastic life, though not addressed in the Regula Benedicti at all’; also Jesse Billett on monastic practices, The Divine Office, pp.13-59.
number of the manuscripts which Andrieu grouped under this title.\(^{499}\) His interpretation of OR XXXVIIb, with its unique additions on the cardinal priests and parrochiani, Andrieu likewise found in several manuscripts, placed under the title.\(^{500}\) The copyists of these manuscripts recognised markers of authority and correctness in the texts which Cologne 138 brought together, even though they were impossible to employ outside Rome, or inappropriate for a lesser bishop. That they did so is a clue to why Cologne 138 employs them together in the first place. Therefore, while it is tempting to see in this manuscript a metropolitan archbishop’s book, with the council as his own record of ceremonies, and the papal ordination perhaps as a model for his own ordination, there is no a priori reason why it could not have been the work of a lesser bishop. Aquileia and Ravenna remain distant possibilities, but another Italian bishopric is plausible. Verona itself is most likely, since Cologne 138 engages in a dialogue on several levels with Verona XCII itself.

**Part 3: Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm.14510\(^{501}\)**

The Handbook of Baturich of Regensburg

Munich Staatsbibliothek Clm. 14510 is the third manuscript of Collection B.\(^{502}\) Unlike the other two, Munich 14510’s copy of Collection B was bound to another manuscript, both of which now fall under the single classmark. The original manuscript, written in a single hand according to Bischoff, was Fols.1-75 of the current manuscript.\(^{503}\) Andrieu had thought the original text began at Fol.30 from whence Collection B begins, (misled by his own conviction that the text represented a ‘pontifical’), but Bischoff corrected this.\(^{504}\) This means the text also contains:

---


\(^{501}\) Digitised at [http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0004/bsb00046285/images/](http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0004/bsb00046285/images/).


Fols.2r-14v PREDICATIO DE NATALE DOMINI. Here are four anonymous sermons. Only the first is entitled and given the liturgical designation of Christmas. These have been attributed to Candidus Wizo, friend of Alcuin, an attribution Jones has defended, and they are found in only three manuscripts. Jones notes that only our manuscript gives the complete set of four, but all three manuscripts are Bavarian. These sermons are doctrinal, outlining orthodox positions on the Trinity, indeed, the fourth sermon supports the doctrine of double procession.

Fols.14v-29v IN HOC CODICE CONTINENTUR DE FIDE SANCTAE TRINITATIS ET DE INCARNATIONE CHRISTI LIBRI TRES. A further exploration of Trinitarian doctrine in one of Alcuin’s most widespread texts. Despite the title given, our manuscript actually only gives the text up to Book 2, chapter 5 (of 21). The chapter list goes no further either. Alcuin’s De Trinitate could have had use as a preaching manual. It is therefore a natural accompaniment to the Wizo sermons which precede it here. It is unclear why the text is only partial, this may be because only Book 1 (given in full) exclusively and comprehensively discusses the Trinity. Book 2 deals with more miscellaneous matters, while Book 3 is about the Incarnation.

Fols.30r-75v ORDO PROCESSIONIS AD ECCLESIAM SIUE AD MISSAM. Collection B of the ordines romani.

The presence of these other texts complicates Andrieu’s designation of the text as a ‘petit pontifical’, as he understood that. Bischoff himself had used this material to deem Collection B ‘not in the strictest sense a liturgical manuscript’ because it was not to be used directly in ritual
This addresses a central problem, how do we see these books being used? The presence of non-liturgical material cannot wholly disqualify the manuscript from being a pontifical, or a liturgical book, or else we should have few such books at all. As we shall see, Munich Clm 14510’s *ordines* also show sustained and comprehensive adaptation to adapt them to the performance of the rites they describe. Do these outweigh the presence of non-liturgical texts? If the text is indeed not, under Bischoff’s definition, a liturgical manuscript (that is-not one which was carried around and consulted in the course of the ritual itself), what is it and how can we see it being used? Do these questions help us interpret pontificals and *ordines romani* more generally?

Of the *ordo* content, Andrieu and Vogel blandly report that this manuscript’s content is a counterpart to Verona XCII, a somewhat primitive recension close to the text of Collection B to which all these manuscripts are related, that is B. Something far more interesting is happening here. Firstly, to locate and date it, Munich 14510 has two complete and individualised sets of *laudes*. The first set is entitled, as usual *IN FESTIS DIEBUS, QUANDO LAUDES CANENDE*. In this, nearly every rank in the hierarchy is named: Pope Eugenius (824-August 827) which gives the manuscript a helpfully narrow date range, Louis the Pious is named as Emperor, his sons are *regibus*, but in place of the queen in the Verona XCII *laudes*, Louis the German is singled out as *rex*, for whom Saint Paul intercedes. He was crowned King of East Francia in 817. No queen or Empress is named, so it is quite likely that this was before 827, when Louis married Emma. The armies of the Franks (*francorum*), come next, but their intercessor is no longer Theodore but Saint Andrew. Since the manuscript is obviously East Frankish rather than Italian, the decision to change the local saint into a

---


515 Hen, *Royal Patronage*, p.14 on the importance of non-liturgical content to interpret liturgical manuscripts.


517 ‘ON FEAST DAYS, WHEN LAUDES ARE SUNG’.

more popular Apostle only highlights how curiously specific to Italy this detail was. The next name on the list is highly interesting:

Ter (marginal) Exaudi Christe. Domno nostro baturico a deo electi pontifico uita.

Ter (marginal) Sancte Emmeramme. Tu illum adiuua.

There follow the intercession of Saint Martin for clerics and Saint Benedict for fratribus nostris, reflecting the original disposition of Collection B. A second set of laudes is set out entirely uniquely of the Collection B manuscripts, and recorded with an entirely new title:

Fol.41r FINITO(sic.) COMMUNIONE ANTE DICTAM ORATIONEM. DICUNTUR LAUDES ISTE.

Ter. Hunc diem R.Multos annos


Ter Domnum nostrum hluduuicuim imperatorem. R. Deus conseruet

Ter. Domnum nostrum hluduuicuim regem. R. Deus conseruet


Feliciter Feliciter Feliciter

Tempora bona habeant. Tempora bona habeant. Tempora bona habeant

MULTOS ANNOS AMEN.


520 Munich Clm 14510, fol.40r; ‘Hear us Christ. To Our Lord Baturich, Pontiff chosen by God, life. Thrice. Oh Saint Emmaram. Aid him’

521 Munich Staatsbibliothek Clm 14510, fol.41r ‘WHEN COMMUNION IS FINISHED, BEFORE THE PRAYER IS SAID, THESE LAUDES ARE SAID:

Thrice. This day. Resp. For many years.
Thrice. This seat. Resp. Lord Preserve.
Thrice Our Lord Louis the King Resp. Lord Preserve
Happily, Happily, Happily,
These are laudes episcopales, structured like those which were were copied c.900 in Autun onto the back of a fifth-century ivory diptych of Flavius Petrus Sabbianus Justinianus, where they also follow a set of laudes regiae. The two sets of laudes in Munich 14510 absolutely located the manuscript to Saint Emmeram, the famous monastery and scriptorium in Regensburg. Like Verona, Regensburg was the seat of a king, Louis the German. Is it not striking that these ordo collections seem most often to arise at the heart of political power, and where it intersects with ecclesiastical prestige? The bishop named twice in these laudes, alongside Emperor and King alone, was Baturich of Regensburg (817-848), to whose own instigation Bischoff attributes this manuscript. Baturich was educated at Fulda. Notably, bishops of Regensburg were also abbots in commendam of Saint Emmeran, so Baturich’s involvement in the monastic scriptorium there, which Bischoff calls one of the bischöfliche Skriptorium of the South-East could already be assumed, were it not already attested by his autograph in a number of manuscripts from St-Emmeran. Baturich is also deemed responsible for another liturgical manuscript, with a so-called pontifical element, Vienna Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Cod.Ser.n.2762, probably of a somewhat later date (though this attribution is purely a convenient supposition). Finally, Baturich appears in the list of amici viventes of Reichenau, a few names down from Ratold of Verona himself. Since, as Le Jan showed, those named here were not picked at random, but were those with whom the monastery had some kind of relationship, an intellectual and powerful network of bishops around Reichenau now becomes highly significant for the dissemination of Collection B. Like Ratold, Baturich was also head of a palace chapel, named arch-chaplain of East Francia in Spring 826, which was either just before

Let them have good times, let them have good times, let them have good times FOR MANY YEARS AMEN.’

524 Ellard, Ordination Anointings, pp.47-48; McKitterick, Frankish Church, pp.35-38; Karl Bosl, ‘Baturich’, Bayerische Biographie (Regensburg, 1982), p.44.
526 Unterkircher, Das Kollektar-Pontifikale, p.35.
or just after this very manuscript was conceived and written! Kantorowicz also highlights the consecration of Louis as king at Regensburg, in April or May 826; since the manuscript contains blessings for royalty, this event too might have had significance in the creation of a new book whose laudes invoke the name of the new king. It is worth noting that, at any date, this manuscript is about a decade after Verona XCII, and perhaps only a few years after Cologne 138.

The text of the ordines is notably very close to Verona XCII. It follows:

Fols.30r-39v OR I with all its β interpolations,
Fols. 39v-41r laudes,
Fols.41r-42v OR XLIV
Fols.42v-45r OR XIII,
Fols.45r-53r OR XI with all the filled-in catechetical homilies,
Fols.53r-59r the original form of OR XXVIII,
Fol.59v-61r OR XLI
Fols.61v-62v OR XLII,
Fols.62v-63r the Gelasian consecrations of paten, chalice and chrism vessel,
Fols.63r-64r OR XXXVII
Fols.64v-71v the Gelasian ordo de sacris ordinibus.
Fols.71v-75v Various additional blessings added to this manuscript.

529 Kantorowicz, Laudes Regiae, p.106.
When we compare the manuscript to Cologne 138 and Verona XCII, as well as St Gallen 446, both the *laudes* and OR XIII are moved to now come after *OR I*. For the rest, it is a significant witness, along with Verona XCII, to what the Collection originally might have looked like, that is the β text. It also has its own significant changes, notably to *OR I* and to the *ordo de sacris ordinibus*, as well as a single unique *ordo romanus*, OR XLIV. The writing is fine and precise, and Andrieu notes a number of ‘rare ligatures’. Never as ornamented as Cologne 138, it nevertheless shows care to detail and presentation, with alternating red and black titles, and red letters and words picking out readings, or the beginning of new sections in the texts, or the beginning of speech. The layout was clearly very carefully designed, since the writer of the red ink never runs out of space. There are some particularly striking instances, notably in the baptism of OR XXVIII where three instructions from the *ordo* to immerse the person, ‘*et mergit semel*’, ‘*et mergit iterum*’ and ‘*et mergit tertio*’ stand out in red against the words which would be said at this point, as they do in the Sacramentary of Gellone.

**A Gallicanised Recension?**

Where it differs from Verona, such as in the extra *laudes*, we see the original work of the Regensburg scribe, a single scribe who has written the entire manuscript and who was active in many other Regensburg manuscripts. Notable in the first instance is the unique *ordo*, OR XLIV, entitled

**ORDO QUALITER DILIGENTIA AGITUR ROMANA ECCLESIA SANCTI PETRI**

As Andrieu described it, this text sets out how to perform a rather mysterious Roman ritual called the *nocturnae diligentiae*, where the tomb of Saint Peter was ritually washed by the *mansionarii*.

---

otherwise only attested by hints in the Liber Pontificalis, and a once-visible inscription in Saint Peter’s from 732.\textsuperscript{534} The account of the ritual is obviously set in Rome, for example at n.1:

\textit{Vespera finita, ueniens domnus papa in chorum mittit planetam suam. et dicit accendite.}\textsuperscript{535}

However, Andrieu found its vocabulary puzzling. For such an obviously Roman source, his usual diagnostic criteria failed him: the sacristy is a \textit{chorus}, something one cannot find in any originally Roman \textit{ordo romanus}, and the designation at n.16 of the Pope’s seat as a \textit{faldo} is similarly alien to Roman writings. The latter term is found in Frankish sources like the writings of Theodulph of Orleans or the Chronicle of Fredegar but not in Roman ones\textsuperscript{536} The limitations of proclaiming \textit{ordines romani} categorically as ‘Roman, of Rome’ or categorically as forgeries, are obvious here. Perhaps, as Andrieu suggests, a Frank on an embassy in Rome could have written the text (this may be true of more \textit{ordines} than Andrieu supposed), but why it had ended up in a unique manuscript written at Regensburg for a Frankish bishop is more interesting. Cologne 138, in itself, revealed that pieces of Roman liturgy, now completely lost, were circulating in the hands of Frankish bishops, and I have explained what interest these pieces had for those bishops, once employed in a manuscript intimately linked to their understanding of their own office and authority, the so-called pontifical. It is possible, moreover, that \textit{diligentiae} of some sort were performed at Regensburg following the script written at Rome. The monks at Monte Cassino seem to have performed a similar rite at the tomb of Saint Benedict, according to a now-lost letter from the abbey, so it was a comprehensible ritual outside Rome.\textsuperscript{537} The architectural imitation of Roman forms, and particularly of Saint Peter’s


\textsuperscript{535} Andrieu, \textit{Les Ordines}, vol.IV, p.431: ‘When Vespers are finished, the Lord Pope, arriving in the \textit{chorus}, puts on his stole and says ‘Let them be lit’

\textsuperscript{536} \textit{Ibid.}, p.433, n.16, p.422, n.2,3.

\textsuperscript{537} \textit{Ibid.}, p.426; Jacques Winandy, ‘Un temoignage oublié sur les anciens usages Cassiniens’ Revue Bénédictine, 50 (1938), pp.264, n.20: ‘Siue cum die sabbatorum ante completorium apud beati patris confessionem diligentiam facimus’.\textsuperscript{538}
and its *confessio*, might well have allowed ritual set in that space to be performed in a new Frankish cathedral.\footnote{538} At the very least, the ubiquitous practice of burying relics under the altar of major churches, borrowed from Rome via OR XLII, might have suggested the idea of treating those relics as the Romans did their own. Indeed, those relics were very often Roman ones.\footnote{539} It is plausible that Baturich tried to experiment with a single, strange Roman usage at his own cathedral, itself dedicated to Saint Peter. Equally, this *ordo romanus* might have been simply intended to be read, just like the Pope’s Ordination in Cologne 138 or Gregory’s *denuntiatio* on the septiform liturgy, as a gateway into the liturgical world of Rome. This text, after all, is highly suggestive of the powerful dynamic of Rome’s sacrality as those across the Alps saw it. That was a particular holiness founded on the bodies of the apostles buried there, and foremost Saint Peter, the authority of the Pope himself as successor to him, and the imaginative power of the city itself and its churches.\footnote{540} Van Dijk calls the *diligentiae* ‘the liturgical expression of the *doctrina petri*’, noting how symbolically important the rite was as the expression of Rome as resting place of the prince of the apostles.\footnote{541} In Munich Clm 14510, the written rite acts as an expression of something similar to a Carolingian audience, for the interest of a bishop clearly concerned with the liturgical expression and foundation


\footnote{541} Van Dijk, ‘Medieval Easter Vespers’, p.341.
of Roman sanctity. Both of these usages could be imagined, simultaneously, to a greater or lesser extent. Not unrelated to such is one of Munich Clm 14510’s entirely unique additions to OR I:

OR I n.1, var.5 ‘Primum omnium observandum est septem esse regiones ecclesiastici ordinis secundum constitutionem beatissimi ac sanctissimi Silvestri summi pontificis Romae urbis’. 542

No other manuscript attributes anything to do with OR I to Pope Sylvester (d.335), so this curious mention of him is mysterious. Ascribing liturgical activity in Rome directly to famous Popes was a feature of the story told by the Liber Pontificalis, the main source the Franks had for papal Roman history. 543 However, there is no mention made of the seven regions being arranged by Sylvester in the Liber, so this particular attribution is an invention or fantasy of this scribe in particular. Nevertheless, this addition undoubtedly shores up the authority of the manuscript and its text of OR I, by giving it direct reference to another of the foundations of Rome’s authority, its orthodox saintly Popes.

As this addition already shows, the author of R was a creative editor of his material to be compared, even to the original creator of Collection B. This is the only manuscript in the whole wide and varied tradition of this text to add certain sentences to OR I. The first comes in the middle of one of β’s original interpolations, at OR I.54;

‘Et tunc si tempus fuerit, sicut pascha vel aliis festis, faciunt laudes maiores, id est Exaudi Christe et cetera, sicut continentur. Nam cereosta, cum dictum fuerit Amen ad primam orationem, statim sollantur...’ 544

542 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.II, p.67; ‘First it is to be observed that seven are the regions of the ecclesiastical order according to the arrangement of the most blessed and saintly Pope Sylvester of the city of Rome’

543 Rosamond McKitterick ‘Roman texts and Roman history in the early Middle Ages’ in McKitterick et al. (eds) Rome Across Time and Space, pp.28-29; Rosamond McKitterick ‘The Representation of Old Saint Peter’s basilica in the Liber Pontificalis’, in Bolgia et al.(eds), Old Saint Peter’s, p.97.

544 Munich Clm, 14510, fol.35r ‘And then, if it should be the time of year, both on Easter and on the other feasts, they perform the great laudes, that is ‘Exaudi Christe’ and all the rest, as they are contained here.'
Obviously, this directly prompts the first set of laudes in the manuscript, those entitled, in festis diebus, which here are moved to follow OR I, thus unifying them to the ceremony of the manuscript in an otherwise unprecedented way. The addition shows that OR I was used in ‘other feasts’ than Easter. This is not the only place in which the Regensburg scribe tampers with the ritual of OR I; there are some striking additions that Andrieu discussed only in a footnote. As with the original interpolations of β, they seem to concern questions arising about the actual performance of the pontifical mass, modelled on OR I. The above, for example, tells you exactly where the laudes were to be performed in that mass, which is not abundantly clear in the original disposition. Cologne 138, too, had added a rubric to the laudes, which addressed the same issue, but it was not his style to interpolate it into OR I itself.

A second addition also addresses the placement of the laudes:

**OR I n.56** ‘Subdiaconus uero qui lecturus est, mox ut uiderit post pontificem episcopos uel presbiteros sedentes et, si tempus fuerit, laudes facta.’

Other additions address rituals common to the mass in Francia, for which the Roman OR I was obviously no guide.

**OR I n.63** ‘Finito evangelio, dicit pontifex: Pax tibi. Et imponit symbolum si tempus fuerit, id est Credo in unum Deum. Finito symbolo, dicit: Dominus uobiscum.’

---

546 Ibid., p.86, n.56, var.5.
547 Ibid., p.89, n.63, var.3; ‘When the Gospel is finished, the pontiff says: Pax tibi. And he chants the symbol if it should be that time, that is the Credo in unum Deum. When the symbol if finished, he says ‘Dominus uobiscum’
Chanting the Creed, or symbol, at Mass was a Frankish custom. Walahfrid Strabo’s discussion makes it clear the Apostle’s Creed was meant.\textsuperscript{548} It served an obviously educational and anti-heretical function, shoring up at every mass the true tenets of faith.

OR I, n.84 ‘et stat post pontifex. \textit{Nam diebus festis, id est pascha, pentecosten, sancti Petri, nat.domini, per has quattuor sollemnitates habent colligendas presbiteri cardinales unusquisque tenens corporalem in manu sua et uniet archidiaconus et porrigit unicique eorum oblatas .I. et accedente pontifice ad altare ad dexteram leuamque circumdant altare et simul cum ille canonem dicunt, tenentes oblatas manibus, non super altare, ut uox pontificis ulentius audiatur et simul consecrant corpus et sanguinem domini. Sed tantum pontifex facit super altare crucem dextra leuaque.}'\textsuperscript{549}

This interpolation, almost unremarked in Andrieu, is an extract from OR III, the supplement to \textit{OR I}, which Cologne 138 and Verona XCII’s editor added after \textit{OR I}, and from which the original author of Collection B had added a few times into \textit{OR I}. This supplement, as I have indicated, was made up of Roman and Frankish elements, in each case answering a question that arose from the narrative of \textit{OR I}. This part of it, OR III n.1, in Andrieu’s numbering, is obviously Roman, given the mention of cardinal priests, and concelebration by them. One way to use this source to fill the gaps in \textit{OR I} was to offer it as a supplement, as Cologne 138 did. But Munich 14510 follows the original compiler of Collection B by inserting this text from OR III into the narrative of OR I itself. He obviously possessed OR III independently. This part of OR III, for example, answers one question by showing how many Hosts the Pope used to celebrate, unanswered in OR I, but given as three in every other example of


\textsuperscript{549} \textit{Ibid}, p.94, n.84, var.13: ‘And he stands behind the pontiff. Now on feast days, that is Easter, Pentecost, St Peter and Christmas, for these four feasts they have that, having gathered, the cardinal priests each holding a corporal in his hand, and there comes the archdeacon and he hands to each one of them one(?) Hosts, and while the pontiff ascends to the altar, they should surround the altar and together with him they say the canon, while holding the Hosts in their hands, not above the altar, so that the voice of the pontiff is heard more strongly, and all together they consecrate the body and blood of Christ. But only the pontiff blesses the altar with the sign of the cross, right and left.’
the supplement, except this one. Here, it is given as one, which also makes the grammar of the clause highly unstable. This is probably a simple error, but it may have been occasioned by the difference between Frankish customs, which used two Hosts, as in Amalarius, OR V and OR IV, and the Roman witness from OR III, which presented it as three.  

OR I, n.88 ‘Ut autem expleverint, surgit pontifex solus et intrat in canonem. Et tunc unum accolitus sub umero suo habens sindonem in collo ligatem, tenens patenam ante pectus suum in parte dextra.’  

In fact, the part in bold was originally part of OR I, but it has been moved back here from OR I.91. OR I.91 detailed how the paten should have moved after the canon, but falls some time later in the service; to move it back helps to clarify the order better.

Another particularly extensive addition adds the characteristically Frankish episcopal blessing, again a non-Roman custom, at OR I.94:

‘Finitam ipsam orationem, tunc uertit se pontifex ad populum et unus ex diaconibus excelsa uoce clamat Humilitatae capita uestra ad benedictionem, et alter diaconus uel presbiter tenet benedictionarium librum super caput suum apertum et flectit se ad pontificem et benedicit pontifex omnes benedictionem ad ipsam diem pertinentem sicut in sacramentorum continetur’.  

---

551 Ibid, p.96, n.88, var.8; ‘But when they will have finished, the pontiff alone arises from his seat and enters into the canon (of the Mass). And then the acolyte comes having the muslin under his shoulder tied at his neck, holding the paten before his chest in the right side’.
552 Ibid., p.97; ‘Then when this prayer has finished, then the pontiff turns himself to the people and one of the deacons in a loud voice declares ‘Humilitatae capita uestra ad benedictionem’ and the other deacon or the priest hold the book of blessings open over their head and bow towards the pontiff and the pontiff blesses everyone with the blessing which pertains to that day as it is contained in the Sacramentary’; Smyth, La liturgie oubliée, pp.217-218.
This text now explicitly assumes that the pontiff in question was not using an authentic *Hadrianum* Sacramentary, since those did not contain episcopal blessings. At the least, the book being used was a supplemented Gregorian, or, more likely, a Gelasian of the eighth century.

The additions made to OR I in Munich Clm 14510 are highly complex. On the one hand, three of the most extensive assume the addition of Frankish rites, the Credo, the *laudes* and the episcopal blessings, to the narrative of the Roman, pontifical mass. These can only be seen in the light of adapting the text to the practices which the bishop, Baturich, was accustomed to perform in Regensburg. But the addition from OR III, at n.84 is less easy to interpret. Concelebration in this manner would never be performed by a Frankish bishop, since it required cardinal priests, and was a part of the complex liturgical negotiation of Rome’s overlapping authorities and liturgical magisteria. Yet, both Munich 14510 and Cologne 138, with Verona XCII following, separately thought it important to include this detail. Baturich’s other additions would appear to reflect practices that were generally unspoken parts of the adaption of the Mass *ordo* elsewhere. OR III, itself, in its complete form also answered a few questions about OR I from a Frankish perspective. However in a manuscript that contains the mysterious *diligentiae* as well, and mentioning Pope Sylvester, one cannot discount the effect that the mention of cardinals and the evocative idea of concelebration would have. In the Collection B recension, the β scribe had already brought in several clarifications from OR III, so this perhaps also explains why Munich Clm 14510’s scribe then felt able to draw in this other note, in some sense completing the work of the original scribe of Collection B.

To OR XIIIB, the *ordo* of readings, Munich 14510 also adds another note directly referring to use (this time in the margin), concerning what was to be said during Advent after the reading.
et de ipsa dominica ad finem lectionum non dicunt: Tu autem, sed tantum: Haec dicit dominus, convertimini ad me et salvi eritis, usque in vigilias domini.\textsuperscript{553}

The \textit{ordo de sacris ordinibus} in Munich Clm 14510 exposes the same active reception of the \textit{ordo} source.\textsuperscript{554} Firstly, the Regensburg text is the very first to offer full prayer texts for these ordinations. From the lowest grade to the highest, psalmist to bishop, the author has gone back to the Sacramentary for each one and gives full texts. This was, again, in line with the writings of the original of Collection B, which filled in the baptismal texts in full, in OR XI. Furthermore, Munich Clm 14510 develops the slight movement of Cologne 138 towards offering both singular and plural recensions of these texts to encompass the entire set of grades. Rather than an afterthought, these plurals are written in red above the black main line, obviously planned in advance. Equally, Munich 14510 is alone in adding to the \textit{ordo qualiter} interpolation a marginal instruction: \textit{dic duus uices usque hic}, ‘say twice until this point’, an instruction directly addressed to the pontiff who would intone this part of the ritual.\textsuperscript{555} The extract of Pope Leo, usually following the Capitula of Gregory seamlessly is here moved to the end of all of the grades, after the bishop, showing that the editor recognised that this was actually distinct from Gregory’s Letter, a true act of ‘correction’.\textsuperscript{556} For the lower grades, up to the deacon, the prayers here are not distinct from the general tradition of Collection B, but the priest’s ordination at once differentiates itself from that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Munich Clm 14510, fol.69v</th>
<th>Gellone 2529-2537\textsuperscript{557}/Phillips 1547-1555\textsuperscript{558}</th>
<th>Verona XCI fol.60r /Cologne 138 fol.35r (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinatio Presbyteri ‘Presbyter cum ordinatur...’</td>
<td>Ordo Presbiterii ‘Presbyter cum ordinatur...’</td>
<td>Ordinatio Presbyteri ‘Presbyter cum ordinatur...’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocutio ad populum ad ordinandum presbiterum ‘Quoniam, dilectissimi fratres...’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{553} Andrieu, \textit{Les Ordines}, vol.III, p.501, OR XIXB, n.13 var.2 ‘And from this Sunday at the end of the reading they do not say ‘Tu autem’, but only: \textit{Haec dicit dominus convertimini ad me et salvi eritis} until the vigil of Christmas’.


\textsuperscript{555} Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14510, fol. 66v.

\textsuperscript{556} Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek Clm 14510, fol. 71v.

\textsuperscript{557} Dumas (ed.), \textit{Gellonensis}, pp.388-391.

\textsuperscript{558} Heiming (ed.), \textit{Augustodunensis}, pp.185-187.
It is obvious, therefore, that in contrast to Verona XCII and Cologne 138, which have the simple Gregorian threefold prayer structure joined to a Gelasian rubric, Munich Clm 14510 goes a long way towards returning this ordination to its Gelasian structure. There are now five prayers out of the six offered in the Gelasian of the eighth century, with two separate benedictions and the consummatio. The prayers are not exactly like the Gelasian of the eighth century, here a few are missing, and the wording differs. In fact, the exact recensions as Munich 14510 offers are found in the Old Gelasian Sacramentary, which itself also does not have the two missing sequences from the Gelasian Sacramentary of the Eighth Century the prayer HIC UESTIS EI CASULA and the allocution ‘Quoniam, dilectissimi’. This is strongly suggestive that the Regensburg scribe went to a copy of the Old Gelasian Sacramentary and there, in fact, he found these texts.559 The final two prayers for

559 Eizenhöfer et al. (eds) Liber Sacramentorum, 147-148, p.26; Ellard, Ordination Anointings, pp.46-47: ‘Munich Clm 14510. In every way a class by itself...For the priest (fol.66v) and for the bishop alike (fol.70v)
Munich Clm 14510, however, are not to be found in the Old Gelasian. The first, *Consecratio Manuum*, took place during the unction of the priest’s hands with oil. Again, this was certainly not a feature of Roman ordination practices, in the Carolingian period.  

Amalarius recorded that that, in the customs he knew, priests were both anointed with oil and had the laying on of hands, as the Gelasian rubric offers, but said that the former was the custom of ‘*episcopi nostri*’, it was not a Roman one.  

Ellard conducted a survey of the anointing during ordination, and he detailed how the presbyterial unction of hands was the earliest such anointing, but was also a Frankish custom (this prayer’s earliest form is found in the *Missale Francorum*). As Andrieu did, he pointed to the testimony of Amalarius and Theodulf of Orleans that unction occurred. Reading their texts, one comes to a better understanding of what was at stake in unction. Theodulf made unction absolutely central to the understanding of the priests whom he addresses, arguing that they should not shame their unction by behaving immorally. The ritual simultaneously defined the priesthood, protected it, and urged moral character upon it. This complex intersection of priorities may go some way towards explaining why unction of the priesthood clung on so tenaciously in Frankish realms, and spread so effectively. It may also explain why Baturich’s scribe, and, as we shall see, another writer involved in another manuscript of Collection B, made sure to include this rite and its prayer, which explicitly states the sacramental change of state involved in the unction. It is also possible the Old Gelasian of Regensburg had acquired this at an earlier point.

---

561 Amalarius LO 2.13.1, Hanssens, *Opera Omnia*, vol.II, p.227: ‘Our bishops maintain this custom; they anoint the hands of priests with oil….And when they are consecrated they receive the laying on of hands’, Knibbs, p.429.
563 Ibid., p.33.
564 Theodulf of Orleans, *Capitula ad presbyteros* Cap.I, PL CV cols.192-193; ‘*Unde oportet uos semper memores esse tantae dignitatis, memores uestra consecrationis, memores sacrae quam in manibus suscepsitis unctionis, ut nec ab eadem dignitate degeneretis, nec uestram consecrationem irritam faciatis, nec manu sacro unguine delibutas peccando polluatis*.’
The last prayer ‘AD PONTIFICEM ORDINANDUM QUI ADDI DEBEAT IN CONSECRATIO CUIUS INITIUM EST’, was intended (as the title suggests) to be inserted into the text of the bishop’s consecration when the bishop being thus consecrated was the Pope himself. It is the prayer text to which the equivalent ordo was OR XL, and equally had no liturgical role for a Frankish bishop. It was the very last prayer in the Hadrianum Sacramentary and could only be applied to the Pope, since it gives him the title, apostolice sedis presulem et primatum omnium. Rasmussen briefly discussed this text, puzzled as to why a text so Roman should have shown up in a number of his ‘pontifical du haut moyen age’. But the text of the prayer itself is notably strong in its assertion of the papal, apostolic power, the same font from which the power of the bishop flowed. This probably had a role in it being added to the opening of his ordination. It could not have been used by the bishop, and can only be explained by a desire to associate these practices with the practices peculiar and exclusive to papal Rome, recording, like OR XLIV in this manuscript, an instance of a Roman usage in which the reader could trace a connection of his own liturgy to that of Rome.

For the ordination of the bishop, in Munich Clm 14510 are again formulae of the Old Gelasian:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Munich Clm 14510 fol.70r</th>
<th>The Old Gelasian Sacramentary (738, 766-773)</th>
<th>Verona XCII fols.60r-v/Cologne 138 fol.35v (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinatio Episcopi ‘Episcopus cum ordinatur’</td>
<td>738 Episcopus cum ordinatur…</td>
<td>Ordinatio Episcopi ‘Episcopus cum ordinatur…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedictio Episcoporum ‘Oremus dilectissimi…’</td>
<td>766 ORATIONES DE EPISCOPIS ORDINANDUM ‘Oremus dilectissimi…’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Adesto supplicationibus nostris…’</td>
<td>‘Exaudi domine supplicum precis…’</td>
<td>BENEDICTIO EPISCOPORUM Adesto domine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Propitiare domine supplicationibus…’</td>
<td>‘Propitiare domine supplicationibus…’</td>
<td>SEQUITUR ‘Propitiare domine.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consecratio ‘Deus honorum omnium…’</td>
<td>Consecratio ‘Deus honorum omnium…’</td>
<td>Consecratio ‘Deus honorum omnium’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

565 Deshusses, _Le Sacramentaire_, 1018, p.348: ‘the bishop of the apostolic see and primate of all…’.

566 Rasmussen, _Les Pontificaux_, pp.481-482.

Again, the rite is expanded, from three prayers in the Gregorian and a mass to four and a mass, but this is not to the extent the Gelasian of the eighth century adorned it. The POST COMMUNIONEM, *Plenum Quaesumus domine*, and the SECRETA ‘*Suscie domine*’, are both only found in the Old Gelasian Sacramentary’s episcopal mass.\(^{568}\) The INFRACTIONE given by Munich 14510 is also not that of the Gelasian, but is Gregorian (there under the title PREFATIO).\(^{569}\) Vat.Reg.lat.316, our only copy of the Old Gelasian, lacks an equivalent *infra actione* for this mass, obviously an oversight, so it is likely that Baturich’s Old Gelasian was simply more complete. In fact, we do know that Regensburg’s earlier sacramentaries seemed to have closely resembled the Old Gelasian, judging by a few folios found as guard sheets.\(^{570}\) Obviously, this taste continued into the ninth century, proving both a great deal of continuity of liturgical practice in Bavaria and the openness of Carolingian bishops, even high-ranking ones, to diverse and local Sacramentary traditions. This is highly suggestive of what I would suggest, that Collection B, and particularly the *ordo de sacris ordinibus*, changed and adapted itself to local usages, as a pontifical would.\(^{571}\)

\(^{568}\) Eizenhöfer et al. (eds), *Liber Sacramentorum*, 773, p.122.

\(^{569}\) Deshusses, *Le Sacramentaire Grégorien*, vol.1, 25, p.94.


Additions from the Bishop of Regensburg

There are a few entirely unique texts in Clm 14510. In the same section, the *ordo de sacris ordinibus*, Munich 14510 has a very interesting summary and interpolation between the ordination of the porter and the rest of the rituals, another text unique to this manuscript alone:


For the minor orders and the bishop, this summary simply echoes the original prescriptions, slightly rephrased here. But the deacon and priest have rituals that none of the other MSS include in the ordinations: the deacon is given the stole, *orarium*, by the pontiff. This is itself part of the ritual detailed in OR XXXVIIA, as found in Munich 14510:

*n.9 Porro orarii qui dandi sunt primum per totam noctem super altare sint repositi et de altari ab archidiacono tollantur, et a pontifice super eorum colla ponantur.*573

For the priest, the aforementioned ritual of unction is now given its own rubric. Perhaps this list acted as an aide-memoire, since it filled in these few gaps in the *ordo de sacris ordinibus*, or simply a

572 ‘To the porters the bishop hands the key to the altar and the church. To the reader the bishop hands the book. To the exorcist the bishop hands the booklet and the power of laying hand on the possessed. To the acolyte the archdeacon gives the candle-stick with candles and an empty cruet. As regards the deacon, the pontiff puts the stole over his shoulder. For the priest however the pontiff blesses his hand with oil over the altar. For the bishop another two bishops hold the book over his head’ Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.I, pp.234-235.
573 Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.IV, p.237: ‘But the chasubles, which were given to them first, are to be plaed on the altar for the whole night and from the altar are taken by the archdeacon, and by the pontiff are put over their neck’
stimulus for the person reading to meditate on the highly symbolic acts given, or perhaps a draft for a new version of the *ordo de sacris*, never completed. The Carolingians were highly interested in copying texts, like the *De Officiis VII Graduum* or the Ordinals of Christ, which set the orders of the church out succinctly, so this text may also have performed a similar function to those. One was copied in Verona at Pacificus’ time, in Verona *Biblioteca Capitolare* XXXVII. Finally, Munich Clm 14510, like the other examples, adds its own extensive set of prayers.

Fol.71v BENEDICTIO DOMUS ‘Benedic domine omnipotens locum istum...’ This prayer was also found in Verona XCII, but was selected here independently. It is not found in the Old Gelasian, but in the Gelasian of the eighth century.

Fols.71v-72v BENEDICTIO CRUCIS ‘Sanctifica domine signaculum passionis...’ A set of three prayers for the blessing of a cross. This begins with the second part of a prayer, ‘*Benedic domine hanc crucem...*’ of the Gellone and Phillips Sacramentaries, and continues exactly like them but misses out the beginning. The so-called Prague Sacramentary, quite probably a much earlier product of Regensburg, does begin at ‘*Sanctifica domine istud signaculum*’, as well.

Fol.72v BENEDICTIO SUPER PRINCIPEM ‘Deus qui congregatis...’ A blessing of a prince in four parts, highly significant in the context of the royal centre that was Regensburg, almost certainly

---

576 BLESSING OF A HOUSE.
577 BLESSING OF A CROSS.
580 BLESSING OVER A PRINCE.
to be used by Baturich to bless Louis the German himself. This is found in the Gellone Sacramentary.\textsuperscript{581}

Fol.73r BENEDICTIO REGALIS\textsuperscript{582} ‘Deus qui uictrices Moysi...’ I have not been able to locate these five prayers in known Sacramentaries, and nor could Andrieu.\textsuperscript{583} The same title is given to the Gellone text above, so is suggestive of coming from a Gelasian text, perhaps the Regensburg Old Gelasian.

f.74r BENEDICTIO SUPER AQUAM FERUENTUM\textsuperscript{584} ‘Deus iuste iudex fortis et patiens...’ Found again in Gellone, under the title EXORCISTO AD CALDARIA ET AD AQUAM EXORCIZATAM, which perhaps suggests a bath or cauldron.\textsuperscript{585} In any case a body of boiling water is meant in our prayer, and the prayer makes it very clear this was intended for the ordeal by boiling water.

Fol.74v BENEDICTIO PUTEI NOVI\textsuperscript{586} ‘Domine deus omnipotens qui in huius...’ The pattern of placing prayers of a similar nature continues here, with a blessing for new wells. This is the first prayer, found in Gellone, where it has a second, not included.\textsuperscript{587}

ORATIO SUPER FONTEM UBI ALIQUA NEGLEGENTIA CONTEGIT\textsuperscript{588} ‘Domine sancte pater omnipotens eterne deus...’ This prayers follows on here, exactly as it does in Gellone, from the other prayer for water, here for contaminated fonts.\textsuperscript{589} Again, Gellone has two, while this has only one. That single prayer is, however, found in the Prague Sacramentary.\textsuperscript{590}

\textsuperscript{582} BENEDICTIO REGALIS.
\textsuperscript{584} BENEDICTIO SUPER AQUAM FERUENTUM.
\textsuperscript{585} Dumas (ed.), \textit{Gellonensis}, 3024, p.484.
\textsuperscript{586} BENEDICTIO PUTEI NOVI.
\textsuperscript{587} Dumas (ed.), \textit{Gellonensis}, 2855, p.451.,
\textsuperscript{588} ORATIO SUPER FONTEM UBI ALIQUA NEGLEGENTIA CONTEGIT.
\textsuperscript{590} Dold, Eizenhöfer (eds), \textit{Prager Sakramentar}, 281, p.153*. 
ORATIO SUPER UASA REPERTA IN LOCIS ANTIQUIS ‘Omnipotens semper Deus insere…’ A prayer in two parts, while Gellone has four, and the Prague Sacramentary only the first.\(^591\)

One of the more mysterious prayers in the Gelasian tradition, this prayer is for saying over vessels found in antique, presumably Roman, ruins ‘vasacula arte fabricate gentilium’, or so says the prayer. Regensburg is a Roman site, so it is not unfathomable that Baturich might have seen some use for this text.

The final prayer picks up on the theme of vessels as Fol.75r BENEDICTIO QUISLIBET UASORUM\(^592\) ‘Protector Deus subditorum tibi…’ This is again exactly as in Gellone, but also as found in the Prague Sacramentary.\(^593\)

Much as his counterpart in Verona gathered a tight set of ordination prayers from the Gregorian Sacramentary, here Baturich’s scribe seems to have extracted a section from a Gelasian, perhaps the same book that afforded him his Old Gelasian ordinations, or perhaps another. The parallels with the Prague Sacramentary, decisive in the case of the Blessing of the Cross, somewhat less distinct elsewhere, show that the traditions he drew on were, in some sense, a part of Regensburg’s liturgical history, and the Old Gelasian’s role is striking in this regard as well.\(^594\) The Prague Sacramentary otherwise offers a Missa pro Regibus and a Missa in Domo, but this is a type unlike our own.\(^595\) Its ordinations rituals are also of a type apart, giving the sequence AD CAPPILARIA INCIDENDUM, QUI PRIUS BARBAM TONDET, and AD CLERICUM FACIENDUM, which is found in other examples of Collection B, but not Munich 14510. The selecting, or indeed the writing, of the two prayer sets for royalty are clearly indicative that these sets were carefully selected for contexts

---

592 BENEDICTIO QUISLIBET UASORUM.
595 Dold, Eizenhöfer (eds), *Prager Sakramentar*, p.136*.
Baturich might himself encounter. His use of the Old Gelasian Sacramentary prayers in the ordination text, over the Gregorian originals, reflects traditions Baturich was himself accustomed to perform and found useful, and the continued use of a form of Sacramentary once thought consigned to history, the Old Gelasian, in the circle of Louis the German. Furthermore, Bischoff’s idea that Munich Clm 14510 was not liturgical ‘in the strictest sense’, must be interrogated. The addition of this group of prayers can only be interpreted as the response to certain liturgical activities, those exclusive to a bishop. The active filling in of prayers in the *ordo de sacris ordinibus*, and the Frankish usages in the *ordines romani* are further proof. These interventions are firmly responding to episcopal needs. The presence of Alcuin’s *De Trinitate* cannot be allowed to overwhelm this evidence. Indeed, it and the Candidus sermons could also be responding to episcopal needs of another sort, if the bishop were a preacher and purveyor of doctrine. Andrieu’s construction of a ‘petit pontifical’ could not support them, but its imperfections grow more and more apparent.

**Part 4: Zurich Zentralbibliothek Car C 102**

**Mediocre witness to a didactic collection?**

Zurich Car C 102, the last of the more or less complete ninth-century examples of Collection B, was not Andrieu’s favourite witness. At every turn, it is deemed a mediocre and sloppy transcription, full of errors, with no clear resemblance to any other manuscript.596 Furthermore, Andrieu strictly divides it from the three other examples of Collection B analysed above. They, Andrieu claimed, were true early pontificals designed for use, while Zurich Car C 102 is a didactic collection, an academic text meant more for the library than the cathedral itself. Susan Keefe follows him in this, deeming the text a ‘school book’.597 Andrieu had thought the text was probably tenth century, or perhaps at the very end of the ninth.598 Both he and Keefe were impressed by the

---

596 Andrieu, Les *Ordines*, vol.III, p.379: ‘Le ms. de Zurich est le plus entaché de graphies vicieuses.’
volume of liturgical exposition appended at the end of the Collection. These comprise extracts from the lesser-known writings of Amalarius of Metz. Nevertheless, possessing such meditations on the liturgy is no actual bar to the use of a book, nor can it forbid a text from being a pontifical, as Andrieu must have known, since his own *Pontifical Romano-Germanique* also contains significant examples of intellectual work on the liturgy. Furthermore, Zurich Car C 102 makes many of the exact same strides as the *petits pontificaux* towards being a complete and sufficient account of the liturgical rites it offers, and even goes significantly further. Nor is Zurich ever on the same line of descent, in Andrieu’s carefully plotted stemma, as the other *collections didatiques* examples of Collection B (all Alemannic or Germanic, they are Saint Gallen 140, 446, and Einsiedeln 110), but always reveals itself to be, if one place removed, at least on the same bar, rather, as the *petits pontificaux*. This becomes somewhat significant when it comes to locating the manuscript, for which I have a new proposal. Andrieu mentions once, completely in passing that the manuscript is from Rheinau, but he never provides evidence or discusses this elsewhere, so it seems he was misled by the large stock of Rheinau manuscripts in Zurich. Bischoff made it plain that the manuscript’s palaeography firmly places it in the third quarter of the ninth century, not the tenth as Andrieu believed, and he locates it in the broad region comprising North Italy and Switzerland. The manuscript has a unique orthography that does not present itself as one or two mistakes but a quite consistent pattern, *benedictio* often becomes *benediccio* or *lectio* is rendered as *leccio*, as *tertio* becomes *tercio*, *infractione* becomes *infraccione*, there is an example of *prafacio* for *praefatio*. Andrieu suggested that it was copied from dictation by a person or persons who were not

599 For example: the exposition QUID SIGNIFICENT DUODECIM CANDELAE, at Vogel, Elze, (eds) *Le Pontificale Romano-Germanique*, pp.90-121 and three *expositiones missae*, at pp.329-347, following an *ordo* of the Mass (OR V), with OR VII coming afterwards; Parkes, *Making of Liturgy*, p.161: ‘Sacramental duties of consecrating, dedicating and ordaining were never fully separable from the worldly duties of explaining, judging and being in charge’.


sufficiently familiar with Carolingian norms of spelling. This particular orthography is characteristic of early Gallic manuscripts, and may have represented a practice of spelling maintained in certain environments and scriptoria. This is a late example, but, while difficult to interpret, does not necessarily mean the scribe was a poor Latinist, as Andrieu assumed. It reminds us that copying a highly Carolingian liturgical collection did not necessarily entail perfect Carolingian spelling. While less extensive than Munich Clm 14510, there are some examples of an apparatus that resemble that text, with the liberal application of red to fill in capitals, for titles, and for numbers of chapters in readings. Numerals are filled in to help locate the catechetical homilies of OR XI, as in Verona XCII. I have found what I believe to be a scribe’s name ‘Inno’ at the bottom of folio 29v; he may have been Alemmanian. The name is found in the Reichenau libri memorialies, once among the fratres of Bad Zurzach and once in the monastery, qui appelatur Nova. But these very lists make plain that monasteries of this kind were extremely international, so the name is not decisive.

Zurich Car C 102’s record of the ordines romani is fundamentally that of the original Collection B. These comprise Fols.2r-32v:

Fols.2r-v OR XIII B. OR XIII is only partial but is identical to OR XIII in its Collection B recension. For some reason, Andrieu failed to identify it as such, simply calling it ordo lectionum and falsely suggesting that OR XIII has disappeared from the Zurich manuscript.

604 Rose, Missale Gothicum, p.65; For example, one liturgical manuscript with similar norms of spelling is Albi Bibliothèque Municipale Ms. 34 (20), of the second quarter of the tenth century and from Aquitaine, for which Rasmussen, Les Pontificaux, pp.39-88.
605 Martimort, Les Ordines, p.47.
Fols. 2v-10r *OR I*, with the Collection B interpolations,

Fols. 10r-13v *OR XI* (with a lacuna inside and the last part lost)

Fols. 14r-24v *OR XXVIII* (the first bit of this is lost),

Fols. 24r-26r *OR XLI* with the *denuntiatio*,

Fols. 26v-27v *OR XLII*,

Fol.28r the Gelasian consecrations,

Fols. 29v-30r *OR XXXVII A*,

Fols.30r-32v The *ordo sacris ordinibus* (going up to the priest with the bishop lost, with several folios lost within).

This is the same order as Verona XCII, with significant, and unfortunate losses. In the usual disposition of Collection B, the *laudes* would have come at the very end of this section; they are almost certainly lost, as was the bishop’s ordination. The second half of the manuscript begins at 33r in the current disposition:

Fols.33r-55v Extract from Isidore’s *Etymologiae* Book VI 1-VIII 3 *De novo et veterem testamento* (Begins after a lacuna), and XXVI *De heresi et scisma*

Fols.55r-59v *DE BAPTISMI OFFICI AC MISTICIS SENSIBUS*. The exposition on baptism once attributed to Odilbert of Milan.609

Fol.59v *INCIPIT EXPOSITIO SYMBOLI* A short (12 line) exposition of the Creed.

---

INCIPIT EXPOSITIO MISSAE Five lines which begin the *Dominus uobiscum* exposition of the mass (also found in full in St Gallen *Stiftsbibliothek 446*), with the rest lost. 610

then begins, on fol.60r a dossier of texts by or concerned with Amalarius of Metz:

Fol.60r-68r *et mediatorem venisse ad convallem lacrimarum...* Begun halfway through, this is an anonymous commentary on the preceding exposition. Edited by Hanssens alongside it and, by him, attributed also to Amalarius.611

Fols.68r-69r ‘*Desiderantissimo et reverentissimo ac sanctissimo*’. Not properly titled, this is Amalarius’ second letter to Peter of Nonantola, in which he responds to the latter’s request to send him his works.612

Fols.69v-70r INTERROGACIO KAROLI IMPERATORIS The first letter of Charlemagne to Amalarius asking about baptism from 811.613

Fols.70r HEC EPISTOLA EST POST LECTAM RESPONSIONEM Charlemagne’s response to Amalarius’ reply.614 He also discusses Amalarius’ situation with the Church of Trier.

Fols.70r-76v RESPONSIO AMALARII EPISCOPI The letter of Amalarius on baptism to Charlemagne615

Fol.76v EPISTOLA VENERABILIS ABBATIS PETRI Letter of Peter of Nonantola to Amalarius asking him for his works616

Fols.77r-78r AMALARIUS VENERABILI ABBATI PETRI Amalarius’ earlier letter to Peter, containing his Versus Marini about their voyage to Constantinople. 617

Fols.78r-87r Capitula sequentis operis praenotamus…. First of two expositiones missae attributed to Amalarius and attested only in this manuscript (untitled).618 Edited as the missae expositionis geminus codex by Hanssens.619 Doubts are raised about attributing this to Amalarius, unfairly.620

De romano ordine et de stacione in ecclesia. The second of two expositiones which are attested only in this manuscript, but partial. Edited as the geminus codex by Hannssens.621

The texts concerning Amalarius from 68r including the only testimonies to his correspondence with Peter, Abbot of Nonantola, seem to form a coherent dossier.622 In his letter, Peter asked Amalarius to send him the copy of his own communication with Charlemagne about baptism, as well as the writings on the Mass which Amalarius had created during their voyage together to Constantinople.623 Our dossier encloses these exact pieces: the letter on baptism, Charlemagne’s response, and the Amalarian ‘Geminus codex’, which Hanssens identified as Amalarius’ treatise sent to Peter.624 This part of our manuscript was probably copied from Nonantola’s own copy of this dossier. The fact that the manuscript refers to Peter as Venerabilis in the titles of each letter is suggestive.

617 PL CI, cols.1287-1288: ‘AMALARIUS TO THE VENERABLE ABBOT PETER’.
621 Hanssens, Opera Omnia, vol.I, pp.265-281.11
622 Jones, A Lost Work, pp.55-56.
Adding to the *Ordines* from Gregorian and Gelasian

In addition to these *expositiones*, there are some extremely important additions to the body of the *ordines romani* to be noted. Andrieu never discusses them as a whole nor assesses how they affect his rendering of the manuscript as a purely didactic collection. Firstly, in OR XXVIII, the *ordo* for Holy Week, the scribe for this section adds in the most important *missae* from the Gelasian Sacramentary of the Eighth Century. On fol.14r can be seen half of one addition, since the preceding page is lost;

...uitam nobis dedisse perpetuam confidamus perendem. SUPER POPULUM Respice domine, quaesumus super hanc familiam tuam, pro qua dominus noster iesus christus non dubitauit manibus tradi innocencium et crucis subire tormentum.

These are the final two prayers of a Mass on the Wednesday of Holy Week. They are found in the Sacramentary of Gellone. Evidently they were originally in place after OR XXVIII described the Office of the Wednesday.

The full blessing of the oil for the sick is added to Maundy Thursday, from the Gregorian Sacramentary, including the rubric from that text where the Pope himself blesses it, but it begins with an offertory chant ‘*Dextera domini*’ which was not given by the Gregorian. At fols.15r:

Sed antequam benedicatur, alat ter in ampullam (OR XXVIII, n.21) **V.D aequum et salutare nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere...**

This begins a long insertion over nearly two folios, that comprises a highly elaborate ceremony and crucial episcopal responsibility, the so-called Chrism Mass whereby chrism was blessed to be

---

625 Dumas (ed.), *Gellonensis*, 586-587, p.76.
distributed across the churches of a diocese by the bishop, for all purposes of unction. OR XXVIII provided basic rubrics for this ceremony, as the one proscribing breathing into the ampoule, but did not give the words at all. Zurich Car C 102 has again gone to a Sacramentary to find them and fill them in. Again these are found in the Gregorian Sacramentary, but also in Gellone.\(^{628}\) Adding the initial VD, representing the *vere dignum* dialogue, is very unusual in *ordo romanus* manuscripts, and links it closely to the Sacramentary’s format.

At fol.18r, in the midst of the baptism ritual for Holy Saturday, the scribe here does much the same thing. Where the *ordo* ends at *Nec te latet Satanas*, with only the incipit, Zurich adds the rest of this catechesis, *inminere tibi penas* until *iudicare uivos et mortuos*.\(^{629}\) This was also found in the Gelasian Sacramentary of the Eighth Century, and the Gregorian.\(^{630}\)

At fol.18v, there is yet another vast insertion of text from the Gelasian Sacramentary. This new material covers the wording for the blessing of the font itself, which was briefly treated by OR XXVIII, nn.69-70, in an incipit *‘Omnipotens sempiterne Deus. Item alia Deus, qui invisibili potentia,* and continued with instructions on where to do three crosses in the water of the font, when one said *‘qui hanc aquam’,* the second at *‘unde benedico te’,* and the third at *‘benedico te per Iesum christum’*.\(^{631}\) Again, Zurich Car C 102 has gone to a Sacramentary, here more like the Gelasian Sacramentary of the Eighth Century, and written in the material here.\(^{632}\) But this time, he has done even more. At those times when OR XXVIII has instructed him that the cross would be made in the water, he has placed a marginal note with exactly the wording of the *ordo*, the first is a direct quote from the *ordo* *‘cum manu sua diuidens aquam in modum crucis’*, the others are simply notes for *secunda* and *tertia* thus uniting totally the information from the *ordo* with the Gelasian prayer text.


\(^{629}\) OR XXVIII, n.51, var.6; Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.III, pp.401-402.


\(^{631}\) Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.III, pp.405-406: *‘Hic primam crucem facit: qui hanc aquam, cum manu sua diuidens aquam in modum crucis: secundum: Unde benedico te; similiter tertiam: benedico te et per Iesum Christum’*; originally, this was OR XI, nn.94-95.

\(^{632}\) Dumas (ed.), *Gellonensis* 702-704d, pp.98-99.
He has also put crosses nearby, which was the only way the Gelasian indicated the action. But there are also two further notes taken from rubrics, both on folio 19r, *Hic mutas sensu* and *hic mittis cereos in fontes*. These were not described in OR XXVIII, but both come from rubrics found in the Gelasian Sacramentary. The actions described were ancient, hence the archaic style of rubric in the second-person.

At fol.22v, the last prayer added to OR XXVIII is described as the ORACIO AD CONFIRMANDAS. This was the invocation of the sevenfold grace of the holy spirit, described only in a rubric in OR XXVIII, but here filled in ‘*Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui regenerari dignatus es...*’. The wording differs from Gellone, and in fact is closest to the Gregorian Sacramentary, though it is not there described as a confirmation prayer, but a signing prayer.

At folio 26r ORACIO AD MISSA Deus qui sacrandorum tibi auctor est ad...etc. This comes at the close of OR XLI, on church dedication, and Andrieu edited it, as an appendix to that *ordo*. He recognised it as a full mass ‘for the dedication of a new church’, as it is found in the Old Gelasian Sacramentary, and it is also in the Gelasians of the Eighth Century. Given the titles of the prayers, it is closer to the Phillips Sacramentary than any other. OR XLI itself ends with the instruction, n.31 ‘and they celebrate a mass as it is contained in the Sacramentary’, so it was an obvious choice to find that text and add it. Nevertheless, none of these Sacramentaries contains the further instructions that Zurich Car C 102, includes, nn.2-5:

---

633 Dumas (ed.), *Gellonensis*, 704 c ‘*Hic mutas sinsum, quasi lectione legas*, and 704d ‘*hic mittis cereos in fontes, et insufflas in aqua ter uitibus hoc modo*’.

634 PRAYER FOR CONFIRMING.


Either the mass that this manuscript drew on was already more elaborated than in the early Sacramentaries we know, or Zurich Car C 102 has chosen to fill in some extra details of what that mass would look like, including, even, the antiphons. Certain early Italian manuscripts of plenary missal type are known to add antiphons to prayer material. In either case, this is again a significant interpolation, much in the tradition of Cologne 138’s additions of the scrutiny missae, creating a more complete account of the rituals the ordines romani offered, but offering very different texts to do so.

Finally, comes the ordo sacris ordinibus, as it is entitled in this manuscript. Zurich Car C 102, like Munich Clm 14510, offers the full prayers of each and every order, but does so entirely independently. Unfortunately, a significant portion of the text is lost, but what remains reveals that the nature of the prayers are the same sets as the original Collection B. It is a Gelasian text up until the three higher grades, deacon, priest and bishop, which become Gregorian, and including the psalmist. But in each case the prayers are given in full, using a Sacramentary. A rubric added to the ostiarius ‘et tradet ei ostium ecclesie’ would also have been copied from an example of the Gelasian of the eighth century. This was not found in Collection B, usually. Notable, once again, is the developed attempt to make every reference in the singular a plural one, somewhat less formal than Munich 14510. The priest, however, has a single extra prayer, of which most is lost with the significant lacuna that follows:

---


PRESBITERORUM CONSECRATIO MANUUM Consecrare et sanctificare digneris

domine manus istas per istam hunctionem et nostram benedictionem ut quecumque

consecrauerint consecrentur... 

Familiar from Munich Clm 14510, this is the presbyterial unction once again, in an unfamiliar climate of Gregorian prayers. Not even the supplemented Gregorians tended to be bold enough to append this prayer to their three very fixed prayers for the priesthood, but Zurich Car C 102 seems to have gone out of its way to add this prayer to an otherwise entirely Gregorianised list. Lucca Biblioteca Capitolare 606 (of the tenth/eleventh century and the abbey of Monte Amiata) has a similar ordination ritual, which is suggestive of the Italian connections of our manuscript. Again, this is highly suggestive of the importance of the unction of hands, for priests to whom it was given, and bishops who gave it to them. It is unfortunate, in the light of this possibility for variation, that the bishop’s ordination was lost.

There are three main prayer texts added to Zurich Car C 102, of varying origin. The first seems to have been added afterwards, on a guard folio:

Fol.1r BENEDICTIO PALME ET OLIUE Omnipotens et misericors deus pretende nobis

mentium...’

There follow five prayers, all set on Palm Sunday, and intended to bless the palms and olive branches the people would carry with them in procession. Andrieu could not find the origin. The first, very short one ‘omnipotens et misericors deus’, seems unique, but those that follow are also to be found in very rare individualised copies of the Gregorian Sacramentary. The second ‘Petimus te sancte pater omnipotens...’ is found in the Paduensis Sacramentary from a scriptorium in the Kingdom of

---

643 Zurich Car C 102, fol.32v ‘The consecration of hands of priests: See fit to consecrate and sanctify, o Lord, these hands by this unction and our blessing, and whatsoever they shall consecrate, let it be consecrated...’

644 Ellard, Ordination Anointing, p.101: ‘the simple forms of priestly ordination as found in the Old Gregorian Sacramentary are here enlarged by the simple sacring of the hands’, Ellard did not know Zurich Car C 102.

645 THE BLESSING OF PALMS AND OLIVES.

Emperor Lotha (Northern France, Belgium or North Italy, see Vogel), as is the third ‘Omnipotens sempiterna deus qui dispersa congruas...’. The fourth ‘Deus qui filium tuum iesum christum dominum nostrum pro salute nostra...’ is found only in Oxford, Bodleian Library Auct.D.1.20, a Gregorian Sacramentary from St Gallen. The fifth and longest ‘Domine inter cetera mirabilium tuorum’ can be seen in OR L, cap.XXIII n.21, that late (post-950) ordo of the whole liturgical year which many manuscripts under the title Pontifical Romano-Germanique carry. This was therefore a gathering of blessings for Palm Sunday from some idiosyncratic source. No Collection B manuscript carries any ordo for Palm Sunday, obviously a short-fall a later reader of the Zurich manuscript noticed and attempted to correct.

The final two prayers are both blessings of objects, here added after the church consecration and paten consecration and other Gelasian consecration texts, thus before OR XXXVII and the ordination rituals. They are:

Fols.28r-29r AD TABULAS BENEDICENDAS another sequence of prayers, here in four parts, including a ‘praefatio’ with the Uere dignum opening. This prayer was to bless altars, probably side altars in a church. The set is identical to the Gelasian of the eighth century.

Fol.29r-v BENEDICCIO CRUCIS ‘Sanctifica domine signaculum tuum...’ The exact same blessing of a cross as that one found in Munich Clm 14510.

These two sets were added to round off the consecration of the church, OR XLII. It seemed that, in each iteration of Collection B, these rituals could be added or left aside, as the person compiling the text wished; they were suggested by the inclusion, followed by all our manuscript, of

---

650 FOR THE BLESSING OF ALTARS.
651 Dumas (ed.), Gellonensis, 2436-2439, pp.365-367.
652 BLESSING OF A CROSS.
the blessing of paten, chalice and chrism vessel, but none have included, for example, the blessing of
the bell, which was a long and ornate ritual, almost an ordo in itself.653 Again, the notion of self-
sufficiency is useful, with degrees to which compilers thought it appropriate to load the manuscript
with more elaborate components of the ritual.

The label of ‘didactic collection’ stuck so firmly by Andrieu to this manuscript, cannot begin
to engage with its complexities. In fact, it treats the Collection in much the same way other examples
Andrieu called ‘Petits pontificaux’ do, by expanding the ordines with the accompanying prayer texts
which were their natural counterpart. It is very difficult to see some of the additions made as
anything other than aides to the use of the manuscript, particularly the marginal notes to the
blessing of the font. Andrieu found the idea that Collection B developed from a guide for use to a
book for study compelling, and so interpreted the evidence in the light of it.654 He correctly notes the
educational and didactic function of some of the later texts in the volume, the short expositio missae
Dominus uobiscum, and the explanation of the Creed, but assumes that this cannot co-exist with
what he deemed to be a pontifical. Zurich Car C 102 certainly stands alongside the other three
manuscripts I have examined as a primarily episcopal manuscript, disseminating the same messages
and with much the same priorities as theirs. Liturgically, it certainly backs up Bischoff’s
palaeographical insight, with links to rare traditions in St Gallen, but closest in aspect to the
Veronese traditions. The most likely place for it to be written was Nonantola. The fact that it
preserves rare texts obviously linked to Nonantola, in the form of Peter’s correspondence, is
suggestive.655 The relationships between Zurich Car C 102 and a later manuscript almost certainly
produced in Nonantola, Rome Biblioteca Nazionale Sessarianus 52, are also possibly illuminating.656

655 For the ninth-century history of Nonantola, Zoboli, Il monasterio di Nonantola; Witt, Two Latin Cultures,
p.47.
656 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.375; See also Giuseppe Gullotta, Gli Antichi cataloghi e i codici della Abbazia
It would not be unknown, in the later period, for monasteries to hold onto pontificals for all manner of reasons.657

Part 5: Paris BnF lat. 14008

The Paris manuscript was created late in the late ninth century, and Andrieu explicitly terms it a petit pontifical, so I shall consider it here, briefly.659 Andrieu had located the manuscript to the monastery of Corbie, perhaps because it is bound up with other manuscripts from there, but Bischoff actually identified it as a Breton manuscript.660 The manuscript lost a great bulk of material in the course of its history and was subsequently bound up with pieces from several other manuscripts, notably an early ninth century compilation from Corbie with grammar and theology, hymns (fols. 26r-27v), Bede’s De Natura rerum and, at the end, two pages from a treatise on computus from the second quarter of the same century. According to Bischoff, our manuscript falls on the ninth/tenth century boundary. It comprises fols. 99r-117v of the current manuscript and, when it is properly reordered by Andrieu, falls like this:

fols. 100r-102r Part of OR XIXIB

fols. 102r-105v, 111r-v OR I

fol. 109r End of OR XXVIII

fol. 109v, 112r-v, 99r OR XXXII

f.99r-v, 106r Paschal Vespers from OR XXVII

106v-108r An Ordo ad Caticumin faciendum (Gelasian)


658 Digitized at http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b9076764f.


108r-v  An *Ordo ad Caticuminum ex pagano faciendum* (Gelasian)

108v, 110r-v  A Baptistmal ordo “*ex libro sacramentorum sancti Gregorii*” (Gregorian)

110v, 113r  Ember Days *Denunciatio* and *Invitatio* (Veronense)

113r-v  OR XXXVIIB

113r  OR XL

113r  *Ordo de sacris ordinibus* (only psalmist-the quire following is missing)

114r-115v  End of canons on penitence and *Ordo* of Extreme Unction

116r-117v  10th century additions, a gloss on Boethius, and dialectic schemata.

We see that the *ordo romanus* content is fundamentally a copy of the Italian Cologne 138. One must here note that fol.109r contains the last sentence of OR XXVIII n.85-86 ‘...*omnibus modis celebraetur. It<..<.> diuturnale cursum seperatim ca<..<.>‘, before it begins the Vespers, which that text (nn.87-89), shared with OR XXX. In his description of the manuscript, Andrieu identifies the text of Paris lat.14008 as OR XXX, but it must actually be the end of OR XXVIII. Like Cologne 138, the manuscript has red letters, rubrics and titles, but a less developed apparatus than Munich 14510 to mark out speech and action.

There were, also, significant additions to the Cologne 138 structure. This manuscript also offers another narrative of Holy Week, under the title *ITEM ORDO IN CAENA DOMINI*. On fols.109v and then on 112r-v and 99r is OR XXXII, on the Day Office. Of the ninth-century manuscripts, only Paris lat.14008 offers this text, but some trace of it is found in Cod.lat.192 of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, a tenth-century manuscript from Brittany (which also incidentally contains Amalarius’
Liber Officialis), in a highly interpolated form. A connection with another Breton manuscript means Bischoff’s identification is verified. Two of the additions made to OR XXVIII by the compiler of Collection B are also found in OR XXXII: nn.16-21 is the Frankish consecration of the Paschal Candle, and n.2, has the rubric instructing that the Office should be sung together on Maundy Thursday, also seen at OR XXVIII, n.28. Andrieu supposed that these texts were extracted from OR XXVIII; the other possibility is that OR XXXII represents a version of a Frankish source the Collection B compiler had originally used to add these pieces. There are also numerous instances where OR XXXIII echoes the rubrics of the Gelasian Sacramentary at n.1 (on the reservation of the Host), 8 (the intercessory prayers on Good Friday), 12-14 (Mass on Good Friday and adoration of the cross), 23 (Prayer on Holy Saturday), 25 (baptismal litany) and 27-29 (vigils when the stars appear in the heavens). These relationships are not word-for-word copying, but prove that OR XXXIII was constructed out of Frankish rubric traditions. The celebrant here is a sacerdos, there is no mention of the Chrism Mass. There is no actual narrative of baptism, but at n.26 the ordo provides precedent for 'ubi autem baptisma non fit', in case baptism was not done, whereby the water was simply sprinkled around. It also, at n.33 gave a narrative of the Saturday of Pentecost. It was therefore a shorter and simpler narrative, perhaps one closer to how Holy Week really unfolded in Brittany, perhaps in a monastery, rather than a highly ornate Roman ceremony. In our manuscript (as in some Collection A manuscripts), Roman and Frankish narratives of Holy Week are presented side by side.

At the end of this:

Fol.99r ITEM ORDO IN EADEM DIE AD UESPERUM ET USQUE IN OCTABAS PASCHAE.\footnote{THEN THE ORDO OF THE SAME DAY’S VESPERS AND UNTIL THE OCTAVE OF EASTER.}

Conveniente scola... Andrieu recognised this as a form of the second half (nn.67-94) of OR XXVII, Collection A’s offices for Holy Week, here repeating the ancient Roman practice of nocturnes, including songs in Greek.\footnote{Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, pp.362-372.} In Paris lat.14008 are to be found nn.67-79, i.e. only half of this, giving only the vespers for Easter Sunday, incorrectly labelled. This text is not that of Wolfenbüttel 4175, the early, Roman version, but nor is it quite like Collection A. Its title, for example, is unique to it, though technically incorrect as this version deals only with Easter Sunday. Aside from copyist’s mistakes, one addition is unique to Paris lat.14008, the filling in of an antiphon:

OR XXVII, n.74, var.4 ‘Et descundunt ad fontes cum antiphona: In die resurrectionis meae.


Like Cologne 138, the compiler also decided to add some prayers from the sacramentary relating to baptism, an ORDO AD CATICUMINUM FACIENDUM, one AD CATICUMINUM EX PAGANO FACIENDAM(!), found in the Old Gelasian.\footnote{Eizenhöfer et al. (eds), \textit{Liber Sacramentorum}, 285-287, 598-601, pp.42-43, 93-94: ‘ORDO FOR MAKING A CATECHUMEN, FOR MAKING A CATECHUMEN FROM A PAGAN’.} These were \textit{ordines} in the loosest sense, sets of prayers tied together with rubrics. As Keefe discussed, these \textit{ordines} for pagans might have been recycled for use in non-cathedral contexts to provide a simpler version of baptism, by a priest for example.\footnote{Keefe, \textit{Water and the Word}, vol.I, pp.156-158.} There is also a set of prayers specifically entitled \textit{ITEM EX LIBRO SACRAMENTARIO SANCTI GREGORII ORATIO AD BAPTIZANDUM}.\footnote{\textit{Then from the sacramentary of Saint Gregory the Prayer for Baptizing’}.} The first prayer in question ‘\textit{Medelam tuam deprecor’}, is found in the Gregorian.\footnote{Deshusses, \textit{Sacramentaire Grégorien}, vol.I, 980, p.335:} What follows, unfolds exactly as the Supplemented Gregorian

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}}
\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, p.366: ‘And they descend to the fonts, with the antiphon: \textit{In die resurrectionis meae. Dicit dominus Alleluia. Congregabo gentes et colligam regna et effundam super vos aquam mundam. Amen’}.}

\textit{Medelam tuam deprecor’}, is found in the Gregorian.
\end{footnotes}
does, with an ORATIO AQUAE AD BAPTIZANDUM INFIRMUM, with some rubrics, and an exorcism of water.\textsuperscript{671} This writer is aware, and makes his reader aware, that he is switching between sacramentaries. The mention of Saint Gregory as being responsible for the text, in fact mostly from the Supplement, is an evocation of Roman authority unique to this manuscript, but in the same tradition as many of the others above. It is unclear if these \textit{ordines} taken from the Sacramentary were meant as a simpler substitute for OR XI, of which no trace has here survived, or a supplement to it. There is a tiny portion from a list of canons dealing with sickness and death on 114r, then an ORDO UNGUENDI INFIRMUM, again a set of prayers bound together by short rubrics, this time for the unction of the sick, again probably from a Sacramentary.

It is highly inconsistent to deem this a \textit{petit pontifical} and call Zurich Car C 102 a didactic collection, as Andrieu does.\textsuperscript{672} Like later manuscripts deemed pontificals, our manuscript contained repetitions of certain rituals, and included canons and intellectual meditations on the material (On fol.116r is an extract from Hrabanus Maurus' \textit{De Institutione Clericorum} discussing the use and effects of unction in baptism and ordination follows the \textit{ordo} of extreme unction).\textsuperscript{673} Here the originally fairly slim manuscript Cologne 138 gathered significant accretions from other sources, showing how such a manuscript could come to contribute towards much larger and weightier traditions such as the manuscripts in the label \textit{Pontifical Romano-Germanique}. St Gallen 446 was another example of Collection B surrounded by other texts, there expositiones and study of the liturgy. But again we must confront the purpose and use of manuscripts like this one. Books of Carolingian learning, including Amalarius, were circulating in Brittany at this time, and so too had some Carolingian liturgical usages influenced, for example, Gospel readings.\textsuperscript{674} Bretons were equally as spiritually invested in Rome and the papacy as their counterparts in the Carolingian heartlands.\textsuperscript{675}

\textsuperscript{671} \textit{Ibid.}, 981-985, pp.335-337.
\textsuperscript{673} The extract is from Hrabanus Maurus, \textit{De Institutione Clericorum}, lib.I, c.30 (PL 107, cols.314, 315).
\textsuperscript{674} Julia M.H.Smith, \textit{Province and Empire: Brittany and the Carolingians} (Cambridge, 1992), pp.169-173 lists a number of interesting manuscripts, e.g. Paris BnF Nouv.acq.lat.1983 is a tenth century copy of Book 4 of Amalarius' \textit{Liber Officialis} glossed in Breton.
\textsuperscript{675} \textit{Ibid.}, p.164.
Thus it is unsurprising that an early ninth-century Carolingian collection of ordines might have reached Brittany. Can this book’s presentation of complementary narratives of Holy Week (OR XXVIII and the XXXII—as well as the Easter Vespers) suggest that it gathered liturgical material from different places, including Rome, to read, teach, meditate upon, or discuss, as well as to use as a celebrant wished? From the very beginning of the ninth century, the Murbach fragments of Collection A had also had two Holy Week traditions, OR XXVII and a Frankish ordo, while individual ordines (like OR XXVIII) show rituals particular to Rome and traditions originating in Francia, set side by side. Sifting or contrasting such material was obviously part of the process of reading such manuscripts. Such usage implies a far more complex process of reception than simply following rubric by rubric thoughtlessly. Acknowledging this allows us to see “liturgical” manuscripts far less restrictively, and understand that multiple uses could exist, to a greater or lesser extent, as a person viewed a manuscript like Paris lat.14008.

Conclusions: The Pontifical Tradition and its Origins and Purposes

I have, throughout, found ‘pontifical’ a useful term to characterise all of the above manuscripts. Andrieu used it bluntly and demanded a strict separation from books for teaching or study, which does not seem supportable. Nevertheless, examinations of the early pontifical tradition have generally ignored the manuscripts of Collection B entirely. Rasmussen offers two justifications for why he did not treat the ordo romanus traditions and, foremost, the Collection B manuscripts: firstly, the ordo, as first conceived, was not a cultic text itself, but an aid to the performance of the cult. Lacking the formulae of the liturgical action, it therefore does not fit in his conception of the pontifical, as a cultic document specific to a bishop. Secondly, Andrieu had already fundamentally treated the manuscripts in question.676 As we have seen, Andrieu’s analysis, while comprehensive, does not engage with these manuscripts from every angle, and the strictness of definition

Rasmussen employed is difficult to reconcile with the manuscript evidence. Establishing when and where a text was actually used can be difficult, and does not seem to reckon fully with the complexity.

In general, Rasmussen’s treatment of manuscripts other than the ordo collections only enhances the conclusions I have drawn about the particular diversity of this tradition: he makes a very good point that fundamental to the nature of the pontifical (and all our manuscripts too) is its uniqueness in a diocese.677 There would be only one required for the bishop: thus there was no need for mass production, and consequent standardisation, as is seen in books that would used by priests across dioceses. Therefore, as I have indicated, the individual needs and tastes of this bishop were definitive.678 How ‘Roman’ liturgical books were treated and employed in his own diocese was governed by the bishop’s directives as it was for Chrodegang in Metz, with no sense that this was intended to be imposed anywhere else.679 Rasmussen deemed the ordines romani in general an ‘episcopal type’ of document, though Nonantola, Lorsch and Murbach all seem interested in them regardless.680 But, when Rasmussen goes on to assert that the Pontifical Romano-Germanique is the only pontifical up to the tenth century that displays a diffusion and a Traditionsgeschichte, here the B manuscripts must be considered as a strong counterpoint.681 Since they contain the materials for liturgy specific to a bishop, they completely fit within his specific definition of a pontifical. They also suffice for the rite themselves, in the light of the addition of the prayer formulae to the ordines that are particular to the offshoots of β, and developed further in Munich 14510 and Zurich Car C 102, where the ordination prayers were also entirely filled in. Whether or not it is accurate to call these manuscripts pontificals on these arguments alone, since the title is not applied to them by anyone in

679 Claussen, Reform of the Frankish Church, pp.266-271.
681 Ibid p.408.
their own time, is quite another question, but it is clear that they should have a place within
Rasmussen’s analysis of the development of bishop’s books, and within the story he outlined. The
earliest of the manuscripts Rasmussen treated, pontificaux du haut moyen age or not, are later ninth
century and the majority are tenth century or later. The Collection B manuscripts provide an
earlier layer of evidence that should be considered too. Great care must be taken with the
assumption that Andrieu makes, that the impulse of these works was to create a ‘pontifical’ as that
word is now used, and with the assumptions that word carries with it. For him, the word meant
purely liturgical texts, created for use. But the criterion of ‘usefulness’ is far from over-powering; it
simply cannot explain many of the choices made in the creation of these manuscripts. The
accretion of texts that complemented and critiqued the liturgy, as seen in Zurich 105, seems to have
been a natural development of these same texts, which happily recorded anachronistic testimony
alongside living ritual, not a degradation foreign to them.

Andrieu’s emphasis on the Pontifical Romano-Germanique led him to place this text, seen as
a unified and distinctive model, at the summit of all the Carolingian developments of liturgy, creating
the same framework in which Cologne 138 is easily seen as the ‘more developed’ version of these
texts. Parkes, as noted above, revealed that the PRG was a fiction: it arose from many examples
rather than one, its commonality more coincidence than coherence. We see in the original Collection
B’s relationship to its offshoots, perhaps, an image of how this might have occurred for the PRG,
how an early text could be reinterpreted continuously while remaining true to the fundamental
ideals that originally animated it, retaining texts that were cut, changed and subtly modified. As
Parkes has noted, and our analysis only reinforces this, these texts were already in wide circulation
long before the hypothetical creation of the Pontifical Romano-Germanique.

---

682 Rasmussen, Pontificaux du haut Moyen Âge, p.12.
684 Parkes, Making of Liturgy, p.27.
685 Parkes, Making of Liturgy, p.96.
Vogel and Rasmussen both asserted that the success of the *Pontifical Romano-Germanique*, was not due to any virtue of its nature, but simply because of political impetus behind it.\(^{686}\) Otto I patronised it, and it came from Mainz, therefore it triumphed. Parkes’ major critique, would definitively compromise the notion that the *Pontifical Romano-Germanique*, as a single exemplar, was itself actually promoted as definitive. Therefore, we can argue that this success is easier to understand on liturgical grounds as well. The groundwork for the success of the manuscripts to which that title is applied, as well as their similarity despite the difficulty of locating a single exemplar, was already laid in the ninth century by the Cologne manuscript. On balance, the category of *petit pontifical* Andrieu applied to these five manuscripts is still, anachronistic or not, a useful category, since the obvious creative impulse that animated each manuscript has always seemed to be strikingly similar, even going back to the original creator, β. Many of the implications of the term have incorrectly obscured the differences in the way this impulse was expressed. In particular, I would take the trenchant remark of Henry Parkes that ‘liturgy emphatically did not need to be used to be of value to a tenth or eleventh century audience’ and apply it to these ninth-century texts.\(^{687}\)

The criterion of a text actually being used is inherently difficult. Even with the text of *OR I* as it stood in its simplest form in, say, Verona XCII, still the text itself would need to be interpreted, and certain pieces discarded, before we could ever imagine actually performing the rite it delineated. I would express deep reservation about the criterion of a text being *used* before it could be termed a pontifical. There is extreme difficulty in glimpsing what this idea of usefulness really meant to the medieval author, and in texts like Cologne, Paris or, more extensively, in most of the manuscripts called *pontificaux romano-germanique*, it does not seem a decisive principle at all. Nevertheless, if the primarily episcopal dimension of the pontifical is the main criterion, and this includes the obvious involvement of the bishop himself in the selection and arranging of text, then the term pontifical does seem a helpful one.\(^{688}\) It is noteworthy that the earlier examples of Rasmussen’s

---


\(^{687}\) Parkes, *Making of Liturgy*, p.182; also Bradshaw *Search for the Origins*, p.5.

\(^{688}\) Rasmussen ‘Célébration épiscopale’, p.584, 588.
Pontificaux du haut moyen Âge, as well as Baturich's Kollektar-Pontifikale, share with Collection B some key texts (notably Ordo 41, and the blessings of the various objects coming after it, and the ordo de sacris ordinibus which is as diversely interpreted in those manuscripts as it is in the Collection B texts). By the time one reaches Zurich Car C 102, which includes even the Chrism Mass in full, the commonalities among these manuscripts are numerous.

Might not Collection B have been specifically written for at least an Italian bishop, if not Ratold himself, as the inclusion of Saint Theodore implies? It could even have been created in Verona, perhaps if Ratold brought pieces of liturgical texts from Reichenau there when he arrived as bishop. There is plenty of evidence that Franks were specifically placed in key positions in Italy, bishops of Milan, abbots of Monte Cassino and San Vincenzo al Volturno. Such figures were intended to integrate the kingdom into the wider Frankish realm; this undoubtedly included liturgical change, along Frankish lines, as is evidenced by the programmes of Ratold, but also of Angilbert of Milan to bring clerical common life to their sees, and the activity of Paulinus of Aquileia, to name but a few.

Collection B could have provided a first ideal for a liturgy that might then begin to affect the diocese as the standard to be reached. As we have seen, it also made the bishop's own role as the centre of the diocese very plain, and attested, at least implicitly in the beginning, from whence came his power. In many sees, and this is notable in Bavaria, the Carolingians were still making it plain in the early ninth century that, for example, only the bishop could perform the chrism mass, and


ordained *secundum morem Romanum*, on the Ember Days. Whether Collection B was truly intended for Italy from the start, it certainly made those aspects of the bishop’s authority starkly plain. Such texts might have been passed around at councils. Ratold was at a council in Mantua in 827. The network around monasteries like Reichenau may also be involved. Ratold was connected by his education and foundation, and by strong ties which continued through his episcopacy and after his exile. In 826 he founded Radolfzell, the cella to which he later retired, and in 830 he sent relics of Saint Mark to the abbey. Baturich had perhaps fewer immediate ties to the monastery, but, at the very least, was united to it by bonds of prayer and fellowship. Nonantola, at least plausibly where Zurich Car C 102 was written, was also closely linked to Reichenau. Later copies of Collection B, but of very early format, do show up in St Gallen, and also at Einsiedeln, suggesting the Collection travelled in that area. Finally, one might also highlight the fact that both Ratold and Baturich were chaplains to royalty. I have suggested their liturgical functions may have been exemplary. The close presence of kings who saw it as part of their function to involve themselves in liturgy, appears to have stimulated the development of books. These books expressed an ideal that they and their bishops saw as correct, one that made strong and striking reference to Rome. Yet Rome’s liturgical example was integrated within a framework where the entrance of rites which were seen as correct because of their exemplary, symbolic or functional usefulness was understandable. The unction of presbyterial hands is the best example, but OR XLI’s Frankish church dedication and the attendant consecrations is another. This was not seen as capitulation or dilution of Roman tradition, but a part of working out the deeper meaning of it.

---

696 Hen, *The Royal Patronage of Liturgy*. 
Finally, I have queried several times what the actual use of the manuscripts could have been, and will hazard a brief answer here. Noticeably, this was never a question Andrieu really asked. He divided his “pontifical” manuscripts from Zurich Car C 102 as a didactic collection, but what, in practice, distinguished them remained hard to say. While the Collection B manuscripts do seem to specifically gather the rites peculiar or characteristic to a bishop, not everything in them was directly to be undertaken or said by the bishop himself. The laudes, for example, were sung by two deacons or two cantors and the scola cantorum. The Apostle’s Creed given in full in Collection B was said by an acolyte.\textsuperscript{697} The ordines are, of course, full of actions done by liturgical actors other than the bishop, before it is even mentioned that certain rites described in Collection B manuscripts (OR XL with the ordination of the Pope, particularly starkly) had no liturgical use in Frankish cathedrals. I discussed signs of liturgical usefulness, such as Munich Clm 14510 marking out direct speech in red, but would this really mean that the manuscript was passed from bishop to deacon to acolyte as each one spoke in the scrutiny described in OR XI? It is hard to envisage. It is equally difficult to see an ordo manuscript really being consulted in the course of a ceremony and how that would work given the details in the narratives that are superfluous to performance. Above I did suggest “completeness” as a motivating factor in the gathering of pieces to Collection B, but just because a manuscript aimed to give a full picture of a rite unfolding does not necessarily mean it assisted in that unfolding as it happened. Even with Collection B’s adjustments, every ordo romanus would need to be processed and thought about before it was used by a Frankish bishop (he would have to, at the very least, put himself in the place of the Pope and his staff in the place of the Roman personnel for a start).

Is it not more likely that the manuscripts were consulted prior to a ceremony in order to make sure everyone knew what they were doing—particularly with the rarer rites like church dedication, or consulted when questions arose while rituals were discussed or when they were

studied? Such a use might still be led by the bishop as leader of the ceremony, and the manuscript
might still reflect his own understanding and taste for such rituals, with personal notes he would find
helpful, but it does not require that the manuscript was used in the course of ritual by the bishop or
anyone else. Furthermore such preparations might include or encompass making sure that the
bishop or others understood the ritual in the right way. At its simplest, that would explain the
attachment of *expositiones* to Zurich Car C 102 which directly explain the rituals the *ordines* narrate
(though in fact, Amalarius’ mass is not the same in every detail as OR I—again such evidence would
need to be read carefully, contrasted and sifted). But in its broadest sense, might it not also help to
explain why Roman details were faithfully maintained in most cases, and why further Roman
material was continually attached to these manuscripts? Our manuscripts would lead a reader to see
how their own ritual performances were connected to Rome. They told a reader how the Pope did a
particular ritual. The titles in Frankish books of prayers and chants which give Roman church names
show that Frankish liturgical life was understood through an identification of one’s own liturgical
actions with Roman action, as do, indeed, the many pieces added to Cologne 138, Munich 14510 and
so on. Just as with those notes one could see where the Pope was giving the prayer you, the bishop
or monk reading the Sacramentary, were also giving, so too in an *ordo romanus* you could see how
the Pope would perform the very action you were about to perform or thinking about. In the course
of the performance of that liturgical action, every participant could then be aware that their actions
had equivalents in the actions of the Roman Church, which, it would seem, was a key part of the kind
of mindset Frankish creators of such manuscripts were keen to inculcate. Reading these
manuscripts, whether one intended to perform the rituals or not in the near feature, would then be
a devotional act directed to the Church of Rome. It might also help to see why a monastery like
Nonantola might have used a book (Zurich Car C 102) that was seemingly full of episcopal rituals.
Does such a purpose (preparing one for or guiding one to a particular experience of a liturgical rite)
exclude from being a ‘liturgical book’, as it does in Bischoff’s strict definition applied to Munich
14510? It still implies an intimate involvement in the setting up and directing of liturgical action.
Calling our manuscripts ‘liturgical’ would mean accepting that using the strict definition of books as only those with direct usefulness for the performance of a ceremony is inadequate, and would allow us to be open to how books called liturgical might have multiple uses, to a greater or lesser extent. Where Munich Clm 14510 gives the full prayer texts of the ordination rituals, these might have been read from the manuscript, for example-this is less difficult to imagine. In any case, the next manuscript, Wolfenbüttel 4175, allows us to explore these dynamics of use further.
Chapter 3: Personalising Collections for Different Purposes

Part 1: Wolfenbüttel Herzog August Bibliothek, Cod.4175 (Wissembourg 91)

Another ‘Petit Pontifical’

Wolfenbüttel Herzog August Bibliothek Cod.4175 (Wissembourg 91) is among the earliest of the ordines romani manuscripts, and yet shows striking development and remarkable agency and intervention by its compilers in the text, along recognisably programmatic lines. Notably, Andrieu also deemed it a ‘petit pontifical’, which opens it up to some of the suggestions made in the previous chapter. The manuscript was written at the beginning of the ninth century, and ended up at the monastery of Wissembourg before passing to Wolfenbüttel. Andrieu thought it was written at that monastery. Bischoff disputed this: ‘definitely not Weissenburg’. In his Katalog, Bischoff preferred a more cautious location to broader West Germany or the Rhine Valley, which is where I shall begin. The ordo content of Wolfenbüttel 4175 was once part of an originally separate manuscript. It was later bound into a complex assemblage of five such units, creating the manuscript we now know as Wolfenbüttel 4175. Broadly these five separate parts are, following Hans Butzmann:

A. Fols. 1-24 The Eusebian Canones, Gregory the Great’s sermon, and a poem on Peter’s imprisonment. Incidentally the Sermon, here, entitled simply ‘De mortalitate’ is in fact Gregory’s Denuntiatio for the septiform litany, as in Cologne 138, but it ends before the final words and lacks the extract on the Roman churches found there. This is more evidence for the transmission of this text distinctly, here as a purely moral lesson. This piece was certainly written at the same centre and in very similar style to the one I shall discuss.

701 The poem is at MGH Poetae IV, 2-3, p.1087.
B. Fols. 25r-88r Papal letters and *ordines romani*

C. Fols. 89-103, 161-76 *Computus*

D. Fols. 104-26 Sermons, Catechism and *Expositiones* ⁷⁰²

E. Fols. 127-60 Prayers, some poems, Breviary, Catechism, including one in vernacular ‘*rheinfränkischer Sprache*’.

Bischoff found 15 separate hands across the manuscript, of hugely varying style and comportment. Obviously, here we can only discuss unit B, containing the *ordines*. ⁷⁰³ Andrieu notabley did not see the manuscript in person, as he admits, and he only described, from facsimile, fols.42v-88v, which covers the actual *ordines romani*. ⁷⁰⁴ He therefore missed some preceding texts that are crucial to interpreting the remarkable interventions the scribe makes in these *ordines*, which he consistently underplayed. Langlois, examining OR XLI, and Van Dijk, examining the Easter Vespers, revealed some of the consequences of Andrieu’s comparative inattention to the manuscript. I should like to go further.

For the unit which represents the original *ordo romanus* manuscript, the content runs, essentially:

Fols. 25v-37r the two epistles of Pseudo-Clement to James of Jerusalem. This opens with a full page capitalis, so is clearly the beginning of the manuscript.

Fol. 37v the life of Clement from the *Liber Pontificalis*,

Fol. 38r pseudonymous correspondence of Damasus and Jerome on the hour of mass,

---


Fols. 38r-42r  the decretal of Pope Gregory’s 595 Council of the Roman clergy (including subscriptions),

Fols. 42v-52r  OR I,

Fols. 52r-53r  OR III,

Fols. 53v-60r  OR XI,

Fols. 60r-71r  Holy Week (pieces from OR XXIV, OR XXVIII, ORXXVIIIA, XXV, XXVI and the Roman Easter Week Vespers),

Fols. 71v-72v  OR XIII,

Fols. 72v-77r  The decretal de recipiendis et non recipiendis, attributed to Pope Gelasius.

Fols. 77r-v  some Gelasian denuntiatii of the Ember Days,

Fols. 77v-83r  Ordination (made up of a Gelasian ordo de sacris ordinibus and OR XXXIV),

Fols. 83r-84r  OR XLII,

Fols. 84v-86v  OR XLI,

Fols. 86v-88r  Pieces from OR XV,

Fol. 88v  A poem about Pope Gregory II ‘Gregorius praesul’.

There are some extraordinary features here, but I shall discuss this non-ordo material only at the end of this section.

The commonalities with Collection B are obvious (OR I, XI, XIII as well as both XLII and XLI). Andrieu was certain that the compiler had both Collection A and B before him, and used them both. However, there are reasons to doubt that; he probably, in fact, only had Collection A. The versions of these texts presented here differ from Collection B in significant ways. For example, the text of OR XIII A is used, in common with Collection A, and not OR XIII B, which was more complete and offered
key Frankish festivals lacking in A.\textsuperscript{705} Holy Week and ordination, both present in Collection B as XXVIII and \textit{ordo de sacris ordinibus} respectively, were also described here, but these two rites are significantly different recensions from Collection B which I shall analyse below. Andrieu’s analysis of the ordination text in this manuscript, in particular, is inadequate. The manuscript’s compiler seems to enact something comparable to Collection B’s attempt to create a sufficient manual for all the bishop’s main duties. If he did so independent of Collection B, it is only more evidence that this was a common preoccupation among Franks faced with the \textit{ordines romani}. Some of the features I described as signs of use are present here. Notably, the scribe has put a cross in the margin every time the celebrant makes the sign of the cross, a significant number of interventions.\textsuperscript{706} There is a rich system of rubrication in the manuscript, comparable to Munich Clm 14510. For example, the rubrics introduce types of chant; the word antiphon, tractus, Graduale, Alleluia and so on are all given in red. Words in red open obviously new sections, as well as highlighting direct speech, particularly noticeable in OR XI. Marginal notation gives explicit chapter numbers to readings, in OR XI and OR XII, suggesting definite use of a Gospel-Book or comes. There is a developed hierarchy of script, from a full page \textit{capitalis} on the first page like Cologne 138, to titles in \textit{capitalis}, to half-uncial headings to minuscule. The manuscript always renders \textit{kyrieleison} in Greek capitals. Given all this, it is easy to see why Andrieu characterised the text as a ‘petit pontifical’. Bischoff even hypothesised, with great caution, that the \textit{ordo} content might have been intended for the Cathedral at Worms, once dedicated to St Peter, since it was so manifestly unsuitable for use in a monastery.\textsuperscript{707}

Some additions made to OR I in this manuscript only, seemingly along similar lines to those found in Munich Clm 14510, are of interest for this question. In general, the text of OR I in Wolfenbüttel 4175, W in Andrieu’s system, is a primitive one. It is particularly close to Albi 42, but

\textsuperscript{706} E.g. at Wolfenbüttel, \textit{Herzog August Bibliothek}, 4175, fols.49: ‘et ille infundet faciens crucem’, 52v ‘et dixerit pax domini mittit in calicem faciendo crucem’, 53v ‘faciat presbyter singulorum frontibus crucem’, etc..
also has some minor commonalities with Collection B, though not the most significant additions unique to that tradition. Its own unique additions include:

OR I, n.55 ‘Tamen septem cereostata mutandae sunt iuxta ipsarum ordinem et tempus’.\(^{708}\) Collection B had a similar instruction about this point (OR I, n.54), but gave far more detailed description. If he had Collection B, why would he not have used that, instead of adding this shorter rubric?

OR I, n.108 ‘Deinde venit archidiaconus cum calice ad cornu altaris et adnuntiat stationem ita: Illo die veniente statio erit ad sanctum Illum, foras aut intus ciuitate. Resp: Deo gratias’.\(^{709}\)

Of all the many manuscripts of OR I, only Wolfenbüttel 4175 gives the exact words the archdeacon would say to announce the station. This is, as we shall see, in keeping with the compiler’s significant interest in words to be said or chanted during rites, which he often adds in full or abbreviated where the original ordines leave them blank. Such additions offered a more complete narrative of the rite in question, and allowed that rite to be used in practice. This particular interpolation, Andrieu supposes, came from a Roman source but he cannot identify it.\(^{710}\) The manuscript writer had access to some Roman liturgical information unknown to us now, but he could also have invented the formula. This attests a highly significant interest on the part of the compiler in the stational liturgy of Rome.

OR I, n.124, var.6 ‘dicit ad populum: Ite missa est’. Resp. ‘Deo gratias’ et pontifex descendit ad confessionem et orat.\(^{711}\)

---

\(^{708}\) Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.II, p.86: ‘However the seven candles are to change, according to their order and the time.’

\(^{709}\) Ibid., p.102: ‘Then the archdeacon comes with the chalice to the side of the altar and announces the station thus ‘On this coming day, the station will be at saint ‘N’, without or within the city. They respond ‘Thanks be to God.’

\(^{710}\) Ibid., p.102, n.108.

\(^{711}\) Ibid., vol.II, p.103: ‘he says to the people: *Ite missa est*’. They respond: ‘Thanks be to God’, and the pontiff descends to the confessio and prays.’
This significant rubrical addition strongly resembles those added to Munich 14510, where recognisable Frankish practices were added to the Roman *OR I*. A *confessio* was Roman vocabulary for the tomb structure over the place which the body of the saint lay, popularised at Saint Peter’s basilica in Rome. A *confessio* was also mentioned in *OR XLII*, there meaning the space under the altar where the relics were deposited in the course of that rite.\(^{712}\) This rubric appears to pre-suppose the annular crypt structure like at Saint Peter’s, where one could descend, as pilgrims did in Rome. Many cathedrals and monasteries imitated Rome in building crypts like this. This rubric appears to set *OR I* in such a setting.

There is also one longer addition to *OR XIII A*:

*OR XIII A*, n.22, var.4 ‘Hoc autem scientes ut catholicorum patrum orthodoxorum sermones uel homelias sicut superius scriptum est, et per omnes festiviitates leguntur ad ipsas pertinentes, id est Agustini, Gregorii, Hieronimi, Ambrosii uel ceterorum’\(^{713}\)

While homilies of these fathers were specified to be read, in *OR XIII A*, on Epiphany, Saint Stephen, and the Vigil of Christmas, this *ordo* expands that to all festivals. Collection B did the exact same thing itself, in *OR XIII B*, by adding the specification in the body of the *ordo* but he did so after each feast in turn. Again, this addition appears to answer a question arising from use of the *ordo*, whether one could use homilies all year round or not. So far, with *OR I* and *OR III A* in mind, Andrieu’s characterisation of the manuscript as a ‘pontifical’, in the tradition of Collection B’s varying members seems secure.

---

\(^{712}\) *OR XLII*, n.10, Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.IV, p.400: ‘et antequam recludantur, ponit chrisma intus in confessione’

\(^{713}\) Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.II, p.488: ‘Knowing also this, that the sermons and homilies of the holy orthodox fathers as they are written above also for all these festivals are read, those to which pertain to them, that is Augustine, Gregory, Jerome, Ambrose and the others’
Greek and Roman Elements in Wolfenbüttel 4175

Wolfenbüttel’s version of OR XI is entirely unique, it has no parallels elsewhere in the contemporary manuscripts. Again, Andrieu relegates discussion of its differences to footnotes, and it was not within his stated remit to understand what they might mean.\(^{714}\) First, OR XI ends early, at n.82, but later than the version in Collection B. It therefore describes all seven scrutinies, but ends before the service of baptism itself on Holy Saturday. As in Collection B, this lack was filled by other pieces in the midst of the Holy Week ordo, including that part which Andrieu identified with his OR XXVIII, nn.50-57, which is an ORDO UERO QUALITER SABBATO SANCTO INFANTES CATICIZANTUR ITA EST. There are also pieces on baptism and the blessing of fonts, which are unique to this manuscript. Often the compiler seems preoccupied with what I have defined as ‘completeness’. Twice he adds chant texts which no other version of the text records.

OR XI n.8, var.6: ‘Tunc primum incipiat clerus antiphonam ad introitum: Dum sanctificatus fuero in uobis Psalm. Benedicam domino. Ad Resp. In domino laudabitur anima mea’\(^{715}\)

OR XI n.44, var.6: ‘Inde uero procedunt quattuor diaoni de sacrario cantando antiph. Sitientes uenite ad aquas’\(^{716}\)

As Van Dijk discovered, the compiler of the Wolfenbüttel manuscript seems to have had some privileged access to Roman chant texts of Easter and Easter Week, so his attention to chant here may have come from the same wellspring. The version of OR XI presented in Wolfenbüttel 4175 is also more loquacious on several other accounts, it always gives the exact and complete formulae that come before reading, Dominus uobiscum and so on (n.48, var.1, 56, var.4; n.59, var.6; n.61, var.14). It also gives, as Andrieu notes, the entire formula address to the electi on each occasion before they pray ‘Orate electi, flectite genua, and so on, whereas every other manuscript simply


\(^{715}\) Ibid., p.419: ‘Then first the cleric shall begin the introit: Dum sanctificatus fuero in uobis. And the psalm: Benedicam domino. And the responsary: In domino laudabitur anima mea’

\(^{716}\) Ibid, p.428: ‘But then there process four deacons from the sacristy, singing the antiphon: Sitientes venite ad aquas’.
gives this formula once in the first scrutiny and, in the others, simply refers back to that by saying ut superius (n.17, var.7; n.20, var.6; n.23, var.3; n.26, var.3). The choice to give large titles in capitalis to each of the scrutinies, PRIMUM SCRUTINUM, SECUNDUM SCRUTINUM and so on, which is again found in no other manuscript, reflects the same attention to the scrutinies found elsewhere, and the clear attempt to understand and clearly delineate them. Aubert pointed out that a few of OR XI’s peculiarities in the Wolfenbüttel manuscript are paralleled in one other place, the Sacramentary of Gellone’s second baptismal ordo:717

OR XI, n.6, var.13 ‘Sequitur benedictio post datum salem. Deus patrem nostrorum, deus uniuersae conditor ueritatis et reliqua, usque aeterna praemia consequi mereatur’.718

This prayer ‘after giving salt’ is found in no other example of OR XI, but can be seen in Gellone’s ordo of baptism.719

However, as above, I significantly disagree with Aubert’s reconstruction of OR XI’s relationships, and he makes a number of significant errors, amidst some very pertinent points. As regards Wolfenbüttel 4175, he made the same mistake as he did with Collection A, by openly stating that Wolfenbüttel 4175’s copy of OR XI only gives a Greek Creed, while Gellone only gives a Latin one, saying that Wolfenbüttel ‘chose’ Greek while Gellone ‘chose’ Latin, from a source such as the Old Gelasian Sacramentary which offered both.720 This is simply untrue as far as both Wolfenbüttel and Collection A are concerned, each of which actually provide both Greek and Latin. Wolfenbüttel gives both Latin and Greek in full, as Andrieu’s edition makes plain, even before one goes to the manuscript to confirm it.721 Therefore, this was not a matter of each choosing which language they

717 Aubert ‘When the Roman Liturgy became Frankish’, p.133.
718 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.II ‘There follows the blessing after giving salt. Deum patrem nostrorum, deus patrem nostrorum, deus universae conditor veritatis and the rest, until aeterna praemia consequi mereatur’.
719 Dumas (ed.), Gellonensis, 2222, p.313: ‘Et pus (sic.) datum sal, dicit orationem hanc: Deus patrem nostrorum…’
720 Aubert, ‘When the Roman Liturgy became Frankish’ p.132: ‘we see that Wolfenbüttel 4175 and Collection A transmit the Greek text, whereas Gellone and Collection B propose the Latin text’.
liked as Aubert suggests; it was a matter of both Gellone and Collection B getting rid of Greek because it was useless in Francia, while Wolfenbüttel and Collection A retained both languages, exactly like the Roman original. As regards the above prayer ‘post datum salem’ there is a relationship between Wolfenbüttel and the Sacramentary of Gellone, but this is not so clear with the other two examples Aubert offers. These are: ‘the rubric Tunc primum incipit clerus…(no. 2223), the indication of an antiphon (no.2262), etc.’.  

In fact, the rubric ‘Tunc primum incipit clerus antiphonam ad introitum’, found at OR XI, n.8 is given in all the manuscripts of OR XI which Andrieu examined; it is not unique to Wolfenbüttel at all. What is unique in Wolfenbüttel is the psalm ‘Benedicam domino’ and response ‘In domino laudabitur anima mea’, neither of which are found in Gellone. Gellone gives a separate ‘psalmum ad repetendum: Accedite ad eum et inluminamini’. I also disagree with the second parallel, between Wolfenbüttel at OR XI, n.44 and Gellonensis 2262. While both narratives do, indeed, indicate an exact antiphon for this moment ‘Sitienes’ or ‘Omnes sicientes’, the Gellone narrative is significantly more elaborate and places the antiphon at the end of the rubric while Wolfenbüttel has it in the middle. The relation is no more than any other example of OR XI. There is little point here in re-imagining OR XI’s steamma, as Aubert attempts, which tells us little more than we already know. But these examples are highly suggestive that the scribe of Wolfenbüttel 4175 added extra details to his pre-existent version of OR XI.

In a further complication, the most fascinating of all of Wolfenbüttel’s differences is true to Rome, but the fact that it is only found in this single manuscript seems to suggest it was the work of the scribe himself, rather than going back to an original. This is the remarkable addition of the Greek credo in full, transliterated into Latin letters, at n.62. The option for the baptised person to confess the faith in Greek was, obviously, a relic of the text’s original recension in seventh-century bilingual

---

722 Aubert ‘When the Roman Liturgy became Frankish’, p.133  
724 Dumas (ed.), Gellonensis, 2223, p.314.  
Rome. Collection A’s OR XI presented this as an option, but gave only the incipit of the Creed:

_Pisteuo his ena theon._ Quite understandably, in Collection B manuscripts this option was erased altogether. And yet the scribe of our manuscript, Wolfenbüttel 4175, seems to have thought the Greek was important enough to search out and copy it in full. It is likely that he found the Greek text in something like the Old Gelasian Sacramentary, which offers interlinear Greek and Latin Creeds as part of its narrative of this very scrutiny. Unlike the Collection B scribe, the scribe of the Wolfenbüttel manuscript does not give the catechetical homilies in full, or prayers in full. He advances on Collection A by adding, with _usque_, the end of each phrase as well as its _incipit_, for example: at OR XI, n.4, var.8 with the prayer _Christi respicere_, at OR XI n.14, var.7 with the prayer _Deus Abraham_ or at OR XI, n.22, var.7 with the exorcism ‘Exorcizo te’ and so on. In each case the Wolfenbüttel scribe adds more than the standard incipit, going several words further into the prayer, and also adds the ending after _usque_. It is clear he also found these words in the Sacramentary. This is entirely unique to this manuscript, but for these spoken interludes, the Sacramentary would still be required to perform them in full. Yet for the Credo, both in Latin and Greek, this habit shifts and he offers these in full. Unlike Collection B, Wolfenbüttel offers the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, just as the Old Gelasian does. The latter was the original form for Roman baptism in OR XI. The text is accented in Wolfenbüttel 4175, undoubtedly to aid in recitation. Certain places in Carolingian Francia practised the chant of the Greek Creed. Wolfenbüttel 4175’s cathedral must have done so as well, in a highly stylized motion of fidelity to and imitation of Rome, which the entire manuscript encourages. The Sacramentary of Angoulême and the tenth-century Sacramentary of Fulda contains the Greek Creed at the Scrutiny as well.

---


727 Eizenhöfer et al. (eds), _Liber Sacramentorum_, 312, pp.48-49.

728 Andrieu, _Les Ordines_, vol.II, p.418, 421

729 Ibid., p.435, n.65; Eizenhöfer et al. (eds), _Liber Sacramentorum_, 314, p..50.

730 Ibid., p.393, n.3.

731 Saint-Roch (ed.), _Engolismensis_, 720, p.104; Bernice M. Kaczynski, _Greek in the Carolingian Age_, p.100-105.
The Easter Vespers are a further sign of this intense identification. They are presented after Wolfenbüttel 4175’s melange of Holy Week ordines. This text, entitled QUALITER UESPERA DIE SANCTA PASCHAE AGENDA SUNT, describes the ceremony of vespers beginning on the day of Easter in ecclesia maiore ad locum crucifixi, which undoubtedly means Santa Croce in Gierusalemæ, with readings, chants and verses. Some of the verses were sung in Greek, for example ‘alleluia o kyrius Versus kecharius. The primates ecclesiae then drank various specified vintages of wine! The narrative continues with the Vespers for all of Easter week, following the same pattern. On Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday they take place between the Lateran and the oratory Sanctum Andream ad crucem, Friday is IN HIERUSALEM, i.e. Santa Croce, then Saturday is at Santa Maria Maggiore, while on Sunday in albas, the ancient Roman name for the Sunday after Easter, Vespers took place at SS Cosma e Damiano. Andrieu believed the Wolfenbüttel version of these texts to be an interpolated and false one, but Van Dijk showed that he was wrong. In fact, Wolfenbüttel 4175 is as close as anything we can find to a Roman original, and Collection A’s version has numerous errors and interpolations. It was the same version of this text which Amalarius used for his de ordine antiphonarii. This is another example of a rare ordo, one also used by the creator of Collection A, but here, once again, in its most antique known form, one that goes back directly to Rome.

**The Holy Week ordo romanus of Wolfenbüttel and its appendices**

The Vespers segment follows directly after Wolfenbüttel’s version Holy Week, a melange of pieces from various known and unique ordines, which Andrieu characterises as ‘suivant un plan préconçu’. The narrative unfolds as follows, beginning on 60r:

OR XXIV nn.1-39 (which characterises the matins offices for Wednesday of Holy Week up until the end of Good Friday),

---

732 HOW VESPERS ARE TO BE DONE DONE ON EASTER DAY.
733 OR XXVII, n.74, with var.9, 10; Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.364.
735 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.278: ‘following a preconceived plan’
OR XXVIII nn.50-57 (which deals with some pre-baptismal ceremonies on the final scrutiny on Holy Saturday),

OR XXV (a unique ordo narrating the blessing of the Paschal Candle on Holy Saturday),

OR XXIV nn.41-45 (the blessing of fonts),

OR XXVIIIa (unique ordo continuing the blessing of fonts and baptism),

an appendix (on the recitation of weekday prayers and the pontifical blessing edited by Andrieu as OR XXVIIa, nn.24-25)\textsuperscript{736}

the whole of OR XXVI, (the night office for the whole of Holy Week from mediana sunday)

the end of OR XXIV nn.41-54, (repetition of ceremonies of Holy Saturday, including baptism and blessing of fonts),

an appendix (edited by Andrieu and also found in two other MSS,\textsuperscript{737} on the chant for the Easter octave)

a note (offered by Andrieu in a footnote to OR XXIV, on the vigil of Easter\textsuperscript{738})

and finally the Roman Easter Vespers discussed above (OR XXVII, nn.65-75)

Essentially it can be simplified down to the following:

1) Matins of holy Week,

2) Saturday Scrutiny,

3) Blessing of Candle and fonts,

4) Night Office of Holy Week,


\textsuperscript{737} Ibid., p.298.

\textsuperscript{738} OR XXIV, n.54, var.9; Ibid., p.297.
5) Baptism on Holy Saturday,

6) ceremonies of Easter Vigil and Octave week.

Seen as such, it is certainly an attempt to make a more coherent and complete narrative of Holy Week from these two ordines, OR XXVI and XXIV, which were lacking in not presenting proper narrative of the final scrutiny on Holy Saturday (again the importance of the scrutiny) or the blessing of the Easter Candle, a Frankish rite, or a full treatment of the blessing of the font. It is therefore a parallel attempt to that found in Collection A, which directly combined both into a single ordo, OR XXVII and added Vespers, and Collection B, which further refined OR XXVII into OR XXVIII, adding some of the same missing rituals. It is worth noting here that, at moments of transition from one ordo to another, one can often see erased text, suggesting that the scribe continued to copy a bit longer than he was supposed to, and had to go back and erase it. This is visible, for example at folio 63v, where there is a transition from OR XXIV to OR XXVIIIa. This provides a small insight into the process of the composition. Across the entire narrative of Holy Week, the compiler makes certain interventions, but these are lost in the footnotes of Andrieu, and the fact that each ordo is considered separately makes it hard to tease out commonalities across the narrative of Holy Week, let alone across the whole manuscript, from his discussion. I shall therefore present some of the most intriguing and interesting, discussing the ordo not, as Andrieu does, as related to other texts found in other manuscripts, but as a full ordo romanus in its own right. Given the daring and creativity, not always wholly successful, of its scribe, it clearly deserves such consideration.

With the title, the writer already announces his intentions by giving a completely new one: ORDO ROMANORUM IN EBDOMADA MAIORE. This suggests that the compiler viewed his Holy Week ordo as a single unit, a new attempt at a complete ordo romanus for the occasion. It was also no less Roman for being highly adapted. Many of the interventions made across the text are in

---

739 Wolfenbüttel 4175, fol.60r ‘The Order of the Romans in Holy Week’.
keeping with some of the interventions found in OR XI, offering more complete narrative of what was read, said or chanted.

OR XXIV, n.1, var.8 ‘Dat orationem diaconus: Flectamus genua, et post paulolum dicit: Levate’.\textsuperscript{740} This adds the exact same diaconal speech that the compiler tended to fill in in OR XI, but which was abbreviated in the original.

OR XXIV n.7, var.3 ‘Passio domini nostri iesu Christi secundum Lucam \textit{cap.CCIX. Adpropinquabat dies festus azymorum usque in quo nondum quisquam positus fuerat}'.\textsuperscript{741} Here the exact reading from the Gospel of Luke is given, with its proper beginning and end.

OR XXIV n.10, var.4 ‘Dicta antiphonam ad introita. \textit{Nobis autem gloriari oportet. Deinde oratione facta, sicut Sacramentorum continet}'.\textsuperscript{742} Again, the compiler adds the exact chant to be said here, and returns to one of his favourite formulae, asking the reader to look to the Sacramentary for the prayer here. One might pause to glance at the Latin here. The original source text used an absolute construction with an ablative participle and accusative noun (in line with Merovingian, pre-Alcuinian Latin). The addition uses a proper ablative absolute. The latin of the \textit{ordines romani} has not been much discussed. As I mentioned briefly in Collection B, the original \textit{ordines} had a pre-Carolingian Latin grammar (of which here is one example). In Collection B, Cologne 138 had ‘corrected’ this, as Montpellier 412 did with Collection A. In other manuscripts, like Munich Clm 14510 such correction was minimal. Scribes responded, therefore, to the Latin of \textit{ordines} in diverse ways.


\textsuperscript{741} Ibid., p.289: ‘The passion of our Lord Jesus Christ according to Luke, chapter 209. ‘But when the feast of Passover was approaching, until in which no one yet had been placed’

\textsuperscript{742} Ibid., p.288: ‘But when the introit is said: \textit{Nobis autem gloriari oportet}. Then the prayers are to be done, as the Sacramentary contains’.
OR XXVIII, n.51 var.4 ‘Nec te latet Satanas usque in nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi qui venturus est iudicare uiuos et mortuos’. Here, as in OR XI, the compiler expands the speech ‘Nec te latet Satanas’ from the incipit by adding the end after usque.

OR XXVI, n.11, var.10 ‘incipiat antefonam psalmis sicut in antephonario continetur et Gloriam in finem psalmi non cantent’ Another detail of the chant is added here, unknown to any other recension of this ordo.

As in OR XI, these interventions were made, with the aid of other liturgical books, that is a Sacramentary, Gelasian in nature, an Evangeliary or Comes and even an Antiphoner. One might characterise them in two ways, certainly not contradictory: firstly towards ‘completeness’, offering the most comprehensive account of the rites in question, and the other, for usability, that is to aid in the actual performance of the rite by a celebrant, or at least the overseeing of it.

Considered in the light of these interventions in the familiar ordines, the additions to Holy Week unique to Wolfenbüttel 4175 begin to make greater sense. These are the two pieces Andrieu treated as separate ordines, OR XXV and OR XXVIIIa, and those he characterised as ‘appendixes’ or ‘notes’, three texts of various length and provenance. The shortest and simplest, OR XXV is the blessing of the Paschal Candle. In the narrative of Holy Week of Wolfenbüttel 4175, this is placed once the final scrutiny of Holy Saturday was complete (OR XXVII, n.50-57), so in a more or less chronologically correct slot in the midst of OR XXIV.


743 Ibid., p.401: ‘Nec te latet Satanas’ until ‘in nomine domini nostri Iesu Christi qui venturus est iudicare uiuos et mortuos’.

744 Ibid., p.328: ‘he begins the antiphon of the psalm as contains the antiphonary, and the Gloria at the end of the psalm they do not sing’.
The chanting of the *Exultet* obviously makes this a Frankish compilation. That was first attested in the Bobbio Missal, the *Missale Gothicum* and the *Missale Gallicanum uetus*.\(^{746}\) It is more likely that here the compiler refers to a Gelasian of the eighth century, the prayer ‘*VD quia dignum*’ is a feature of the Gellone, Angoulême and Phillips narratives of Holy Saturday.\(^{747}\) Andrieu suggests this *ordo*, OR XXV, was composed by the Wolfenbüttel compiler himself. He used the Roman terminology suggested by OR XXIV, with his *suburbanis ciuitatibus*. Given the alignments with his interventions elsewhere, this is not unreasonable: the *usque* formula, the *sic in Sacramentorum continet* formula, all resonate strongly with his work. It is, furthermore, extremely rare to find the *Vere dignum* with the Sacramentary’s characteristic initial *VD* in other *ordines*, but both this text and OR XXVIIIa, also unique to our manuscript, do present it, copied directly from the Sacramentary. Only Zurich Car C 102 has the same symbol, again with its highly concentrated borrowings from a Gelasian of the eighth century.

OR XXVIIIa is longer, and yet is analysed only over a single page and a half by Andrieu.\(^{748}\) He describes it as a combination of OR XI and OR XXVIII, and indeed most of what it describes, enumerating the consecration of the font and the baptismal rite itself, is to be found in one or both. It is suggestive indeed that the compiler found the terse instructions in the Roman OR XXIV for both the blessing of the font and the blessing of the Easter candle to be inadequate, and expanded them by his own composition with sources he had available, including the Sacramentary. As the text of Holy Saturday unfolds in the manuscript itself, OR XXIV, nn.41-45 opens the narrative of the blessing, following on from OR XXV. This small section simply describes the readings of Holy Saturday, which


again the compiler expands, as is his wont.\textsuperscript{749} The ordo continues with the pontiff descending to the
font with a litany, and ends here with ‘unde pontifex mittit crisma in fontem’.\textsuperscript{750} OR XXIV did go on to
describe the blessing of font and baptism itself, but with very little detail, over nn.46-49, for example
it only says ‘Tunc baptizat’ and says nothing of the interrogation of the faith of the godparents or the
triple immersion, which both OR XXVIIIa and OR XI highlight and dwell on in detail. This was part of
the inadequacy of the text. By removing the latter half of OR XI, the compiler was left with very little
specific information about how this was done, and clearly he found OR XXIV to be unhelpful, for
both this and baptism. He asked more from this text than the narrative it offered. According to
Andrieu, he turned to OR XI, the original, as well as OR XXVIII, which he had from Collection B. I am
less sure that the scribe of Wolfenbüttel 4175 had Collection B, but the relations here between OR
XXVIIIa and OR XXVIII are striking. Perhaps they shared a source text, a more complete narrative of
baptism itself based on OR XI? Andrieu never highlights the fact that this process of combination
also marks the earlier extract from what he calls OR XXVIII nn.50-57, the narrative of the final
scrutiny, where numerous phrases recall OR XI as well.\textsuperscript{751} OR XXVIII in itself was less interesting to
the compiler than a combination of it with OR XI, offering material from both. Among the more
instructive parts is n.4, which describes the actual consecration of the font, almost all of it unique to
this manuscript.

OR XXVIIIa, n.4 Item consecratio fontis. Dicit Dominus uobiscum. Resp. Et cum spiritu
Dignum et iustum est. V. D aeque et salutare nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere, Deus
qui invisibili potentia tua sacramentorum tuorum mirabiliter operaris effectum usque
indulgentiam consequantur. Hic signas aquam primam crucem: hanc aquam, cum manu tua

\textsuperscript{749} OR XXIV, n.42, var.3, \textit{Ibid.}, p.295.
\textsuperscript{750} OR XXIV, n.45, \textit{Ibid.}, p.296.
\textsuperscript{751} OR XXVIII n.52, var.1: ‘tanget presbyter eorum singulorum et oris sui et dicit uniuscuiusque ad aurem; n.7: ‘Et uertit se ad feminas et facit similitur’; n.53 n.3: ‘eis pectua et inter scapulas de oleo exorcizato et uocato
nomina singulorum dicens; n.54, var.1: ‘Inde uero dicit symbolum’.

Resp: Amen.752

Here, again the compiler shows his debt to the sacramental tradition. As above, it is extremely rare for ordines to give such complete accounts of prayer texts, particularly with the VD initial. His usual practice of usque and the end of the prayer as well as the incipit is useful here in giving exact moments for the rubrics during the blessing, the blowing thrice in the water and putting the candle in it. The same rubrics were found in marginal notes given in Zurich Car C 102, and, as there, reflect a very old tradition of second-person rubrics seen in the Old Gelasian Sacramentary and the Gelasian of the eighth century.753

The other unique parts of this text offer similar interest. At OR XXVIIIa, n.13, the prayer invoking the septiform grace of the Holy Spirit is specified as ‘Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui regenerare dignatus es hoc famulos et famulas tuas, usque Qui tecum uiuit et regnat Deus in saecula

752 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, pp.421-422: Then the Consecration of the fonts. He says: Dominus uobiscum. They respond: Et cum spiritu tuo. Sursum Corda. They respond: Habemus ad dominum. Gratias agamus domine deo nostro. They respond: Dignum et iustum est. V.D aequum et salutare nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere, Deus qui invisibili potentia tua sacramentorum tuorum mirabiliter operaris effectum until indulgentiam consequatur. Here you sign the first cross in the water: hanc aquam, cum manu tua dividens in modum crucis X: the second: Unde benedico te X creatura aquae; The third similarly: benedico X te et per iesum Christum filium eius, usque in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti. Here you change volume, as if reading a reading: haec nobis precepit seruantibus, tu, Deus omnipotens, adesto usque: mentibus efficacies. Here the candles are put in: Descendat in hanc plenitudinem fontis uirtus spiritus tui, And you blow thrice in the water: et tota huius aquae substantia regenerandi fecundet affectum, usque: Per dominum nostrum iesum Christum filium tuum, qui venturus est iudicare uiuos et mortuos et saeculum per ignem. They respond: Amen

This was the Gregorian form. He also gives the prayer at the signing of the cross ‘Uel aliter: Signum Christi in uitam aeternam. Pax tecum. Resp. Et cum spiritu tuo’. This was a Gelasian form. At OR XXVIIIa, n.20, the compiler adds exact references and incipits and usques for the readings from Colossians and Matthew, again in keeping with his practices above. OR XXVIIIa, therefore, again offers a more complete and usable narrative of the blessing of fonts and baptismal ceremony than OR XXVIII, both along similar lines to movements in Collection B, and in keeping with the general patterns of the Wolfenbüttel compiler’s work.

The first of the three small specifications which Andrieu calls ‘appendices’ or ‘notes’ begins immediately following OR XXVIIIa. But it is divided from that by beginning on a new line with a capital. This text owes nothing to OR XI, or OR XXVIII, or even to the Sacramentary. It has no precedent elsewhere, and it is likely, as we shall see, the fruit of the labour of the Wolfenbüttel scribe himself.

OR XXVIIIa, nn.24-25 ‘Et sane scientes quod per singulas orationes sabbato sancto et pentecosten et omnem quadragesimam, exceptis diebus dominicis, genua flectere debemus; similiter IIII mensium tempora anni, id est primi, quarti, septimi et decimi mensis, cum feriis ipsarum observandum est; similiter et in dicto ieiunio vel vigiliis festivitatibus sanctorum faciatis. Et quando pontifex benedictiones super populum tradere uoluerit, archidiaconus, vel quem ipse iusserit, aspicit ad pontificem, ut ei annuat, et dicit ad populum: Humilitate uos ad benedictionem. Resp: Deo gratias. Si autem pontifex, ibidem non fuerit, supra scriptum habemus.’

---

757 Eizenhöfer et al. (eds), Liber Sacramentorum, 452, p.74.
759 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, pp.424-425; ‘And soundly knowing that for each of the prayers on Holy Saturday and Pentecost and for all of Lent, excepting the Sundays, we ought to genuflect; similarly those four Ember Days, which are to be observed with the days of the first, fourth, seventh and tenth month; similarly do also in the stated fasts and vigils for the feasts of saints. And when the pontiff wishes to give blessings over the people, the archdeacon, or whom he will have chosen, waits for the pontiff to signal to him, and then says to
This text is a kind of supplement, with wording inspired by OR III, the supplement to OR I, and referring directly to it. When the scribe says as ‘we have above written’, discussing the potential absence of the pontiff during Mass, he is referring back to OR III, itself present at fols.52r-53v in this very manuscript. One part of that ordo, OR III n.2, discussed the absence of the pontiff at mass. This suggests that this appendix was compiled for this very manuscript. The ‘scientes’ opening was also found in Wolfenbüttel 4175’s addition to OR Xllla, see above, so may be regarded as a habit. Obviously, the addition of this supplement was inspired by certain questions asked about the saying of prayers on Holy Saturday and Pentecost and about how the pontifical blessings were introduced by the archdeacon. Both of these questions clearly arose in other manuscripts of the ordinines romani.

In Munich Clm 14510, the episcopal blessing was inserted into the narrative of OR I in its place, with the same wording as is here recommended to introduce it. In the BAV Pal.lat.487 note after OR XXIX, it is attested that the monk who wrote the letter asked Pope Hadrian about genuflection on Holy Saturday. The same applied to Pentecost, weekdays in Lent, and on the Ember Days, which are here again highlighted, as well as saints’ days. The question of the pontifical blessing has less obvious relevance to the Holy Week Office itself, but perhaps was added because it was also a question arising in the ordinines romani the writer knew. It was, as above, a wholly Frankish custom, and had to be added because Roman ordinines like OR XXIV or OR I offered nothing about how it should occur.

OR XXVI follows directly after this appendix, dealing with the Night Office of Holy Week, and then OR XXIV nn.46-54, again the description of Holy Saturday office repeated here. At OR XXIV n.46-49 this narrative again describes the blessing of the font, and baptism. Exactly the same ceremonies were described in OR XXVIIa, but, here, in significantly less detail. OR XXVIIa also describes the

the people: Humilitate uos ad benedictionem. And they respond: Deo gratias. But if the pontiff should not be there, we have written above’.

760 Ibid., p.425, n.25.
763 Ut supra, pp.31-32.
litanies, readings and Agnus Dei that this text does. This is one of the incoherences of this Holy Week narrative, that such ceremonies are in fact described twice, with the same wording on more than one occasion. This speaks something of the methodology of the scribe, who, even if he could bisect and dislocate OR XXIV, did not let a part of it be entirely erased, and still wanted to have a complete record of the ordo in his manuscript. Where OR XXIV finishes at n.54, with ‘sed tantum incensum’, this scribe has added another supplement.

Appendix to OR XXIV ‘In pascha usque in octabas ad omnes cursus non cantatur responsum nec lectio recitatur sed versum pro versu, id est ad tertiam, sextam nonamque sed tantum Resp. Grad. Haec dies dicantur primam; sine Kyrieleison autem fac totum officium in ipsa ebdomada, nisi tantum in missa dic Kyrieleison. Feria II ad Venite et per totam ebdomadam ant. Surrexit dominus uere alleluia’.764

This supplement therefore discusses the exact mechanisms of Office chant during the Easter Octave, a time with which our manuscript is significantly preoccupied. Andrieu notes that this supplement is very similar to one found in Brussels 10127-10144 (Northern France, 8th/9th C), there also after OR XXIV, and in Saint Gallen 614 (Saint Gall, c.850), there between OR III and XXII. The wording of beginning and end are identical, and content is similar, but our manuscript offers some significant differences which seem to be additions by our very manuscript, which I have put in bold type (for example only the Wolfenbüttel recension specifies exactly that the offices concerned would be terce, sext and nones and only Wolfenbüttel uses the imperative here, very unusual for an ordo). This supplement, in the same style as the Brussels and St Gallen recension not like Wolfenbüttel, was added in full to OR XXVII, n.66 and OR XXVIII, n.89, which suggests that the compilers of Collection A themselves had a copy of OR XXIV with the same supplement. We have already seen that the

764 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol. III, p.298; ‘In Easter until the octave at all of the offices the responsary is not sung, nor the reading recited, but verse before verse, that is at terce, sext and nones, but only the Responsary Gradual Haec dies is said at prime; but without Kyrieleison do the whole office in this week, except only at mass say Kyrieleison. On the Monday at the Venite and for the whole week the antiphon is Surrexit dominus uere Alleluia.’
compiler of the Wolfenbüttel manuscript had some preoccupation with chant, and extra sources for that. No other manuscript has the second part of this supplement, however:

OR XXIV, n.51 var.9 ‘Similiter ad vigilias per totam ebdomadam terni psalmi dicendi sunt et per omnes psalmos Alleluia usque octabas pentecosten omnimodis predicenda est.

Dominica sancta, statio ad sanctam Mariam ad praesepio; qualiter missa celebratur superius habemus comprehendens et per reliquas stationes. Nam quod intermisimus de vigilia sancta dominicae resurrectionis breviter est perstringendum. Alleluia super Venite et super primum, secundum et tertium psalmum. et matutinis laudibus Alleluia dicende sunt; in evangelio antiphona et omnia sicut continet auctoritas.’

The discussion of office chant continues here, again giving exact details for the vigils. Here, too, and rather apropos of nothing, the text refers back to another ordo earlier in the manuscript, here to OR I, ‘how the mass is to celebrated we have above unfolded’. This is specified to be ‘statio ad sanctam Mariam ad praesepio’, one old Roman name for Santa Maria Maggiore ‘et per reliquas stationes’.

The whole appendix at this point in the manuscript seems to give the compiler’s own answers to questions he felt arose from his narrative of Holy Week, or questions that he was told arose from it. The somewhat more cramped writing suggests it may have been added slightly afterwards, though it is fully rubricated in the same style as above. In that case, it may have occurred to the writer that his choice to put OR I first of all, as is the custom for all manuscripts of the Collections, left some confusion on the timing of the year. Therefore, he wanted to direct his reader there again, at the closing of the rites of Holy Saturday, back to the ordo for Easter Day itself, before the Vespers for the following week began. These appendices unite the manuscript’s ordines to an otherwise almost unattested extent, encouraging direct reference from one to the other. OR III already encouraged

765 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.297: ‘Similarly at vigils for the whole week three psalms are to be said, and before all the psalms Alleluia is to be given until the octave of Pentecost. On Easter Day, the station is at Santa Maria Maggiore; how the mass is to be celebrated we have above unfolded and for the other stations. But what we have omitted concerning the holy vigil of the Lord’s resurrection briefly is to be drawn up: Alleluia before Venite and before the first, second and third psalm. And at matins prayers Alleluia are to be said at the gospel antiphon and all things as contain authority.’
supplementation to deal with troubling aspects of the *ordines romani*, or where questions arose in practice, and the Wolfenbüttel scribe has run with this idea more than any other manuscript. In summary, Andrieu’s comment on the goal of the compiler’s creation of Holy Week is pertinent: ‘He wished to make a personal work and compose a sort of small episcopal directory, a timid sketch of the future pontifical’.\footnote{Ibid., p.417: ‘Il a voulu faire œuvre personnelle et composer une sorte de petit directoire épiscopal, timide ébauche du futur Pontifical’.
}

**Roman and Gallican Ordinations converge**

Turning to ordination, which comes after the Easter Vespers, is found another startling construction of the scribe’s own ingenuity. There is no *ordo* for the Ember Days themselves here, no equivalent of OR XXXVII in Collection B. But the ordination sequence does begin with two *Denunitatii* for those occasions: DENUNITIATIO IEIUNIORUM PRIMI QUARTI SEPTIMI DECIMI MENSES.\footnote{ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE FASTS ON THE FIRST FOURTH SEVENTH AND TENTH MONTH.}

These are not, however, the unusual Leonine formulae Cologne had used, but the Old Gelasian ‘*Annuersare fratres*’ and ‘*illi mensis ieiunia*, that are also to be found in the Gelasian of the eighth century.\footnote{Eizenhöfer et al. (eds), *Liber Sacramentorum*, 652-653, pp.101-102; Dumas (ed.), *Gellonensis*, 272, 1094, pp.34, 145-146.}

This suggests, again, that Wolfenbüttel 4175 acted independently from any compiler in Collection B, but the compiler had parallel ideas as those manuscripts; namely that, in order to a be sufficient account, the rite of Ember Days required some kind of announcement. Given this, it is striking that certain episcopal statutes actively prescribed that the Ember Days were properly announced by all priests to the people, using the word ‘*denuntiatur*’.\footnote{Capitula of Waltcaud of Liège, MGH, *Capitula Episcoporum*, I, p.49: ‘Cap.XVII Quomodo a presbiteris quattuor temporum ieiunia agantur vel denuntiantur in plebe et quomodo observantur’.
}

Here, our manuscripts respond to this by giving an example of what would be said in such an announcement. Significantly, the texts also detail the actual mechanism of the Ember Days.

---

\footnote{Ibid., p.417: ‘Il a voulu faire œuvre personnelle et composer une sorte de petit directoire épiscopal, timide ébauche du futur Pontifical’.
}

\footnote{ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE FASTS ON THE FIRST FOURTH SEVENTH AND TENTH MONTH.
}

\footnote{Eizenhöfer et al. (eds), *Liber Sacramentorum*, 652-653, pp.101-102; Dumas (ed.), *Gellonensis*, 272, 1094, pp.34, 145-146.
}

}
‘illius mensis instaurata deuotio IIII igitur et VI feria sollicite conuenientes occures offeremus deo spiritale ieiunium. Die uero SABBATO apud beatum petrum cuius nos intercessionibus credimus adiuuandos sancta uigilias christiana pietatae celebremus’  

Such liturgical texts explained to the reader or celebrant the purpose of the Ember Days, and also did to those to whom he would read it, in announcement. The Saturday would take place ‘in the presence of the blessed Peter’.

After these denuntiatii, the ordo de sacris ordinibus begins, with the rite for the porter, ostiarius, and no sign of the psalmist. This proves that Wolfenbüttel did not take this text from Collection B, but directly from a Gelasian Sacramentary of the Eighth Century. That small, but telling rubric ‘et tradit ei diaconus ostium ecclesiae’, is found in the porter’s ordination. This was not in Collection B, since none of Verona XCII, Cologne 138 or Munich Clm 14510 carry it, but again is found in examples of the Gelasian of the eighth century. The arrangement then follows the ordo de sacris ordinibus formula, with lector and exorcist; once again the text only offers incipits for the prayers.

The acolyte’s usual rubric is given, acolytus cum ordinatur and so on, but before his blessing begins, a new text is suddenly inserted at its end:

Dum missa celebrata fuerit induunt clericum illum planeta et orario....

And so on. This was the opening of OR XXXIV, the Roman ordo of ordinations carried by Collection A. As I have indicated, this text did not have most of the minor orders, and began only with the acolyte up until bishop. The compiler of Wolfenbüttel 4175 has integrated both choices, Roman ordo and Frankish canon rubrics with Sacramentary prayers, as if they were one ceremony! For as soon as OR XXXIV’s narrative of the acolyte’s ceremony is done, we return to the sacramentary, with the usual acolyte’s blessing Domine sancte pater omnipotens aeterne deus usque virtute confirma. Per.. This is

770 Eizenhöfer et al. (eds), Liber Sacramentorum, 652, pp.101-102: ‘But having resumed the consecrating of this month, the Wednesday therefore and Friday gathering we offer to God a spiritual fast. But on SATURDAY, with blessed Peter, whose intercessions we believe help us, we celebrate holy vigils in Christian piety’.

771 Wolfenbüttel Herzog August Bibliothek 4175, fol.78r ‘When the mass is to be celebrated, the clerics vest him in the chasuble and stole’.
given with the highly interesting title, ITEM ORATIO SI VIS, which implies it was a matter of choice which prayer the celebrant chose to use during the ceremony; this blessing or the prayer also given from OR XXXIV to Mary ‘Intercedente beata et gloriosa’.

The sacramentary material continues with the Ordo qualiter interpolation, as normal in the Sacramentary. The compiler, as elsewhere in the manuscript, writes out kyrieleison in Greek majuscle. The Capitula sancti Gregorii follows, as usual. Here, as in Munich Clm 14510, the reading from Leo does not follow, showing how confusing it could be under Gregory’s name. The ORDINATIO SUBDIACONI comes afterwards, with the rubric subdiaconus cum ordinatur, detailing the usual objects given to him. What comes next is a long dialogue ITEM ‘Uide cuius ministerium’, introduced by the rubric that the chalice and paten are exhibited before the bishop, where the bishop underlines the subdeacon’s new duties. This is found in a number of Gelasians of the Eighth Century but not seen in any example of Collection B. This again proves that the text the compiler combined with OR XXXIV was taken from a Sacramentary, rather than taken from an example of Collection B. At the end, following the SEQUITUR, is what we might expect, the short ordo of OR XXXIV for the subdeacon’s ordination. The two prayers that follow it with ‘deinde sequitur benedictionem’, are both the expected Gelasian formulae, the set-up is therefore exactly like that of acolyte: Gelasian rubric/OR XXXIV/Gelasian prayers.

---


773 Wolfenbüttel Herzog August Bibliothek 4175, fols. 79r-v: ‘ITEM. Exhiebat ur in conspectu episcopi patena et calix uaccus et dicit episcopus: Uide cuius ministerium tibi traditur. Et ideo si usque nunc fuisti tradus ad ecclesiam, a modo debes esse assiduus, si usque nunc somno lentus, a modo uigiles, si isque nunc ebriosus a modo sobrius, si usque nunc inhonestus, a modo castus. Oblationes quae ueniunt in altare, panes propositiones appellantur, de ipsis oblacionibus tantum debet in altare poni quantum populo possit sufficere, ne aliquid putritum in sacrario remaneat. Pallae uero quaesunt in substratorio in alio variae debent laui, in alio corporalis pallae. Ubi pallae corporalis lauate fuerint, nullum lenteamen ibidem aliud laui, ipsa aqua in baptisterio debet uergi, ideo te ammoneo tuitate exhibe ut deo placere possis, et tradet ei calicem et patenam. SEQUITUR. Si ad subdiaconatus officium eum uolerit prouocare adducitur ad medium et iurat cora sancta Christi quattuor euangelia de quattuor capitulis secundum canones. Et tunc porregit ei archidiaconus uel episcopus calicem sanctum in ulnis foris planeta et se in terra prosternet et dat orationem ut supradiximus. Deinde sequitur benedictionem: Oremus deum. Item alia: Domine sancte pater
Unsurprisingly, the deacon’s ordination is similar, with the Gelasian rubric, given, then SEQUITUR, then the OR XXXIV ordination of the deacon beginning ‘Et si ad diaconatus ordinem voluerit prouocare...’. Here one Gelasian prayer for the deacon is actually entered into the body of OR XXXIV, with his usual usque formulation, and the expectation that the rest would be said there too, since the ordo left a place for them ‘et reliqua’:

Expleta vero laetania surgent a terra et dat ei orationem consecrationis: Adesto quaesumus omnipotens deus honorum dator ordinum distributor, officiorumque dispositor usque potiora capere mereatur per dominum et reliqua. Dum uero consecratus fuerit dat osculum episcopo.

The priest’s ordination again follows the same pattern. The priest’s rubric ‘Presbyter cum ordinatur’, then SEQUITUR and the extract from OR XXXIV, ‘Si uero eum voluerit consecrare presbyterum’ and so on. Again, the compiler leaves space for the prayers from the sacramentary, here referring to it explicitly, in the body of his extract from OR XXXIV:

‘et ducit eum ad episcopum. Et consecrat eum presbyterum sicut sacramentorum continet. Haec expleta, dans osculum episcopi uel ceteris sacerdotibus.’

For the bishop, OR XXXIV offered a more extensive ceremonial over Saturday and Sunday. In Wolfenbüttel 4175, the Gelasian bishop’s rubric is given as usual (fol. 80v), ‘episcopus cum ordinatur’, and this extensive interpolation follows with the title SEQUITUR QUALITER EPISCOPUS ORDINATUR, which covers OR XXXIV n.14-45. The writer of Wolfenbüttel 4175 uses the Greek ἀνθρώπω in Greek capitals instead of ‘masculo’, for the prohibition of homosexuality. It is the only

---

774 Wolfenbüttel Herzog August Bibliothek 4175, fol.80: ‘But when the litany is finished they rise from the earth and he gives to him the prayer of consecration ‘Adesto quaesumus omnipotens deus honorum dator ordinum distributor, officiorumque dispositor’ until ‘potiora capere mereatur per dominum’ and the rest. But when he will have been consecrated, he gives a kiss to the bishop’

775 OR XXXIV, n.11-12, var.6, Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.606; ‘And he leads him to the bishop. And the priest consecrates him, as the sacramentary contains. When these are finished, he gives a kiss to the bishop and the other priests’
witness of OR XXXIV to do so.\textsuperscript{776} Again, space is made for the sacramentary’s prayers within the body of the borrowing from OR XXXIV, with an addition:

\begin{quote}

Completa uero letania, surgent et tunc benedicet eum \textit{sicut sacramentorum continet}.\textsuperscript{777}
\end{quote}

Thereafter, the text ends exactly as OR XXXIV does. This sequence of ordination is a highly interesting synthesis, showing that the insoluble gap between Roman and ‘Gallican’ rites simply assumed by most commentators could be bridged. The rites are not entirely coherent. It is quite unclear where exactly the ceremonies described by the Gelasian would fit in OR XXXIV’s ceremony. Are they alternatives, or is the Gelasian rite presented as the opening of the ceremony, or is it meant to be slotted in as the climax of the rite? The compiler seems determined to offer as total a narrative as he could, working from different books. Wolfenbüttel 4175 again proves that ordination remained fluid in the early ninth century. Many compilers, particularly those who made strides towards a more usable narrative of ordination, preferred the Gelasian rubrics and prayers, actively avoiding the Roman OR XXXIV. Some manuscripts, particularly those of Collection A, offered only OR XXXIV. Wolfenbüttel 4175 is one of two manuscripts that I know of which attempt something bolder, a synthesis of both traditions. The structure of Wolfenbüttel 4175’s ordination rite has some similarities with the ordination rite in Baturich’s \textit{Kollektar-Pontifikale}, Vienna Cod.Ser.n.2762.\textsuperscript{778}

Baturich’s version is somewhat more elegant, and that manuscript changes tack with the priest and bishop, there inserting wholly Frankish rites and leaving OR XXXIV. The idea of integrating OR XXXIV and the Gelasian, however, is clearly present in this manuscript as well, perhaps independently. In the light of Wolfenbüttel 4175, written perhaps 30 years earlier, the Vienna ordination sequence becomes a little less singular than it appears at first glance. Finally, Andrieu characterises the version

\textsuperscript{776} OR XXXIV, n.16, var.13, \textit{ibid.}, p.607.

\textsuperscript{777} OR XXXIV, n.40, var.40, \textit{ibid.}, p.613: ‘But when the litany is finished, they rise and then he blesses him, as the Sacramentary contains’.

\textsuperscript{778} Ut infra, pp.250-253.
of OR XXXIV used by the Wolfenbüttel scribe as a very early recension of that text, close to the earliest example in Collection A, BAV Pal.lat.487.779

The Final *Ordines*: OR XLII, XLI and XV

Another indication that Andrieu may have been mistaken to suppose Wolfenbüttel 4175 had Collection B before him is that, though he offers both church dedication *ordines* like that text, he does so in the opposite order, the Roman OR XLII appears first, and then the Frankish OR XLI appears afterward. The idea of combining Roman and indigenous Frankish church dedication rites was not unique to Collection B manuscripts: the unique text OR XLIII also took elements from both.780 Again, OR XLI’s recension is quite close to the partial Albi 42 example, so the two manuscripts are related in every single one of the four *ordines* they share.781 This implies that some kind of gathering of that four (OR I, OR XLI, and OR XXVI and OR XXVI) had at least some circulation. Again, this particular text of OR XLII itself is singular, with elements that neither Collection offers. I shall draw attention to a few

OR XLI, n.1, var.12 ‘Vadit episcopus in ecclesia ubi reliquiae sunt positaet facit laetaniam, et dat orationem hanc: Oremus. Aufer a nobis, domine, quaesumus, iniquitates nostras et ad sancta sanctorum puris mereamur mentibus introire. Per dominum. Item alia si vis. Fac nos domine, sanctorum tuorum auxilio specialiter dicata membra contingere, quorum cupimus patrocinia incessanter habere. Per dominum.’782

Albi and Wolfenbüttel both share this second prayer, so it may go back to an earlier, specific example of OR XLI (but is not given in Collection A or B versions of this text). This second prayer is to

---

782 *Ibid.*, p.397: ‘The bishop comes into the church where the relics are to be placed and he sings a litany, and gives this prayer: Oremus. Aufer a nobis, domine, quaesumus, iniquitates nostras et ad sancta sanctorum puris mereamur mentibus introire. Per dominum. Then another if you like. Fac nos domine sanctorum tuorum auxilio specialiter diacata membra contingere quorum cupimus patrocinia incessanter habere. Per dominum.’
be found, notably, in the *ordo* for dedicating churches in the Drogo Sacramentary, Paris.lat.9428, accompanied by the same first prayer ‘*Aufer a nobis*’.\(^{783}\)

Twice, the Wolfenbüttel scribe does something he is wont to do throughout the manuscript. Where the original OR XL either did not make it clear that one had to say in the name of the father, son and holy spirit, he has put in the exact words, repeated on each new occasion they are said.\(^{784}\)

He did something very similar in OR XI.

OR XLI, n.19 ‘Hoc peracto, canit scola antifonam ad introitum et, post Kyrieleison, dicitur *Gloria in excelsis Deo si tempus est, sin autem dicit orationem sicut Sacramentorum liber continet*’\(^{785}\)

Again, the compiler refers back to the Sacramentary, here dealing with an exigency also arising from use.

OR XLI, n.20, var.10 ‘Et postea per totam ebdomadam missa publica in ipsa ecclesia celebretur, usque octo dies completos (sic.). *Sciendum uero est ubi domnus apostolicus dedicat ecclesiam, praeter episcopos nulli licitum est infra ipsam ecclesiam missas celebrare*’.\(^{786}\)

This addition is made in a different coloured ink at the very end of the page, suggestive that the writer came back and added it afterwards, though it also received its rubricated letter. Therefore, while Andrieu wondered if it was genuine to the original disposition of OR XLII, it might belong

---

\(^{783}\) Pelt, *La liturgie*, p.92.

\(^{784}\) Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.IV, p.401: ‘OR XLI, n.13, var.2: ‘*Et ponitur TABULA. Ipsa namque tabula quam super reliquias poni debet antea confirmat ea cum chrisma in cruce ita dicendo: In nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti*’; OR XLI, n.14, var.13: ‘*Et postquam fuerit letania, facit crucem desuper dicendo sicut supra per quattuor angulos altaris, ipsa super scripta uerba verba dicendo et crucem faciendo. In nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti*’

\(^{785}\) Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.IV, p.402: ‘When this is done, the scola sings the introit antiphon and afterwards Kyrieleison, then the *Gloria in excelsis dei*, if it is the correct time. If not, he says a prayer as the Sacramentary contains’.

\(^{786}\) *Ibid.*, p.402: ‘And afterwards for the whole week a public mass is celebrated in that church, up until eight days are done. But it is known that when the lord apostolic has dedicated a church, no one except bishops is licensed within that church to celebrate masses’.
amidst the various appendices and notes the compiler seems to have had at his disposal. Like some of them, this one adds a further Roman embellishment to the source, by mentioning the Pope himself dedicating the church. The Pope is not the celebrant in the rest of the *ordo*, and this extract underlines his liturgical authority and special position by forbidding normal priests to celebrate masses (presumably only in the eight days concerned) in a church he has consecrated. This, again, becomes significant in the picture the whole manuscript offers.

While OR XLI, here offered after OR XLII, has some divergences from Collections A and B as well, they are mostly covered by Langlois.\(^7\) As above, he showed convincingly that Wolfenbüttel 4175 offered an ‘older’ version of the text It was the authors of Collection B, for example, who added the *Denuntiatio* at the beginning. One matter of interest is the title, here *ITEM ORDO ANTIQUA AD ECCLESIAM DEDICANDAM*, specifically contrasting an *ordo romanus*, OR XLII, with an *ordo antiqua*, and thereby perhaps showing some awareness of the text’s non-Roman pedigree. According to Langlois, the majority of Wolfenbüttel’s differences from Collection B are also present in the other example he surveyed, so they are not interpolations by the scribe himself.

The final *ordo romanus* in this fascinating collection is OR XV, or select extracts from it. This text, in its full form found in St Gall 349 is that curious narrative of the entire liturgical year, entitled the *Capitulare Ecclesiastici Ordinis*.\(^8\) A number of manuscripts took pieces or parts from it, Montpellier cod.412, Collection A, has nn.1-85, the canonical collection in three manuscripts has nn.1-75, and Wolfenbüttel 4175 has two pieces, nn.66-71, and nn.79-84. As Andrieu reconstructs it, there were three lines of recension of this text: St Gall 349 represents one, the Montpellier manuscript with the three canonical collections is the second family, and Wolfenbüttel 4175 represents a significantly different recension from either, ‘the most developed’ according to Andrieu.\(^9\) But first, what do these pieces of OR XV narrate, and why did the author choose them?

---

Firstly, they seem to have been added after the rest of the *ordines romani*, by a very similar hand, if not the same one as the main body of the text. They are in a differently coloured ink, and this hand has to draw in his own capitals, rather than relying on a rubricator. This suggests that the author found this *ordo* in a separate place, and perhaps felt it had something to add to the ‘pontifical’ already elaborated. He does not add any title. The *Capitulare* narrates the whole liturgical year, meaning it crosses over with other *ordines* significantly, which the Wolfenbüttel scribe seems to have noted and made sure to avoid. The first part he avoided, OR XV nn.12-65, deals with the pontifical mass of Christmas, but this narrative is substantially based on OR I. He took up the pen at n.66, where the *ordo* begins to describe the Christmas Octave, and liturgical performance from then until Epiphany. The descriptions are terse, but again mainly deal with chant and readings in general, without specific indications. At Epiphany itself, this is n.69, fasts and masses are prescribed, and then ‘in the middle of the night they enter to vigils’ and sing psalms and readings and responses. 790

OR XV, nn.70-71 ‘Expletis igitur nocturnis seu et matutinis mox cum cereis et candelabris seu et turabulis, cantando *Te Deum laudamus*, ad fontem ueniunt. Hoc finitum, incipient letania, id est *Christi audí nos*, et reliqua. *Et benédicit fontes sicut mos est.*

*Baptismo expleto, ingrediuntur ad missas et finiatur ad ipsum diem pertinentem ordine suo.* 791

In OR XV, as presented in the other manuscripts, baptism at Epiphany was given its own narrative here, based on OR XI and the Sacramentary of Gellone. In their detail, this short narrative essentially repeated much of what the Wolfenbüttel scribe had already written. The Wolfenbüttel scribe has chosen to abbreviate the text significantly to ‘sicut mos est’, and ‘Baptismum expleto’, so as not to

791 *Ibid.*, pp.110-111: ‘But therefore when nocturns and matins are finished, at once with candles and candelabrae and alsothuribles, while singing *Te Deum laudamus*, they come to the fonts. When this is done, they begin a litany, that is *Christi audí nos* and the rest. And he blesses the font as is custom. When the baptism is finished, they enter to masses and complete what pertains to this day, in its order’.
repeat himself. Baptism at Epiphany was a great curiosity in OR XV, since it was not only non-Roman, but canonically forbidden by authorities both papal (decretals of Siricius, Leo I and Gelasius I) and Gallican (the councils of Mâcon and Auxerre, both around the year 585, forbade baptism except at Easter). It is possible the Wolfenbüttel author pruned back the narrative of baptism here, aware of how controversial it might be. There is also a curious marginal note with signa exactly at this point, which Andrieu did not record.

Wolfenbüttel cod.4175, fol.86v: ‘+ presbiteri uicarii non romani(?) +’.

The two obelus signs seem to be referring to the sentence which is right next to them ‘Expletis igitur’ until ‘ad fontes’ in the manuscript. Traditionally, and it is likely here too, the obelus marked out passages that were suspect or spurious. It would not be surprising if the compiler found the reference to baptism on Epiphany unusual. This is, notably, the only time he uses such signa or makes an intervention of this kind. If indeed the abbreviation ‘non rom’ means non romani, that would also have some relevance for the text nearby. It is less clear why the text speaks of ‘vicar priests’.

Once the Epiphany baptism narrative was completed, the Wolfenbüttel scribe took up the text again, at OR XV, n.79 and continued the ordo until n.85. This part began at the Purification of Mary, or Candlemas, at the second of February, and covered the customs of Lent. At n.85, however, began a narrative of the Lenten scrutinies, substantially based on OR XI, so the compiler again avoided repeating himself by ending it here. The Montpellier example (a manuscript also containing OR XI), also ends at this point, suggesting that it was common practice to use OR XV to describe some feasts that the usual ordines romani did not, i.e. Christmas through Lent, but to dispense with rituals already described. Both Montpellier and Wolfenbüttel agree on certain aspects against the St

Gallen example, including some fascinating references to stations at Roman churches, but the Wolfenbüttel also has some substantial material of its own. As regards Candlemas, Andrieu’s apparatus shows three layers of development, with the Wolfenbüttel manuscript being the most elaborated of all:

OR XV, n.79 ‘Postea quidem die secondo mense februario Ypapanti, quod est IIII nonas ipsius mensis, colleguntur omnes tam clerus romanae ecclesiae quam et omnes monachi monasteriorum cum omni populo suburbano seu et copiosa multitude peregrinorum de quacumque provintia congregate, venientes ad ecclesiam beati Adriani mane prima et acippiunt de manu pontificis unusquis cereum unum tam uiri quam feminae simulque cum infantibus et senibus, omnes conlaudent nomen domini et accendentibus cereis portantibus in manibus unusquis in ordine suo quo militant, antiphonam cantando in processione, sicut continet antephonarius praecedentibus ante domino apostolico septem candelabra cum cereis seu et turabula cum thymiama et accensis lampadibus ante unusuisque domnum ante pontificem procedunt omnes cum magna reverentia ad sanctam Mariam maiorem, et ibidem devotissime missas celebrentur’ 793

Montpellier and Wolfenbüttel each offer this part of the text, in contrast to St Gallen 349’s very brief summary of the celebrations of Candlemas, for which see Andrieu. Referring to Candlemas by the Greek name as ‘Ypopanti’, which St Gallen does not, was known in Francia, for example by Amalarius. 794 The part in bold is only in Wolfenbüttel 4175. Montpellier narrates the same

793 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.II, pp.113-114: ‘But afterwards, on that day in the second month February of Candlemas, which is the fourth nones of that month, both all the clerics of the Roman church and also all the monks of monasteries, with all the suburban populace and a copious multitude of pilgrims from every province congregate, coming to the church of Saint Adrian first thing in the morning and they take from the hand of the pontiff, each, one candle each for the men and women with the children and elderly, together they all praise the name of the Lord, and, having lit the candles, each carries them in their hands in their order as they march like soldiers, singing an antiphon in procession, as the antiphonary contains and there have processed before the apostolic lord seven candelabras with candles and thuribles with incense and, having lit lights before each home, everyone processes before the pontiff with great reverence to Saint Maria Maggiore, and there with the greatest devotion masses are celebrated.’; Also Semmler (ed.), ‘Ordines aevi regulae mixtae’, pp.68-70; Häußling, Mönchskonvent, p.70.
information essentially, but the reference to the antiphonary, for example, is unique to Wolfenbüttel, as is the specification that the people would together praise the name of the Lord. Montpellier and Wolfenbüttel are again identical after it, with the description of the procession and masses. This vivid and charming picture of Candlemas in Rome was obviously added early in the transmission of OR XV, but was not original to it. It was therefore added by a Frank, since OR XV is Frankish, not by a Roman. It could be based on a Roman text circulating in Francia, but I would incline to see it as a Frankish narrative based on vocabulary, for example *candelabra* rather than *cereostata.* It was perhaps based on observation of the Roman ceremony. In any case, the Wolfenbüttel compiler did briefly elaborate it here, and in his usual way, referring to an *antephonarius* in the process.

At n.80 the same three layers of the text, represented by St Gallen, Montpellier and Wolfenbüttel are again visible, here when describing Septuagesima

OR XV, n.80 ‘Deinde septuagesimo die ante pascha, dominica tamen ingredi
septuagesima apud eos celebratur, *ita ut in psalmis matutinis nocturnis horis sine cessatione simul cum responsories uel antiphonis, cantatur Alleluia. Ad missas uero iam tractus usque ad pascha dicetur.* Hoc enim faciunt pro reverentia tante festiuitatis uel pro eruditionem populi’

Again, what is in bold is unique to the Wolfenbüttel compiler. Yet again the compiler offers some clarification about when exactly the Alleluia was to be chanted during the year. The *ordo* continues through Lent, and the celebrations at Sexagesima, Quinquagesima, and Quadragesima Sunday, as well as the thirtieth, twentieth, fifteenth and eighth day before Easter. These were ancient

---

796 Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.II, p.114: ‘Then the seventieth day before Easter, Sunday having begun however, Septuagesima among them is celebrated, thus so that in the psalms of the hours of matins and nocturnes, without ceasing, as with the responsories and antiphons, Alleluia is to be sung. But at masses the tract is to be said until Easter. They do this for reverence of such a feast and for the edification of the people’.
denominations of Lent, found in the *comes* of Wurzburg. Both Montpellier and Wolfenbüttel carry a particularly interesting interpolation, not in St Gallen 349, at OR XV, n.81, discussing how this set-up encourages people to abstain more and more fervently from any iniquity to be worthy of communing at Easter, and a second at OR XXV, n.82 which adds that only the vulgar people fast from Quadragesima.

Afterwards, Wolfenbüttel diverges very significantly at Ash Wednesday:

OR XV, n.83 ‘Primum autem ieiunium III feria ad sanctam Savinam publicae agitur cum cruce et turabulis simul cum laetaniis, id est post Lma et ante XLma, necnon et VI feria similiter faciunt ieiunium publica.’

Both Montpellier and St Gallen address this feast in similar terms, but they do not mention the station at Santa Sabina, and their instructions for how to locate it are less precise. Nor do they specify the public fast on Friday. Again, this may be a Roman fragment unique to Wolfenbüttel, but the information that the station was at Santa Sabina can be easily found in almost any Frankish Sacramentary, and the idea that the Friday was a fast day too is in a prayer for that day. Gellone even renders the church SANCTAM SAVINAM just like our own text.

OR XV, n.84 ‘In XLma uero, prima ebdomada, si in mense martio uenerit, III et VI feria seu et sabbato, omnes publicas stationes faciunt ad Sanctum Petrum in XII lectionibus.

---

799 Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.II, p.115: ‘But the first fast is done publicly on Wednesday at Santa Sabina (!) with a cross and thuribles, similarly with litanies, that is after Quinquagesima and before Quadgrasima, and also on Friday they similarly do a public fast.’
801 Dumas (ed.), *Gellonensis*, 51, p.35: ‘XLVIII. CAPUT DE IEIUNIIS. STATIO AD SANCTA SAVINAM.'
Sin autem minime in martio mense prima ebdomada uenerit, in alia uel tertia ebdomada quando pontifex iudicauerit, XII lectiones agenda sunt et ordinantur qui ordinandi sunt.802

All three manuscripts differ in how they render the Ember Day of Lent, reflecting the contemporary difficulty with the dating. There are some complications here. Only Wolfenbüttel gives the idea that the station was ‘at Saint Peter’s’. These additions seem to show the scribe’s particular fascination with the stational system in Rome, which may also explain his copying of the Easter Vespers, for example, with their stational indications. But here the compiler appears to suggest that all three of the days, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday, had stations at Saint Peter’s, which was not true, and he seems to put them all under the formula ‘in XII lectionibus’, when that title, like the station at St Peter’s, properly belonged only to the Saturday. This latter error seems to come from copying from the Sacramentary, see again Gellone which gives SABBATO AD SANCTUM PETRUM IN XII LECTIONES, exactly the same formula as our scribe uses.803 Here, we can see the scribe checking where the station was in his Sacramentary, and inadvertently copying the whole formula. IN XII LECTIONES, originally referring to the six-fold Greek and Latin readings in Rome on Saturday, had become a totemic title to this Frank, and, in confusion, he applied it to all three dates. Both Montpellier and St Gallen make the distinction much clearer.804 As above, the Romans had the Spring Ember Day always falling in the first week of Lent, whether that was in March or not, it was the Franks who decided that it had to come in March in preference. Therefore, this note is entirely a Frankish invention.

Just before OR XV draws to its end in Wolfenbüttel, there is another appendix, again dealing with the chant of the Alleluia:

802 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.II, p.115-116: ‘But in the first week of Lent, if it should come in the month of March, the Wednesday and Friday and also the Saturday, everyone should do public stations at Saint Peter’s, in 12 readings, But it the first week should not fall in the month of March at all, in the next or the third week when the pontiff judges it, the 12 readings are to be done and those who are to be ordained are ordained’.
804 OR XV, n.84: ‘iterum quarta et sexta feria seu et sabbatum staciones publicas faciunt, et ieiunium et XII lectiones in ipso sabbato consumantur.’
Once more the writer shows himself fascinated by the changes during the year in whether the Alleluia was chanted or not, but here he even shows himself something of a musical theorist, or a symbolist at the very least! This was not an uncommon interpretation for the suppression of Alleluia in Lent, but it has a distinctively personal ring, particularly in the midst of an *ordo romanus*, traditionally of such a detached tone. Many of the Wolfenbüttel scribe’s additional notes read like this, either personally addressed to the reader, via the imperative, or with the sustained preoccupation with the Alleluia, or the repeated use of participles of *scio: sciens* twice and *sciendum* once. The addition of this part of OR XV, therefore, rounds up the narrative of the year given by this manuscript, with some new guidance for parts of the liturgical year which the *ordines* did not cover, Christmas to Lent, including key festivals Epiphany, Candlemas and the Spring Ember Day, with significant guidance on how Lent affected liturgical performance. One can only see the addition of this rare segment as a further attempt by the reader to create a more completely formed episcopal guidebook, including liturgical guidance for as much of the year as he could find. This is what Andrieu

---

805 Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.II, p.116: ‘But from the Alleluia praise should everyone honourably refrain from the beginning of Quinquagesima until the vigil of Holy Easter, just as also by everybody from the vigil of Easter until Pentecost by every Christian through the whole world, Alleluia without ceasing is given forth, so that, just as it is said, it is to be observed during those days, so that on the day of Holy Easter the voice of the Bride should be new and the voice of praise just like the resurrection of the Lord, so that everyone might pray with one voice that our evil vices may be buried through baptism in death, so that we may walk in a new life, and with him reach to eternal joy’.
characterised as his ‘timid sketch of the future pontifical’, though I do not see it as timid by any means!

While Langlois saw the compiler of Wolfenbüttel 4175 as an antiquarian, and Andrieu wondered if some of the distinctive aspects of his recensions of the *ordines romani* went back to now lost originals, a sustained examination of the whole manuscript has revealed that the hand of the compiler is quite consistent. One of the most coherent goals is the addition of texts from beyond the *ordo romanus*: primarily these are prayers taken from the Sacramentary, almost certainly a Gelasian of the eighth century. He adds these prayers in a form that is wholly personal and unattested elsewhere, with an *incipit* that goes on for longer than the traditional format, then *usque*, then the end of the prayer as well. Thus, his goals are similar to Collection B. Less often, but still consistently, he adds antiphons and readings, using his evident access to an Antiphonary and Evangeliary as well. Additionally, he often refers more indirectly to these books. Where original *ordines* did not often repeat the spoken words of the ceremony, the formulae in OR XI, or the invocation of the Trinity in OR XLII, the Wolfenbüttel compiler prefers that the words be repeated anew each time. Both of these tendencies offer a more complete narrative of the rituals, as aides to the performance of it. The Wolfenbüttel compiler also often responds to questions that would arise in the course of the performance by a Frank, such as how the Frankish episcopal blessing would be introduced, or what times of year one was supposed to genuflect during prayer. His addition of OR XXV with the *exultet* would also answer similar questions arising from OR XXIV. He shows particular care, throughout, in both appendices and interpolations, for the chant of the Alleluia. He had access to at least one rare and Roman source on Vespers chants, but most of his interpolations about the Alleluia seem to be his own writing, perhaps based on observation of the practice with which he was familiar, but Frankish in any case. All of this would encourage us to see the manuscript, as Vogel and Andrieu do, as a pontifical, a manuscript designed explicitly for the hands of a bishop. Andrieu himself personally refers Wolfenbüttel 4175 forward to the *ordo romanus antiquus*, the work at the heart of the PRG, suggesting the project here was framed in similar terms, ‘of an identical
character’. Vogel even calls Wolfenbüttel 4175 a pontifical ‘purer’ than the Pontifical Romano-Germanique, since he thought that its content was solely liturgical where the manuscripts placed under the PRG banner also contain liturgical expositiones and other material. Here, Vogel was led to an error by Andrieu.

Outside the Ordines Romani: Papal Writings

Another tendency in the manuscript is consistent attention to Roman custom, even apart from the Greek credo, Easter Vespers, and OR XXXIV. The compiler makes three unique references to the stations, Easter at Santa Maria ad presepio with the same practice ad reliquias stationes, Santa Sabina on Ash Wednesday and Saint Peter’s in XII lectionibus. At the end of OR XLII, he has a unique reference to the prerogative of the Pope. These small notes acquire even greater significance when we come, at last, to the content of the original manuscript which is not ordines romani. The pontifical in the narrow ‘pure’ sense conceived by Vogel and Andrieu, was not supposed to have non-liturgical content, but this manuscript has highly significant material discussing rather than describing the liturgy, and it is all writings of the Popes. Therefore, even by their own measure, Wolfenbüttel 4175 is not as ‘purer’ as Andrieu or Vogel supposed; both of them were looking only at fols. 42v-88v, and a significant portion of these papal writings are in fols.25-41, now established as part of the original manuscript. The ‘pure’ pontifical that they imagined before its contamination by non-liturgical material, was fantasy, and was never a goal of any early medieval compiler. Returning to these papal writings, we have already seen significant interventions of scribes who insert writings and names of popes into their liturgical manuscripts, such as: the capitula of Gregory attached to the ordo de sacris ordinibus, the denuntiatio of Gregory the Great found in Cologne 138, Sylvester being attributed the seven regions in Munich Clm 14510, the quotation from the homily of Pope Gregory in OR XVII or the reference to the ‘missal’ of Gregory in Paris lat.12405, or the answers given by Andrieu, Les Ordines Romani, vol.I, p.490: ‘La tentative du moine de Wissembourg n’atteint pas la perfection. Au siècle suivant un autre liturgiste rhénan, sollicité par les même préoccupations, produira une oeuvre plus vast, mais de caractère identique, l’Ordo romanus antiquus’.

Vogel, Medieval Liturgy, p.277.
Hadrian in OR XXIX. The writing of the Pope in these examples validated or consolidated the liturgical content. At the very least, it associated the religious authority of Rome and of certain named Popes with the ordines romani, a group of liturgical texts which had no certain named authority behind them. The lack of a named authority in the ordines romani was something of a problem for the Carolingians, who were accustomed to look to authority for validation of a text’s ‘correctness’. These anxieties can be seen in Amalarius’ confusion about who wrote the ordines romani, or in Florus of Lyon’s response to him.808

This is most straightforwardly shown in the text found in the middle of the ordines romani, Pope Gelasius’ de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis or the Decretum Gelasianum.809 This ‘decretal’ was probably not the work of Pope Gelasius (492-496), and is probably from the sixth century. But it was perceived as Gelasius’ work by many Carolingian authors, and so it is here entitled: INCIPIT DE DECRETALE DE RECIPIENDIS ET NON RECIPIENDIS LIBRIS QUI SCRIPTI SUNT A GELASIO PAPA CUM LXX ERUDITISSIMIS UIRIS EPISCOPIS IN SEDE APOSTOLICA URBIS ROMAE.810 Simply enough, it sets out the canon of Holy Scripture, also giving, in a separate section, the apocrypha. With clear logic, this decretum is placed after OR XIIIA, the ordo of readings. This gives Gelasius’ seal of approval to the arrangement of books that was echoed in OR XIIIA, now spread throughout the year. Since one was authoritative, the other could be too. This text also presented the Roman church’s authority as the Carolingians perceived it, with the Petrine commission and the Pope’s authority to judge. Such a text made a reader consider Rome’s authority in liturgical matters, and drew him into the atmosphere of Rome’s historical importance; this would have consequences for how he perceived the liturgical texts enclosing the Decretum.

808 Ut infra, pp.224-225.
809 Edited by Ernst von Dobschütz, Das Decretum Gelasianum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis (Leipzig, 1912).
810 Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek 4175, fol.72v: ‘The decretal concerning the books to be received and those not to be received which was written by Pope Gelasius with seventy learned bishops in the apostolic see of the city of Rome’.
Folios 25-41, from the beginning of the original manuscript, present a number of other pseudonymous writings of Popes, as well as one genuine decretal of Pope Gregory the Great.

Coming first, thus setting the scene for the reading of the entire text was a letter, entitled IN CHRISTI NOMINI CLEMENS AD IACOBUM FRATRUM DOMINI DE OBITU BEATISSIMI PETRI APOSTOLI ET DE ORDINATIONE SUA HANC SCRIPSIT EPISTOLAM ITINERIAM F(ELICITER).

This is, the apocryphal letter from Pope Clement, the successor of Saint Peter, to James of Jerusalem, brother of Christ, a quite ancient document which formed part of the so-called Clementine Homilies. The letter encloses a quasi-liturgical discourse of Peter as he selects his successor:

Wherefore I communicate to him the power of binding and loosing, so that with respect to everything which he shall ordain in the earth, it shall be decreed in the heavens. For he shall bind what ought to be bound, and loose what ought to be loosed, as knowing the role of the Church.

Afterwards, Peter lays hands on Clement and leads him to sit in his ‘cathedra’. The interest of this text for the question of papal authority and papal history in Rome are both obvious, but one must also note that it presents a kind of ‘mirror’ of episcopal ordination, highly idealised. Peter gives a long discourse, comprising most of the letter, on the duties and responsibilities of the bishop, within the church, and those of a priest and deacon as well. If we see this text as a pontifical, the property and plan of a bishop, the place of this text within that becomes obvious.

Now, on fol.35r begins another, shorter letter of Pseudo-Clement to James: ITEM EPISTOLA EIUSDEM CLEMENTIS PONTIFICIS URBIS ROMAE AD EUNDEM IACOBUM FRATREM DOMINI

---

812 PL 130, cols.19-27B.
813 PL 130, col.20 C ‘Propter quod ipsi trado a Domino mihi traditam potestatem ligandi et solvendi, ut de omnibus quibuscumque decreverit in terris hoc decretum sit et in coelis. Ligabit enim quod oportet ligari, et solvet quod expediat solvi, tanquam qui ad liquidum Ecclesiae regulam noverit’.
KIEROSOLYMORUM CIUITATE EPISCOPO KARISSIMO.⁸¹⁴ Again this is pseudonymous, perhaps later than the first letter, and not a part of the Clementine homilies, but here the two letters are associated.⁸¹⁵ Both of these letters were incorporated in the Pseudo-Isidorian decretsals. This letter again presents itself as decrees overheard from Peter himself, this time Peter discusses matter of obvious liturgical usefulness: the grades of the church, and sacred vessels and vestments.

Then on fol.37v, is a direct extract from the Liber Pontificalis, only about a folio in length, comprising that text’s vita of Pope Clement himself, entitled DE LIBRO EPISCOPALE.⁸¹⁶ The extract in question is a summary, how long Clement reigned, that he wrote books and was martyred, wrote two ‘Catholic epistles’, and that he appointed notarii to care for the seven regions of Rome and he performed a number of ordinations in December. The latter is the common formula of the Liber Pontificalis. The text of the Liber Pontificalis vouchsafes the authority of at least one of the two preceding letters ‘you will find in the letter written to James how the church was entrusted to him by Peter’.⁸¹⁷ It is possible, therefore, that the text was found in the same exemplar as the letters. In this context, it seems to present a similar kind of mirror for a bishop, as an ideal portrait of a Pope with some small details of Roman liturgical custom and topographical features.⁸¹⁸ As such, it resonates with surrounding and succeeding details in the manuscript to create an even stronger ‘evocation’ of Rome and papal prestige.

On fol.38v, there is another short papal text, but here Wolfenbüttel 4175 is a very significant witness. This is entitled INQUISITIO BEATI DAMASI PAPAE URBIS ROMAE AD KIERONIMUM (sic.)

---

⁸¹⁴ Wolfenbüttel Herzog August Bibliothek 4175, fol.35r: ‘THEN THE EPISTLE OF THE SAME CLEMENT, PONTIFF OF THE CITY OF ROME, TO THE SAME JAMES, BROTHER OF LORD, BELOVED BISHOP OF THE CITY OF JERUSALEM’.

⁸¹⁵ PL 130, cols.37-44.


⁸¹⁷ Wolfenbüttel 4175, fol.38r ‘Tamen in epistola quae ad iacobum scriptum est qualiter ei a beato petro commissa est ecclesia’.

⁸¹⁸ McKitterick, ‘Perceptions carolingiennes’, pp.92-95; Giorgia Vocino ‘Bishops in the Mirror: From self-representation to episcopal model: the case of the eloquent bishops, Ambrose of Milan and Gregory the Great’, in Meens et al. (ed.), Religious Franks, pp.331-349 on some similar cases; also Brand, Holy Treasure and Sacred Song, pp.24-25 on how the Liber Pontificalis played this very role in Lucca.
Reynolds prepared an edition of this text’s various incarnations, and this example represents the earliest recension, what he calls the ‘short correspondence form with brief conclusion’. However, Reynolds was not aware of this manuscript in particular. His earliest example is Stuttgart *Württembergische Landesbibliothek* HB VI 113, from Chur (8th/9th C), and there are two more ninth-century examples, one from Regensburg of 826-828, and one of St Gallen of the final third of the ninth century. Therefore the Wolfenbüttel manuscript has one of the earliest witnesses, unknown to Reynolds. Wolfenbüttel 4175 would also accord with an origin point for this text in ‘Southern Germany or the Rhaetian Alps’. There are some significant differences in the Wolfenbüttel text from the edited form offered by Reynolds, including a more correct grammar which implies the attention of a conscientious editor. Essentially, the text comprises the short request of Pope Damasus asking Jerome what times it was lawful to celebrate mass. In response, Jerome appealed to a canon of the Council of Nicaea (of which we have no knowledge, if it ever existed), that mass was not to be celebrated on Sunday after the third hour. This is an attempt to reckon with the rather confusing decision attributed to Pope Telesphorus in the *Liber Pontificalis*. This text therefore directly concerned liturgical functions, and thus comfortably fits into the pontifical framework this manuscript is building, but it also continues the variation on the theme of Papal Rome, and papal authority. The title opening Damasus’ extremely short letter is in *capitalis*, while Jerome’s reply is entitled only in small rubrics (in Stuttgart MS, both letters have titles the same size), drawing great attention to the supposed papal element at play here.

At the bottom of the same folio, fol. 38v, begins the final papal text before we come to the *ordines*, but perhaps the most significant. This is entitled *incipit decretum beati Gregorii papae*

---

819 Wolfenbüttel, fol.38v ‘THE INQUIRY OF BLESSED POPE DAMASUS OF THE CITY OF ROME TO JEROME THE PRIEST’.
URBIS ROMAE AD CLERICUM IN BASILICA BEATI PETRI APOSTOLI. This was the decretal of Pope Gregory’s 595 council in Rome. Significantly, from its title, it situates itself in the topography of the city, and the introduction relates that the council took place ‘before the most holy body of blessed Peter’, as well. This council issued six decrees, rounded up to seven and each neatly numbered in our manuscript: settling the role of deacons in the Roman church, who was allowed to enter the cubiculi of the Pope, those who unlawfully presumed to ecclesiastical titles (and bishops to punish those who did so—which our manuscript makes a separate decree), that the Pope’s funeral bier should not be veiled, against the exchange of goods for ecclesiastical titles and finally on the process of slaves becoming monks. Some of these decrees did not apply outside Rome, but issues of ordination and simony were probably just as vital to the Carolingian bishop as they were in sixth-century Rome. Of some significance are the subscriptions which follow. Gregory’s own name is given in red capitals, and there follow the various bishops who attended in minuscule. The 35 titular priests who attended give their names and the churches they served. This was usual practice in council records. But our manuscript has only this single council text, and OR I opens on just the next page and throws the reader into liturgical enactment of Rome’s customs and topography. There are also the various notes on the stations added by our reader’s own pen. In this context, this careful list of Rome’s most significant churches takes on a particular power to evoke the city and inform the reader about it.

Obviously, the compiler had available a significant stack of Roman decretals and letters, some real, some perhaps pseudonymous, with potentially a copy of the Liber Pontificalis as well, and he chose a number of texts to open his pontifical. They all share a focus on the role of the bishop, liturgical and otherwise, through their presentation of the Popes, bishops par excellence and those from whom the authority of the bishop ‘to bind and loose’ ultimately descended. The other facet is

826 PL 77, cols.1334-1339.
827 PL 77, col.1334: ‘coram sanctissimo beati Petri corpore’.
their fixation on Rome itself and Rome’s urban space. Peter is a constant presence, his martyrdom and passing of his authority in Clement’s letters, and in Clement’s own Vita, and his body is evoked in his own basilica in Gregory’s council. These formidable statements certainly encouraged a reader to perceive the liturgy that followed, marked in its own way by the names of Rome’s churches and stations, as uniquely authoritative by virtue of association with that topography. I must stress again that this forceful intent seemingly did not derail the scribe’s significant alterations, including the insertion of Frankish customs, notably in ordination, the blessing of the Paschal Candle and so on. He could hold both a strong devotion to Rome’s urban setting and traditions, and a pragmatism about how to deal with gaps in the record.

One more text serves the same function. It is on the verso side of the folio which contains the end of OR XV and the alleluia appendix (88v). This text is entitled INCIPIT PROLOGUS, and it is the poem ‘Gregorius praesul’. This is a meditation on the virtues and wisdom of Pope Gregory, received in Francia as Gregory the Great (particularly in a manuscript like this one). The poem probably originally concerned Gregory II. The version here is almost identical to that found in the late eighth-century Italian manuscript, Lucca Biblioteca Capitolare 490. This manuscript also carries the famous copy of the Liber Pontificalis used by Duchesne, and a very early antiphoner. The poem Gregorius Praesul describes Gregory as a creator of musical books for liturgical usages:

‘Then he (Gregory) composed for the scola cantorum this booklet//with which are chanted spiritual songs in a reciprocal manner to Christ, their God//=while the priest pours

828 HERE BEGINS THE PROLOGUE.
830 For the manuscript: Luigi Schiaparelli, Il codice 490 e la scuola scrittoria lucchese (sec.viii-ix), Studi e Testi 36 (Vatican City, 1924); on the poem, Joseph Gajard and André Mocquereau (eds), Paléographie Musicale, Les Principaux Manuscrits du Chant, vol. II (Tournai, 1891), p.19, n.2, with a plate, pl.3; MGH Poetae IV, 2-3, pp.1069-70.
out the holy offerings of the poet//let the antiphons strike the ears with sweet harmonies//let the ring of the psalms sound out from the chorus and in two parts’.\textsuperscript{832}

In the Wolfenbüttel manuscript, the poem ends about two thirds of the way through, compared to the Lucca example. It doubtless was completed on the next, now lost folio. Given that the title of our version is INCIPIT PROLOGUS, one might wonder if something originally came after it, now lost, but there remains no evidence and the poem is partial.\textsuperscript{833} As it is, the poem probably simply acted as another evocation of a famous Pope, Gregory the Great. There are poems about Saint Peter in the other sections of the manuscript now in Wolfenbüttel produced in the same centre, and the historical texts found in the ‘Pontifical’ all have the papacy as a reference, so this is likely sufficient to explain the text’s presence.

Conclusion: The Pontifical of Bernhar of Worms?

With all this in mind, we cannot but envisage Wolfenbüttel 4175’s project as the creation of some kind of ‘definitive’ liturgy, a complete account of everything the celebrating pontiff would require. The early date of the manuscript is revelatory about the capacity for Carolingians, from the very beginning, to engage in a highly self-conscious way with their material. It goes further than Collection B on almost every matrix, but the animating principle is similar, particularly to Cologne 138. That manuscript had added a selection of antiphons ‘\textit{ad reliquias deducendas’}, as well as Leonine \textit{denuntiatii} for the Ember Days, both recalling similar interventions made by Wolfenbüttel 4175. Both manuscripts also powerfully evoked Rome, with Cologne 138’s ordination of the pope, but also adding particular notes about Rome’s topography and unique ecclesiastical positions and customs as they did so. They both added OR III, for example, but Cologne 138’s additions concerning cardinal priests are of a similar nature to Wolfenbüttel 4175’s stational notes. Cologne 138 had

\textsuperscript{832} Wolfenbüttel 4175, fol.88v ‘Dum composuit scola cantorum huncque libellum//Qui reciproca deo moduletur carmina Christo//Quando sacer sacraque libans libamina uatis//Dulcibus antiphone pulsent concentibus aures//classibus et geminis psalmorum concrepet oda.’

\textsuperscript{833} Butzmann, \textit{Kataloge}, p.261 thought so: ‘\textit{Introductio zu einem Graduale oder Antiphoner’}, but the poem is not necessarily attached to an antiphoner in most witnesses so it is unlikely.
formidable ongoing influence, on Paris lat.14008, and on the manuscripts under the title *Pontifical Romano-Germanique*. The ‘Wolfenbüttel collection’ of *ordines* leaves almost no trace outside it. This is likely because Cologne 138 remained easier to use and copy, particularly on ordination. OR XXXIV was unwieldy; sticking it in pieces within the framework of the *ordo de sacris ordinibus* made it even more difficult to understand. For Cologne 138 and the other manuscripts of Collection B, merely the rubrics of the *ordo de sacris ordinibus* sufficed. Elsewhere I have looked at dynamics of completeness and self-sufficiency. As it turned out, Cologne 138 was self-sufficient, even without the Greek *credo*, or OR XXXIV. Wolfenbüttel 4175 was the product of, and intended for, someone highly practised and able with liturgy, to whom the mass of Roman material would speak but who could tease out what was intended for him to ‘perform’, someone expert in liturgical performance on the cathedral setting.

While the manuscript ended up in Wissembourg, this is one manuscript that it is difficult to imagine outside the hands of a bishop. The weight of evidence seems to suggest a highly self-conscious liturgical performer, aware of difficulties arising from the performance of the ordines and with significant familiarity with Roman texts, if not with Rome itself, wanting to create a book that summarised his duties and responsibilities. This bishop was also highly conscious of his role and standing, and related himself directly and strongly to the papacy. Like Baturich’s *Kollektar-Pontifikale* it only later come back to the monastery from a bishop’s cathedral. Baturich’s text ended up bound in manuscripts from Mondsee. Analogy with Baturich’s *Kollektar-Pontifikale*, the only manuscript which presents a similar daring, is suggestive of a see with a similarly powerful incumbent. Greek was sung there, as it was, for example in Metz on Holy Saturday.834

Bischoff suggested Worms, close to both Metz and Wissembourg, principally because the cathedral there was dedicated to Saint Peter. The poems of Saint Peter in the first and third sections of the manuscript, Wolfenbüttel 4175, as it stands now, as well as the letters of Pseudo-Clement in

the *ordo romanus* part, might imply the attention of an incumbent of a cathedral of Saint Peter. Worms was under the jurisdiction of the archdiocese of Mainz. If the manuscript was created for Worms cathedral, the bishop in question would most likely be Bernhar of Worms (803-826). Bernhar was firmly tied to the royal family, just like Ratold and Baturich. He was brother of the wife of Einhard, Emma, and perhaps even a relative of Charlemagne. He attended the councils of Mainz in 813, which treated baptism *secundum ordo romanus* and the apostolic succession of bishops, subjects with which the Wolfenbuttel text is closely concerned. He was also, and this is highly suggestive, abbot of Wissembourg from 811! After his death, the pontifical might have passed to the monastery in which he was abbot. Bernhar was sent to Rome in 809 with Adalhard abbot of Corbie to discuss the Council of Aachen’s findings on the Holy Spirit with Pope Leo, so could easily have observed there some of the Roman peculiarities we saw, and taken up some Roman texts and customs for his own cathedral. As an intellectual, intensely engaged in the programme of *correctio* with personal knowledge of Roman customs and topography, he would be a highly suitable owner of this fascinating manuscript.

**Part 2: Albi Bibliothèque Municipale 42**

**A Monastic Study-Book?**

In a few places above, I signalled that there were distinctive instances of cross-over between Wolfenbüttel 4175 and Albi 42. They share several important variants in OR XXVI, OR XLI and OR I. Nevertheless, both have their own, independent variants, and most of Wolfenbüttel 4175’s most distinctive notes are absent in Albi 42; none of the so-called appendices is here, nor are OR XXV,

---


836  Hartmann, *Die synoden der Karolingerzeit*, pp.128-140; MGH *Concilia* II, 1 p.259: ‘Hildibaldus, scilicet sacri palatii archiepiscopus, Rinhofus (of Mainz), et Arno (of Salzburg) archiepiscopi seu Bernharius’.

XXVIIIa, the Gallican *ordo de sacris ordinibus* and so on. It is therefore fair to suppose that Albi 42 represents something closer to the text Wolfenbüttel 4175 had used originally to compose his pontifical. One might call it a collection comprising: *OR I*, *OR XXIV*, *OR XXVI* and a partial *OR XLII* (nn.1-4). I suggested, as regards Palat.lat.487, that the so-called ‘Collection A’ seemed to have gone through at least several stages of composition before reaching the full form first attested in Montpellier 412. Here is, perhaps, an early form of that Collection: *OR I* and *OR XLI*, and two constituent parts of what would make *OR XXVII*. The manuscript was written after 852, most likely in or near Rheims as Bischoff and Andrieu agreed, though Susan Keefe suggested ‘Southern France’ for reasons she did not give.\(^{338}\) The dating and Rheims location are attested firstly by the presence of Hincmar of Rheim’s synodical capitularies, of 852, dealing with a whole range of liturgical and non-liturgical matters.\(^{339}\) The second piece of evidence is the letter written by Almannus, a monk of Hautvillers also in the diocese of Rheims, to Archbishop Sigebod of Narbonne, in a unique copy. Following the letter comes a commentary on the ritual of church dedication, which was in all likelihood by the same author and originally attached to the letter.\(^{340}\) Almannus’ commentary is quite characteristic of the non-*ordo* content of the manuscript. Also attached was Theodulf of Orleans’ response to Charlemagne’s 813 letter on baptism.\(^{341}\) Theodulf discusses a rite which is very close to *OR XI*, though not identical, and Almannus offers an explanation of a rite similar to *OR XLI*. Therefore, while lacking both of the *ordines*, the manuscript still has these commentaries as a way into the *study* of the rites in question. Keefe presents the manuscript as an ‘episcopal schoolbook’ and to Andrieu it was firmly a didactic collection.\(^{342}\)


\(^{339}\) PL 125, cols.773-78.  


The lack of a total account of baptism, apart from Theodulf’s commentary and the very short discussion in OR XXIV for Holy Saturday, is particularly suggestive that the manuscript never saw actual use. Only the very beginning of OR XLII is given, perhaps because of scribal negligence, so that rite would be impossible to perform as well. It has none of the signs of what I have suggested were aids or apparatus for use, such as proper rubrication. Aside from Hincmar and Theodulf’s texts, the presence of Augustine’s *de agone christianus* has no liturgical relevance. Marginal notation, also ninth century, found alongside this text suggests reading by a scholar: ‘*error manichea*’ on fol.43r, or ‘*deus bonis et malis bene utizitur*’ on fol.45r. The slightly later addition of extracts of Isidore’s *Allegoriae* and the pseudonymous dialogues of Augustine and Orosius on Genesis are equally suggestive of a study book.

If Theodulf and Almannus’ commentaries on baptism and church dedication parsed rituals to discover the meaning behind them, the *ordines romani* preserved here might have been read in a very similar fashion. The *ordines* of Albi 42, despite its late date, are seen by Andrieu to represent a quite early state of the texts, in keeping with the idea that this text was probably copied from a very early form of what became Collection A. On OR XXIV ‘it has not suffered alterations’. There are some pieces of interest. Some go back to an exemplar shared with Wolfenbüttel 4175, including the two significant additions to OR XXVI I briefly mentioned above:

OR XXVI, n.10 ‘Ac deinceps preperatis custodibus, omni lumine decoretur ecclesia. Et

*ita ingrediuntur ad missas sicut in Sacramentorum continetur uel in Antiphonarium. Missa
expleta, communicant ordine constituto et servant de Sancta usque in crastinum iuxta
consuetudinem. Sed ipsa ecclesia usque ad vigillas inluminata permaneat.*

---

843 PL 40, cols.290-310.
844 PL 83 cols. 97-101; PL 40, cols.733-41.
846 *ibid.*, p.327: ‘And then, when the sacristans are prepared, the church is decorated with every light. And then they enter to the masses as is found in the Sacramentary and Antiphonary. When the mass is finished, they communicate according to the set order and they preserve some of the Host until the next day according to custom. But that church remains illuminated until vigils.’
OR XXVI, n.14 ‘Et hic ordo agitur cena domini mane; et sicut in isto die taxavimus, sic et sexta feria faciendum est et sabbato, ea tamen ratione; ad hora nona excutiunt ignem de lapide, sicut diximus, et a mansionario portetur; sexta feria ab archidiacono; sabbato uero sancto ab episcopo iuniori portetur. Si vero hic ordo in monasterio agitur, quinta feria custos ecclesiae portetur, sexta feria praepositus, sabbato uero sancto abbas’. 847

Both of these additions appeared very early on in the transmission of OR XXVI. Only two manuscripts, Brussels 10127-10144 and Saint Gallen 614, lack them. They are both definitively non-Roman. According to Amalarius, the Romans did not reserve the Host for Good Friday. 848 The second shows an attempt to grapple with the equivalents of Roman personnel in a monastery, for the rite of New Fire. Obviously, this rite had a significant hierarchical function in the original text, building up from lower rank, ‘mansionarius’ to the ‘episcopus iunior’, representing one of the Pope’s suffragan bishops. One of those through whom this text passed on its way to Albi 42 and Wolfenbüttel 4175 attempted to make an equivalent hierarchy for a monastery, from sacristan to abbot. This is a very early sign of the kind of monastic re-working found in OR XXIX. It shows that monasteries were involved in adapting Roman ordines romani for Holy Week for actual performance from the very beginning. The process of questions being asked of the ordines romani and new rubrics being added to answer them was a part of the process from the moment these texts, in whatever form, crossed the Alps. Both variations from this tradition passed into OR XXVII, so nearly every ordo romanus in the ongoing tradition is marked by them. 849

847 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.329: ‘And this order is done on Maundy Thursday morning; and thus on this day we judge, that it should be done on Friday as well, and Saturday, however with this arrangement: at the ninth hour they strike fire from stone, as we said, and by the sacristan it is carried; on the Friday by the archdeacon; but on Saturday by a junior bishop it is carried. But if this ordo is done in a monastery, on the Friday by the sacristan of the church it must be carried, on Friday by the provost, but on Holy Saturday by the abbot.’


There are two features of the narrative of OR I in Albi 42, useful primarily for the insight into relations between this manuscript and others:

OR I, n.60 ‘Et cum transierit cum evangelia ante episcopos inclinans se ad eos, illi dant ei benedictionem ita: Dominus tecum. Post haec inclinat se ad presbiteros et illi dicunt: Spiritus domini super te’.\textsuperscript{850}

One other manuscript carries this in the main text of OR I, namely Cologne Dombibliothek 138. This was important evidence that it was a recension of OR I from a manuscript like Albi 42 (though an earlier example) which had been used by the compiler of Cologne 138 to ‘correct’ his Collection B version of OR I. Verona XCII, therefore, also carries this note as a marginal intervention by Pacifiucs. Bern Burgerbibliothek 346, one of the earliest partial examples of OR I, (late eighth century, Metz) was also ‘corrected’ via marginal note. These corrections reveal that Albi 42’s recension of OR I and probably the rest of the Albi 42 Collection circulated in North Italy and Metz decades before the recension of the only manuscript witness to it. Both texts attribute authority to the Albi 42 exemplar, recognising it as an early witness, and checking their own versions of OR I against it.

OR I, n.59 ‘\textit{et dominus pontifex dat ei benedictionem faciens crucem in his verbis}: Dominus sit in corde tuo et in labiis tuis’\textsuperscript{851} Bern 346 was ‘corrected’ with this text. This is again an addition in keeping with many we have seen, recognising the symbolic power of the sign of the cross and fixing where exactly it would be placed. Wolfenbüttel 4175 offered a similar rubric at this point.

Albi 42 therefore, towards the end of the century, preserves a precious witness of an earlier collection which had significant influence. Even a canon of the 798 Council of Rispach actually quotes a segment of OR XXIV.\textsuperscript{852} It does seem that the presentation of these select ordines with Theodulf’s

\textsuperscript{850} Andrieu, \textit{Les Ordines}, vol.II, p.88: ‘And when he crosses with the gospel before the bishops, inclining himself to them, they give him blessing thus: Dominus tecum. After this, he inclines himself to the priests and they say: Spiritus domini super te.’

\textsuperscript{851} \textit{Ibid.}, p.87: ‘And the lord pontiff gives blessing to them, making the sign of the cross in these verbs ‘Dominus sit in corde tuo et in labiis tuis’

\textsuperscript{852} MGH \textit{Concilia} II, 1, p.212: ‘Ut, si uobis uidentur usum Romanum habere velle, fer.III ante cenam Domini orations, quae scriptae sunt ad fer.VI Parasceue, ab episcopis uel presbiteris hora tertia diei supradictae,
reply to the query on baptism and Almannus’ commentary is an attempt to present a complete account of liturgical matters, but the angle is towards the study of the meaning and ratio of those rites. There are no prayers added here, or denuntiati. Study and the search for ratio were certainly not excluded from the manuscripts I have deemed pontificals, but the weight of matters here has shifted. Given what we have seen was happening with ordo romanus manuscripts even in the early ninth century, including Wolfenbüttel 4175, it is likely that Albi 42 seemed somewhat out-of-date, as regarded liturgical practice, by 852. But it had value enough to be preserved, and presented within a context where it would be read as a guide to liturgical ratio alongside writings of contemporaries that parsed rituals of a similar nature.

Chapter 4: Explaining the *Ordines Romani*

Part 1: Amalarious of Metz and the ‘Exegesis’ of Liturgy

Above, I have examined testimonies of ten individual manuscripts containing one or more examples of the *ordines romani*. In each case, the compilers were active and creative participants in the process of drawing out what a correct liturgy might look like. Throughout, we have seen that explaining liturgy’s deeper meaning was far from being separate from describing the practice of it, both went together, and the Roman nature of the *ordines romani* was certainly nuanced by interventions in the text and intensified by association with other texts in the whole manuscript. The vision of a complex and active reception is enhanced by an analysis of one thinker, Amalarious of Metz, who actively quotes from and uses the *ordines romani* in his exegesis of the liturgy. But Amalarious uses them in very select ways. Attempts to construct the actual texts of *ordines romani* from Amalarious’ narrative are problematic, but he shows how they might have been used by those who both practised and studied liturgy from the same texts. To begin with, a summary of Amalarious’ career is pertinent. He was archbishop of Trier, the archdiocese in which Metz is located, for several years, ambassador to Constantinople in 813, but fell from grace and lost his diocese in the initial purges of Charlemagne’s court under Louis the Pious, only to be reinstated and given temporary lordship over the archdiocese of Lyons in 835. But within three years he was driven from that see by the sustained campaign of the deacon Florus and Archbishop Agobard. He died before 851. These are the bare facts of his life without his involvement in the liturgy, but it is the liturgy which gives his life its colour and coherence. Amalarious wrote what have been called *expositiones missae*, in a very individual way which seemed, both to some of his contemporaries and to modern

---

scholars, outlandish.\textsuperscript{855} However, his allegorizing was the extension of the ubiquitous practice of biblical exegesis, and, indeed, a natural extension of the ideals of the Carolingian Renaissance.\textsuperscript{856} Amalarius claimed fundamentally that he wanted to find the \textit{ratio}, the ultimate, divine reason that lay behind liturgical actions, while being very aware and accepting that there was great diversity in those actions:

‘I your servant, although the least of all, was once moved by a desire to know the purpose (\textit{rationem}) behind the order (\textit{ordine}) of our Mass, which we celebrate in accordance with established custom. I was struck even more by the diversity of our celebrations—how sometimes one epistle is read, sometimes two, and other such matters that also relate to the other offices’.\textsuperscript{857}

This crucial term \textit{Ratio} is synonymous with the wider aims of the Carolingian movement ‘to correct’ in general, and with its aims in the liturgy in particular. OR XV used the same term, for its understanding of correct performance of the Mass.\textsuperscript{858} It is often noted that the earliest \textit{expositiones missae} arose from a context of standardisation and explanation, in which the capitularies and episcopal degrees of Charlemagne demanded that priests correctly understand the words of the Mass, particularly the canon and the Lord’s Prayer.\textsuperscript{859} But it is rarely appreciated that Amalarius too, operated with similar aims. To posit foreign or uniquely individual influences upon him unfairly isolates him from the same benign impulse to educate and inform his audience, with the


\textsuperscript{859} See Vogel, ‘Chrodegang et les debuts’, p. 95; particularly, the \textit{Admonitio Generalis}, MGH \textit{Legum} II.1, pp.58-61.
accompanying awareness that they were performing the same rituals with variations that were a
fact of liturgical life.

Amalarius’ magnum opus, the Liber Officialis, combines his previous efforts into a grand
unified schema of liturgical exposition. It was published in three editions, and underwent extensive
revisions throughout Amalarius’ career. Book III is a treatment of the entire course of the Mass, in
the style of an expositio missae, where Books I and II deal with various liturgical prescriptions,
vestments, celebrations, and Book IV with the divine office.860 It was very popular in the Carolingian
and post-Carolingian world.861 In the course of the Liber Officialis’ extensive survey, Amalarius
quotes from a similarly titled libellus de ordine romano a total of seven times. He affixes to these
quotations the same cross signal that he applies to every quotation from the ‘fathers’ of the Church,
the reason for which he explains in the preface:

Note that I have added the sign of the cross where the words of the fathers end and
my own words begin, so that I cannot be accused of secretly weaving my own words with
theirs.862

As a way into Amalarius’ reception of the ordines romani, it is useful to ask what kind of
ordines romani he might have had before him. Can his libellus de ordine Romano be identified with
any single manuscript of the ordines romani I have considered? Keefe tells us that Amalarius quoted
from OR XI on three occasions, in his letter to Charlemagne.863 She offered a new edition I shall use
here:

860 Reconstructed by Hanssens, Opera Omnia, vol.I, pp.120-200; Jones, A lost work, p.18.
861 Steck, Der Liturgiker Amalarius, p.13; Collins, The Carolingian Debate, p.60.
862 Hanssens, Opera Omnia, vol.II, p.21:‘Notandum est etiam, ne videretur parvitas mea quasi furtim
interpolare mei verbis sanctorum dicta patrum, interposui in fine eorum et principium meorum signum
This would refer to OR XI, n.3.

This refers generally, to the seventh scrutiny, nn.82-89.

Yet Keefe also notes that, when discussing the Symbol, Amalarius chooses to give an exposition of the Apostle’s Creed, rather than the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed. This was as the Collection B scribe did, in his own version of OR XI, but it was not found in Collection A’s OR XI, which suggests from the start that Amalarius did not view himself bound to the letter of his ordo romanus. As we shall see, Amalarius certainly knew OR I, to which he refers numerous times. He also had a Holy Week ordo. Andrieu identifies it with OR XXVII, which was only present in Collection A, but he notes that OR XXVI and OR XXIV, which are in Albi 42, are essentially identical. This means Amalarius’ texts might have resembled Collection A.

Firstly, Amalarius refers to the libellus on a number of occasions concerning practices of Holy Week, in Book 1 of his ordines. They can all be seen in the apparatus of Andrieu’s edition of OR

---

864 Keefe, *Water and the Word*, vol.II, p.339: ‘in the scrutiny, we make the sign of the cross over the children, as we find written in the Roman ordo’;
865 *Ibid.*, p.344: ‘On that day we do the seventh scrutiny, as we find written in the Roman ordo’
866 *Ibid.* p.346: ‘Then we examine the godparents, if they can chant the Lord’s Prayer and the symbol, as we have warned, and afterwards through the order, as in the Roman ordo it is written, we do the sacred office until the most sacred work of baptism’.
XXVII. He recorded one of the charming and curious details of Roman custom; the making of lambs from wax on Maundy Thursday. This was present in OR XXVI, nn.6-8, and passed from it into OR XXVII, n.9. It was removed from OR XXVIII.

Liber Officialis, I, c.17

Romanus libellus narrat eadem die benediciri ceram oleo mixtam, indeque fieri agnos, eosque reservari usque in octavas paschae; in octavis vero post communionem dari populi ex his incensum, adolendum, et adsuffumigandum domibus suis. Et narrat similiter nos facere debere de cereo consecrato.870

OR XXVI, n.6-8, OR XXVII, n.9.

Et hic ordo cerei benedicendi in forensibus civitatibus agitur. Nam in catholica ecclesia infra civitatem romanem. Sed mane prima, sabbato sancto, in Lateranis venit archidiaconus in ecclesia et fundit ceram in vas mundam maiorem et miscitat ibidem oleo et benedicit ceram et ex ea fundit in similitudine agnorum et servat eos in loco mundo. In octavas vero paschae dantur ipsi ogni ab archidiacono in ipsa ecclesia post missas et communionem populo et ex eos faciunt in domos suos incensum accendi ad suffumigandum pro qualecumque eis evenerit necessitas. Similiter et in forensibus civitatis de cereo faciunt.871

Amalarius sees ‘nos’, i.e. the Franks, in the ‘forensibus civitatibus’ of this ordo romanus. They consecrated a paschal candle, the papal church itself did not. This is one way in which Roman practice, as related in the ordo romanus tradition, was not monumental. It allowed one to ‘opt in’ to certain practices if one desired.

Another telling quote from the rites of Holy Week follows some time later. This details the rite of the chrismation of the newly baptized person by the bishop on Holy Saturday, with the

870 Hanssens, Opera Omnia, vol.II: ‘The Roman booklet tells that on the same day wax mixed with oil is to be blessed, and then lambs are made, and these are kept until the octaves of Easter. But in the octaves they are given to the people so that from them incense, for scenting and fumigating their houses. And it tells us we ought to do similarly from consecrated wax’.
871 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.326-327: ‘And this ordo of the blessing of the candle is done in the cities outside. But in the Catholic church within the Roman city, it is not thus blessed. But first thing in the morning, on Holy Saturday, the archdeacon comes into the Lateran in the church and he pours forth wax in a large clean vessel and he mixes oil with it and blesses the wax and from it he creates figures in the likeness of lambs and he conserves them in a clean place. But on the octave of Easter, these lambs are given by the archdeacon in this church after the masses and the communion to the people, and from them, they create in their houses incense to be lit for fumigation for whatever necessities will happen. But similarly also they do from wax in the cities outside’.
invocation of the Trinity. Only in certain examples of Collection A, Montpellier 412 being the only one I have considered, is the response ‘et cum spiritu tuo’ given, as Amalarius presents it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LO, I. 27.33</th>
<th>OR XI, 101, var.5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dicit Romanus libellus, de quo sape commemoravimus, 'oratione expleta, facit crucem cum pollice ex chrismate in singulorum frontibus, ita dicendo: In nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti. Pax tibi. Et cum Spiritu tuo'(^{872})</td>
<td>Oratone expleta, facit crucem cum police et chrisma in singulorum frontibus, ita dicendo: In nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti. Pax tibi. Et respondent: Amen (LMQ Et cum spiritu tuo)(^{873})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This seems to presuppose that Amalarius had some form of Collection A. Again while discussing Maundy Thursday, Amalarius mentions the recitation of the Creed:

On this day the penitents come for absolution, and in certain places the Creed is recited by the catechumens, as is written in a canon from the council of Laodicea. But we follow the Roman order, and reserve this recitation for Holy Saturday.\(^{874}\)

Amalarius refers to the exact same canon of Laodicea which was written onto a spare folio in Verona XCII. This is again evidence of Amalarius’ actual awareness of what Keefe demonstrated, which is the variety of practices surrounding baptism and preparation for it. As in his responses to Charlemagne, Amalarius identifies the practices most familiar to him (from Metz?) with his ordo romanus.

However, the redditio symboli is not to be found in the Holy Week ordo, OR XXVII, in its narrative of Holy Saturday, nor in OR XVI and OR XIV. It can be seen in OR XI, n.86:

\(^{872}\)Hanssens, *Opera Omnia*, vol.II, pp.150-151: ‘The Roman booklet says, from which we have often quoted: when this prayer is completed, he makes a cross with a reed from the oil in the fronts of each, saying this: in the name of the Father and son and Holy Spirit. Peace be with you. And with your spirit’; Knibbs, *On the Liturgy*, vol.I, p.274

\(^{873}\)Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.II, p.446: ‘When the prayer is finished, he makes a cross with the reed and oil in the fronts of each, saying this: ‘In the name of the father and son and Holy Spirit. Peace be with you. And they respond Amen. (And with your spirit).’

OR XI, n.86 ‘Haec expleta ambulet in circuitum, inposita manu super capita eorum, decantando excelsa voce: Credo in Deum. Vertit se ad feminas et facit similiter.’

Collection A (which had a full account of Holy Saturday) would therefore offer the rite as Amalarius presents it.

In speaking of the blessing of oil for the sick of Maundy Thursday, Amalarius refers first to the account of that rite in the Sacramentary, and then to the ordo romanus, treating each completely separately:

‘It remains that we should tell something about the order of consecration, as it is found in the notes of the sacramentary and the libellus which is called the ordo romanus.’

This is, once again, hugely telling. Sacramentary and Roman ordo are presented as quite separate and yet complementary accounts of the same ritual. Amalarius was not any more blind than we are to the differences between such accounts, but he recommends neither as definitive; each helps him to unlock the meaning he sees in the ritual, the ratio. First, he discusses the Sacramentary, quoting the only large rubric in the ritual ‘Ante quam dicitur: Per quem haec omnia, Domine, semper bona creas’, levantur de ampuliis quae offerunt populi, et benedicit dominus papa quam omnes presbiteri.’ This rubric is to be found in the Hadrianum, but in no Gelasian Sacramentary. The Roman ordo he refers to is, once again, that of OR XXVII but in a place in which the text is indistinguishable from OR XXIV.

---

877 Ibid., p.75: ‘Before saying ‘through whom Lord, you always create these good things, the oil is raised from the ampoules that the people offer, and both the pope and all the priests give their blessing’.
Dicit libellus Romani ordinis de consecratione chrismatis ‘continuo duo acoliti involutas ampullas cum sindone alba de siricio, ita ut videri possint a medio, teneant in brachio sinistro’. Et paulo post ‘Antequam benedicat, halet ter in ampullam’. Et iterum ‘Ampulla autem quae cum chrismate est, statim ut benedicta fuerit, operitur, ut a nemine nuda videatur; sed, tenente eam acolyto, omnes per ordinem salutent, quam episcopus et diaconi prius salutent’.

Amalarius also refers to the *ordo romanus* on Holy Week several other times, each time close to OR XXVII, for the stripping of altars, adoration of the cross, incense only carried at the gospel, two candles lit on Holy Saturday, and so on. Jones’ reconstructed work of Amalarius on the *Triduum* (already amply surveyed there and clearly not as widely copied as the *Liber Officialis*) likewise quotes OR XXVII.

On the Mass, Amalarius refers directly to an *ordo romanus* four times. First, on the actions being enacted by the ministering clerics while the priest says the canon, Amalarius quotes at length from his source, identical in all respects to OR I. The second, longer quotation is on the process of

---

879 Hanssens, *Opera Omnia*, vol.II, pp.75-76 ‘The manual of the Roman order says this about the consecration of the chrism ‘Let two acolytes hold the ampoules in their left arms throughout, wrapped with a white silk sindon such that they are only half visible’. And a little later: ‘Before he blesses, let him breathe into the ampoule three times’. And again: ‘But the ampoule that contains the chrism is covered immediately after it is blessed, so that it is seen bare by no one; rather, as the acolyte holds it, let all venerate it in order, before the bishops and the deacons venerate it’; Knibbs, *On the Liturgy*, vol.I p.122

880 Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.III, pp.353-354, ‘Let two acolytes hold the ampoules in their left arms throughout, wrapped with a white silk sindon such that they are only half visible’; ‘Before he blesses, let him breathe into the ampoule three times’; ‘But the ampoule that contains the chrism is covered immediately after it is blessed, so that it is seen bare by no one; rather, as the acolyte holds it, let all venerate it in order, before the bishops and the deacons venerate it’.

881 Jones, *A Lost Work*, e.g. p.187: ‘Scriptum videmus in romano ordine candelas debere extinguere...’; analysis, pp.64-69, 75.

the Peace and the giving of communion quoting from OR I nn.96-101.\(^\text{883}\) He also quotes it from the moment of consecration, at OR I, n.95.\(^\text{884}\) Finally, he draws from OR I, n.53 on the Gloria.\(^\text{885}\)

It seems that Amalarius actually had a copy of Collection A, or some version of it, with OR I, OR XI and OR XXVII at least. Apart from these select and specialised quotations, the general mass text of Amalarius’ Liber Officialis adds many Gallican customs, ignores several important Roman ones, and has a number of prescriptions that are also present in the text OR V (only in post 950 manuscripts), but completely absent in OR I.\(^\text{886}\) Andrieu notes, amongst others, the chanting of a iubilatio, which ‘we call the sequence’, the deposition of liturgical staffs, the censing of the offerings. the subdeacon holding the paten uncovered. Certain processes in the course of the OR I Mass, Amalarius simply leaves out, notably the extensive treatment in long and detailed rubrics of the reception of the offerings, of the commixtions, and of communion itself. He describes several aspects of rituals that OR I never mentions.\(^\text{887}\) He appeals to a text that is identical to OR I in a number of select quotations, but the majority of the Mass, as he relates it, is something far more like an individual and creative narrative of events. In this respect his response to the question of the


\(^{887}\) Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.II, p.179, n.5; LO III, c.5 Eamdem pacem offert [pontifex] cantoribus qui retro stant; c.8 Sacerdos, quando dicit Gloria in Excelsis Deo, orientis partes solet respicere; c.15 Ministri casula exuunt quando lectoris sive cantoris officium assumunt; c.18 Deinde ponit episcopus thymiama in thuribulum super prunas; c.31 Ideo tangit [cum oblast] quatuor latera calicis; c.36 post omnia sacramenta consummata, benedicat populo atque salutet. Deinde revertitur ad orientem; c.36 Consuetudo nostra tenet ut catechumenos repellamus ante evangelium.
number of crosses made during the process of the canon is characteristic. OR I does not refer to this custom at all. Amalarius is at his most individual and laissez-faire:

Otherwise, with the respect to the crosses that it is our custom to make over the bread and the wine in varying ways, I have nothing to say about why they are fixed at this point, or why in one place more are made and in another fewer…It seems to me that, if a cross is made over the bread and wine once, that can suffice, for the Lord was crucified once.\(^{888}\)

Here, as he openly stated in his introduction by reference to the concept of ratio, Amalarius’ primary concern was what made the most sense to him, not what his source said, or even what he saw practised around him. Amalarius’ ‘Mass’ did not necessarily represent a single Mass ordo, or practice here or there, but could be termed an ‘ideal’. Steck, therefore, is misguided to argue that because Amalarius’ liturgy does not cohere with the Drogo Sacramentary and therefore is not representative of Metz, he must have practised elsewhere.\(^{889}\) Representing Metz’s liturgy was not Amalarius’ goal.

It is mistaken to suppose that Amalarius actually had a different version of the ordo romanus from one we now possess, most likely Collection A or something like Albi 42. Keefe also noticed that, while the rite of baptism that he described as a whole had similarities to Andrieu’s OR XI and to the rite of baptism offered in OR XV, the order of the process and the vocabulary he used for certain individual matters of the rite agreed completely with neither.\(^{890}\) She supposed he was using an individual ordo of baptism, ‘another, now lost version of the ordo romanus’.\(^{891}\) Bouhot also argued

\(^{889}\) Steck, Der Liturgiker Amalarius, pp.119-157.
\(^{890}\) Keefe, Water and the Word, vol.I, pp.60-62
\(^{891}\) Ibid., p.62.
that Amalarius might have used a now-lost Gallican ordo missae. However if one looks at his actual treatment of the ordo romanus, the idea that the mass he parses was described in every detail by it cannot be substantiated. Amalarius quoted very selectively from the ordo romanus of Holy Week, OR XXVII, and that of the Mass, OR I. In his discussion of the blessing of chrism, he uses the Sacramentary’s rubrics in the same manner as he does the ordo, as a liturgical authority that can be dialogued with selectively, to help explain the deeper meaning, ratio, of the rite, along with quotes from patristic authors. The ordo romanus was not, to him, a total narrative of everything that happened in the course of the rite. It is an authority to help interpret that rite. His attitude is very useful here for how others, too, might have read ordines romani, and his additions and editings are not surprising in light of how other manuscripts treated them. Amalarius did not slavishly follow the letter of any ordo romanus, but used them to give him certain important points he used to give a picture of an ideal liturgical ceremonial and interpret what this ideal was intended to mean.

By his own admission, Amalarius never found anything like the libellus de ordine romano in Rome, when he went there in 831:

In the manual entitled On the Roman order, a copy of which I have not found in Rome, it is written that some of the Lord’s body should be kept in reserve until the next day.

It is often stated, without real justification, that the discovery that his libellus was not in use in Rome was deeply traumatic to Amalarius’ view of the liturgy and view of his sources. Partly, this is because Amalarius’ enemy Florus of Lyons did seize on that fact, gloating that:

---

893 LO I 12 34, Hanssens, Opera Omnia, vol.II, p.79; ‘Scriptum est in libello qui praetitulatur De ordine Romano, cuius exemplar non inveni Romae, quod reservandum sit de corpore Domini usque in crastinum’; Knibbs, On The Liturgy, p.129
894 Jones, A Lost Work by Amalarius, pp.65-66.
He takes the little book of the *ordo Romanus* as so great an authority that he strives to explicate it to the letter; yet he then immediately states, against his own view, that this book is not known to the Roman archdeacon, in whose teaching he so exults.\footnote{Florus of Lyons, *Opusculum adversus Amalarium* PL 119 cols.76A-B ‘Libellum Romani ordinis tantae auctoritatae habet, ut eum pene ad verbum nitatur exponere; et tamen statim sibi ipse contrarius asserit hunc Romano archidiacono, cuius traditionibus gloriatur, ignotum’.}

But, given that Florus constantly misinterpreted Amalarius, putting the most malicious spin on everything his rival produced, we can take this volley with a grain of salt.\footnote{McKitterick, *The Frankish Church*, p.149.} Amalarius does not mention the *libellus’* absence in Rome at all in the new *preface* to the *Liber Officialis* he added after that trip to Rome. In this preface, he discusses some differences he noticed between Roman practice and the practices he did know.\footnote{Hanssens, *Opera Omnia*, vol.II, pp.12-18.} Neither does he add the same comment about the *libellus* not being found in Rome to any of the other quotes or usages he drew from it. While editing the *Liber Officialis*, Amalarius never removed the quotations from the *libellus*, even where he found it explicitly contradicted. Here, again, on the practice of Good Friday:

‘In the aforementioned manual I found it written that two priests, after venerating the Cross, bring in the Lord’s body which had been reserved before, along with the chalice containing the un-consecrated wine, which is then consecrated and then the people receive communion. I asked a Roman archdeacon about this point, and he replied ‘In the station where the Pope venerates the cross, no one receives communion’.

Finally, given that I have discussed the *ordo de sacris ordinibus*, it is worthwhile here to demonstrate that Amalarius, too, drew from this text, and treated it in the exact same manner as he

did the ordines romani he used. He considered seven grades of the church, and quoted from the ordo de sacris ordinibus for nearly every one. 899

Firstly, on doorkeepers, ’ostiarii’:

‘These, when they are ordained, receive the keys of the church and they hear from the bishop: ‘Therefore behave as if you can render an account to God for those things that are included with the keys’, and they receive responsibility for the door. 900

This is a direct quote from the ordo de sacris ordinibus, the final sentence I have in bold is key in showing from where Amalarius took his copy of the text, so I shall return to it. One might also note that the recension of this text, in Latin, is in the plural, so Amalarius envisaged several porters being ordained at once. On lectors, Amalarius quoted a prayer found in the ordo de sacris ordinibus. 901 On exorcists he quoted the rubric. 902 He did the same for acolytes. 903 Both of these grades have distinctive vocabulary found in the ordo de sacris ordinibus.

Something interesting happens in the subdeacon’s ordination:

‘These, when they are ordained, receive a paten and a chalice from the bishop. The assisting subdeacons, who receive a cruets from the archdeacon for serving the wine during the supper of Christ’s body, also receive a vessel of water and a dish for hand washing, along with a towel. It is appropriate that they receive these from the archdeacon, because they

899 Briefly discussed and compared with the Drogo Sacramentary, Steck, Der Liturgiker Amalarius, pp.129-130.
have been ordained to assist him. At the time of the sacrifice, the regional subdeacon stands facing the pontiff; the assisting subdeacons must therefore tend to necessary matters outside.\footnote{LO, 2.11.3 Hanssens, \textit{Opera Omnia}, vol.II, p.220; ‘Hi, quando ordinantur, suscipiunt ab episcopo patenam et calicem. Subdiaconi sequentes, qui accipiunt ab archiacono orciolum ad ministrandum uinum in eucharistiam corporis Christi, ipsi etiam accipiunt sciffum aquae et aquae manile cum manutergio. Merito ab archidiacono susciuunt, quia in eius adiutiori consecrati sunt. Subdiaconus regionarius tempore sacrificii stat in facie pontificis; ideo necesse est ut subsequentes necessaria a foris ministrent’; Knibbs, \textit{On the Liturgy}, p.415.}

Here, the essentials are a direct quote from the \textit{ordo de sacris ordinibus}, but Amalarius nuanced the text, and in a way directly bearing on the \textit{ordines romani}. The original text applied all the rites to the subdeacon without distinction, but Amalarius specifies that the cruet, the \textit{sciffum aquae} and the \textit{aquaemanile cum manutergio} go to only one type of subdeacon, the \textit{subdiaconus sequens}, who assists the archdeacon. He further suggests that these had a different role during the mass from the \textit{subdiaconus regionarius}. The latter position was a distinct peculiarity of Rome, found in OR I, which it seems that many different places in Francia took up. They were undoubtedly guided by texts of \textit{ordines romani} to do so. But the \textit{subdiaconus sequens} was also a distinctly Roman type of subdeacon whose place and role were delineated in the \textit{ordines romani}. Amalarius’ understanding of the role of the subdeacon was therefore formed by a negotiation of the narratives of \textit{ordines romani} with the \textit{ordo de sacris ordinibus}, both viewed as authoritative accounts. Whether he drew primarily on Metz’ own traditions, the rites which he were familiar were shaped by both the \textit{ordo de sacris ordinibus} and the \textit{ordines romani}, much as the author of Collection B brought these traditions together and allowed them, implicitly, to interpret each other.

For the deacon, Amalarius shows a very instructive attitude to his source, the \textit{ordo de sacris ordinibus}:

With us there is a certain book on the sacred orders (I do not know who wrote it) that says the bishop alone should lay his hand on the deacon ‘because he is not ordained to
the priesthood, but to the ministry’. Is the writer of the book really more learned and holier than the apostles, who laid many hands upon the deacons when they were ordained? Gibaut valiantly argued that Amalarius was presenting here a tradition he knew better (of multiple laying of hands), perhaps one found in Metz, against the single laying of hands found in the *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua*. He noted that the same rubric itself is altered in the Sacramentary of Angoulême and the Old Gelasian Sacramentary. Nevertheless, Gibaut makes a mistake in seeing this as evidence of actual practice; there is no reason to do so in what Amalarius says, and considerable reason to be cautious. Amalarius, and the two Sacramentaries, all show evidence of the same anxiety about the *ratio* of a rite that seemed to contradict biblical narrative. The actual alteration of the rite in practice was another question entirely. Amalarius’ characterisation here of his source as *libellus apud nos de sacris ordinibus* is another significant aspect of this extract. This suggests that he drew the text from a small, separate booklet which he knew to be Frankish in origin. It seems to be distinct from his *libellus de ordine romano*.

The priest has two distinct elements to his ordination, according to Amalarius:

‘Our bishops maintain this custom, they anoint the hands of priests with oil...And when they are consecrated they receive the laying on of hands’

As I detailed elsewhere, only the laying of hands was called for in the original *Statuta*, but unction tends to be attached to this, via a prayer *Consecratio manuum*, from the moment the text arrived in the Gelasian tradition. Here Amalarius quoted from neither, but it is clear that the Gelasian rite is

905 LO 2.12.8 Hanssens, *Opera Omnia*, vol.II, p.224; ‘Et libellus quidam apud nos de sacris ordinibus (nescio cuius auctoris), qui dicit solum episcopum debere manus imponere super diaconus ‘quia non ad sacerdotium consecratur, sed ad ministerium’. Numquid scriptor libelli doctor atque sanctior apostolis, qui posuerunt plures manus super diaconos quando consecrabantur’.
the one he had in mind. That *episcopi nostri* performed unction might suggest Amalarius knew the custom was non-Roman, but he saw the rite as highly symbolically important nonetheless, ‘that their hands may be clean for offering sacrifices to God and generous in other offices of piety’.  

The final grade, the bishop’s, is again more complex. Amalarius here quoted from the *libellus de sacris ordinibus* for the last time:

> ‘A book, according to which consecration is celebrated among some people, says that two bishops should hold the Gospel over the candidate’s head. Neither ancient authority, nor the apostolic tradition, nor canonical authority calls for this. Nevertheless, placing the Gospel over the head can admonish those holding it to request that the Lord strengthen the same Gospel in the candidate’s heart, or to admonish him who is consecrated to remember that he is now under the yoke of the Gospel more than he was before’.

Amalarius once more did not seem to recognise the rite as one he himself would practise, but he did not dispute its usefulness. It had a certain *ratio* despite not being attested in writings he saw as authoritative. This is, again, a lesson in the expansiveness of *ratio* for Amalarius. While he had the *libellus* as a source, he suggests it was followed on this point *apud quosdam*. Again, I would be extremely cautious about drawing any conclusions about what the episcopal ordination rite actually looked like, in Metz or elsewhere. Amalarius has two further prescriptions concerning episcopal ordination, first that multiple bishops would be present (this was openly prescribed by the *ordo de sacris ordinibus*’ rubric), and that his head was anointed with oil, which was not to be found there.

---


911 LO 2.14.3-5, Hanssens, *Opera Omnia*, vol.II, pp. 233-234, ‘But in canon law it is added that multiple bishops should be present...the pouring of oil upon his head is also added to his consecration’.
As Ellard showed, unction of the head became a part of the episcopal ordination in time, because, as Amalarius suggests, it was prefigured by Aaron, but was attested in liturgical sources only slowly (though Hincmar practised it at Rheims).\textsuperscript{912} None of the recensions of the \textit{ordo de sacris ordinibus} I am dealing with explicitly prescribes it, not even the Gelasians of the Eighth Century. Finally, Amalarius makes one single quote from what he calls the ‘words of his consecration’.

‘Hoc sonant uerba consecrationis eius: Tribuas ei cathedram episcopalem ad regendam ecclesiam et plebem universam’.\textsuperscript{913}

These words were indeed part of the Gregorian rite, but Amalarius takes this from the Gelasian, where they formed the final part and climax of the episcopal consecration.\textsuperscript{914}

Again, a representation of actual ordination practices was not necessarily what Amalarius really aimed to accomplish. Amalarius tended to treat his \textit{libellus de sacris ordinibus} in much the same way as he did the \textit{libellus de ordine romano}; both were building blocks to his vision of what an ideal, correct liturgy could look like, but often required explanation, clarification or even correction. But we can clarify somewhat what the \textit{libellus de sacris ordinibus} actually looked like. Gibaut explicitly suggests that Amalarius copied directly from the \textit{Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua}, a mistake which Andrieu heavily implied and Knibb’s edition perpetuates.\textsuperscript{915} Amalarius, in fact, used a version closest to that found in the Gelasian of the eighth century. The addition of unction of hands to the priest implies this, but there is significant further evidence. Firstly, he presents the orders from lowest, porter, to highest, bishop, while the \textit{Statuta} had them the other way round. Secondly, he does not include the psalmist, but begins only with the porter, exactly as the Gelasians of the Eighth Century did. And thirdly there is the small addition to the porter’s ordination ‘et accipiunt ostium’. This small

\textsuperscript{912} Andrieu ‘Le sacre épiscopal’, pp.39-54.
\textsuperscript{915} Gibert, ‘Laying of Hands’, p.234: ‘The “certain little book” (\textit{libellus quidam}) which Amalarius criticizes is the \textit{Statuta ecclesiae antiqua} (SEA) of the late fifth century’; Knibbs, \textit{On the Liturgy}, e.g. p.530.
rubric is nevertheless highly important. It is not found in the Statuta or in Collection B, but was added by certain examples of the Gelasian of the eighth century, notably the Phillips Sacramentary. This, and the explicit absence of the psalmist, also show that the text Amalarius parsed was not the same example as the ordo de sacris ordinibus used by Collection B’s author. Since we have Amalarius’ source, we can see how he dialogued with it, questioned it, and changed it. He did the same for the ordines romani. There was no ordo romanus he followed slavishly to the letter with all the details of the Mass or baptism rite. He used ordines romani like those we have, but he used them actively.

Part 2: Expositiones and Ordines in Bamberg Staatsbibliothek MS.Lit.131, St Gallen

Stiftsbibliothek 446, Paris BnF lat.1248

The association of the written ordines romani with Amalarius’ writing was not invisible to medieval and even near-contemporary writers, and many manuscripts transmit both together, from within decades of Amalarius’ death at the latest. I have already discussed one, Zurich Car C 102, where Collection B is followed by Amalarius’ communications with Peter of Nonantola and his two otherwise unattested early expositiones missae. Other manuscripts of a similarly early date make the same relationship clear. Bamberg Staatsbibliothek MS.lit.131 is part of a group that merits discussion. Andrieu post-dated the manuscript, again, to the tenth century. Bischoff proposed, instead, the second half of the ninth century. Keefe categorised it, with greater accuracy in this case, as a schoolbook, with the proviso that it was probably episcopal. Much of the manuscript is taken up with liturgical expositiones of various kinds, and in fact it only contains one ordo. This is of ambiguous character and ambiguous relationship to the other ordines romani, OR VII.
Nevertheless, I shall treat it here for its relationship with Amalarius and Amalarian writings. Here, as in related manuscript St.
Gallen 446, OR VII directly follows after the so-called **Eglogae de ordine romano**.\(^\text{922}\) It is noteworthy that this manuscript, now **re-dated** to the second half of the ninth century, actually assigns the *eclogae* directly to Amalarius, albeit with a rather unusual spelling, it carries the title *Hacmialheri abbas aedit*.\(^\text{923}\) This suggests that direct attribution of the *Ecllogae* to Amalarius was a feature of one early family transmitting the text, which may bear on the question of their authorship.\(^\text{924}\) With the *Ecllogae* and various anonymous *expositiones*, including five of the baptismal texts which Keefe edited, the manuscript offers a huge range of liturgical discussion on many major feasts. This also includes extracts, unattributed, from Amalarius’ *Liber Officialis*, on the Great Litany, the seven days of Pentecost, the *kyrieleision*, Christmas, Easter, and his letter to Jeremiah of Sens on the name of Jesus, which gives a small glimpse of the range of topics given treatment.\(^\text{925}\) OR VII is among the most widely copied of the *ordines romani*, appearing in 25 manuscripts examined by Andrieu, many going beyond the ninth century into the traditions called the *Pontifical Romano-Germanique*. It is entitled **QUALITER QUAEDAM ORATIONES ET CRUCES IN TE IGITUR AGENDAE SUNT** but instructs the reader generally in the actions taken during the canon of the mass.\(^\text{926}\) In the version presented in the Bamberg manuscript, the long recension, as Andrieu calls it, the prayers of the canon are given in full, therefore most of the *ordo* appears as a simple record of the canon, with a number of rubrics added. The canon follows a recension very close to the *Paduensis* Sacramentary, so much so that Andrieu saw it as a direct extract from a sacramentary which assumed an independent life as an *ordo*.\(^\text{927}\) As Andrieu also explains, in the prayer *Libera nos quaesumus*, four notable new saints are found from beyond the original Roman canon: Stephen

---


\(^\text{925}\) Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol. I, pp. 87-88; the extracts are from LO I, 37 DE LETANIA MAIORE, c.39 DE SEQUENTIBUS SEPTEM DIEBUS PENTECOSTEN, LO III.3, cc. 6-8 DE KYRIELEISON, cc. 41-44 DE NATIVITATE DOMINI and LI, c. 34 DE DIE SANCTO PASCHAE; Letter is edited at Hanssens, *Opera Omnia*, vol. II pp. 386-387.

\(^\text{926}\) How several prayers and crosses in *Te Igitur* are to be done.

Protomartyr, Hilary of Poitiers, Martin of Tours and Benedict of Nursia.\(^\text{928}\) Therefore the *ordo* itself went back to an exemplar redacted outside Rome, perhaps one created in the dioceses of Metz or Besançon, in which the cathedral was dedicated to Saint Stephen. While applying to a *sacerdos* at times, the *ordo* also represents the practice of the *domnus papa* or *apostolicus*, the Pope, at others, as here:

\[
\text{OR VII, n.22 ‘But when the Lord Pope says Pax domini sit semper uobiscum, he does not put a part of the Host in the chalice, as is the custom for other priests’}^{929}
\]

OR VII even draws directly from *OR I* elsewhere.\(^\text{930}\) Nevertheless, in principle, there was no barrier to the performance of the mass it defined by any bishop, given that the only other celebrant mentioned was the archdeacon. The rest of the manuscript is purely expositional. But, as I have tried to show, it misrepresents liturgical manuscripts when one imagines practice and study as a strict dichotomy, as Andrieu and Palazzo did. They could co-exist in one text, in one manuscript, to a greater or lesser extent, and OR VII, with the *expositiones*, certainly served to inspire reflection about what I have called ideal or correct liturgy. OR VII is represented as Roman, as the *Elogiae de ordine romano* themselves claim to delineate a Roman liturgy. Writings of Popes accompany them, namely the same letter of Pope Damasus to Jerome on the hour of the mass that I discussed in Wolfenbüttel 4175 and a short extract from Gregory the Great on Resurrection. Yet another *expositio missae, Primum in ordine missae*, is described as *Haec a coenobio sancti dionysii uenit*, i.e. it is associated with the abbey of Saint-Denis. We find in this same manuscript the capitularies of Theodulf of Orleans and Haito of Basel, as well as the writings of Walahfrid Strabo.\(^\text{931}\) Here, Roman and Frankish writings about liturgy happily co-exist and complement each other, towards a broader


understanding of what Amalarius called ratio. If it is easy to see such coexistence here, with expostional texts, why should it not have been equally visible for writers and readers of the ordines romani?

The arrangement of ordines in Bamberg 131 closely parallels another manuscript, St Gallen Stiftsbibliothek 446, again dated to the tenth century by Andrieu, but actually of the last third of the ninth.  

Keefe also discussed this manuscript. This manuscript and the Bamberg exemplar seem to go back to a single tradition, shared with a number of later manuscripts such as the eleventh-century Einsiedeln Stiftsbibliothek 110. In St Gallen 446 are to be found, pp.18-45 the Eclogae de ordine romano again attributed to Amalarius (Sequentia Amalhere abbas edidit), then OR VII at pp.45-50, then the expositio missae attributed to the monastery of Saint-Denis at pp.50-74, then a number of shared, shorter expositions on vestments and sacraments. The two do then diverge, but the St Gallen manuscript also contains numerous additional expositiones, many likewise extracted from letters of Alcuin and Amalarius, just like Bamberg 131. But Saint-Gall 446 also ties itself even closer to the ordo romanus tradition. Firstly, before the Eglogae even begin, at pp.2-18, is to be found OR I itself. The same arrangement is seen in the Einsiedeln manuscript. It is quite plausible that this was part of the original disposition of this family of texts, and it is Bamberg 131 which has lost its example of OR I. This is implied by a related book once in Reichenau, listed in the book list made by Reginpert of those acquired between 835-846. The book listed by Reginbert contains ‘expositiones missae super missam ac Ordo romanus qualiter missa celebratur, ac walo fridi libellus, qualiter ordo ecclesiasticus...et quomodo per temporum augmentaciones sit multiplicatus in diverso’ Therefore it contained OR I, the ordo romanus qualiter missae celebratur, which the

934 Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.I, p.337: ‘De uestimentis sacerdotalibus...De sacramentis aecclesiae...De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis domini...De offio missae...de ordine missae’
Bamberg manuscript does not, and which the Saint Gallen and Einsiedeln manuscripts do. Andrieu lays out at length that this version of OR I is not exactly that of either Collection A or B, but a subtly different tradition. The compiler of Saint Gallen 446 saw fit to add marginal notes with variants he found in another copy of OR I from another manuscript of the same abbey, Saint Gallen 140. So, for example, at OR I n.123, the marginal note directs that the prayer after communion should be said ‘directus ad orientem’, an addition only found in Saint Gallen 140, and the ‘short recension’ of OR I in Saint Gallen 614, to which that manuscript is related. The more extensive additions of the other St Gallen manuscript were not added.

Finally, the Saint Gallen 446 manuscript also, after its set of expositiones, and here from p.106, encloses a copy of Collection B of the ordines romani. Einsiedeln 110 follows it in this. So here are OR XIII, XI, XXVIII, XLI, XLI!, the Gelasian blessings of paten, chalice and chrism vessel, OR XXXVII and the ordo de sacris ordinibus. Only OR I is missing, because that was already part of the original manuscript. This arrangement is shared almost completely with Verona Biblioteca Capitolare XCII, and the recensions of the ordines are firmly in the Collection B mould, i.e. in OR XI the catechetical formulae are given in full, Greek formulae and baptism were suppressed, and so on. The example of the ordo de sacris ordinibus here is exactly like that of Verona XCII and Cologne 138, with only one-line incipits for prayers, and the Gregorian prayers for the upper three grades of deacon, priest and bishop, including a Gregorian Mass for the latter. This is more evidence that the original compilation of Collection B was presented in exactly this manner. St Gallen 446, while eminently readable, shows none of the apparatus I described in the Collection B texts as aiding use, such as clear rubrication, marginal annotation, plural options and so on. This seems to demonstrate that it was possible to place the Collection in the context of a school book for personal study of liturgical matters.

---

938 Ibid., p.107.
Paris BnF lat.1248, a manuscript once held at Saint-Martial of Limoges, also places three *ordines* from Collection B, XLI, XLII and XXXVII alongside the *Eglogae* and other examples of *expositiones*.\(^{939}\) Andrieu had seen this as an eleventh-century manuscript, but again Bischoff corrected this to the last third of the ninth century, and to the broad designation of Francia.\(^{940}\) Keefe has the mid-ninth century and Northern France.\(^{941}\) Briefly, this manuscript also carries a unique *ordo romanus* for Holy Week, OR XXXIII.\(^{942}\) Andrieu suspected the *ordo* was older than the eleventh century date he assigned the manuscript, and with Bischoff’s dating we are clear it was a ninth-century *ordo*. As we have seen several times before, the redaction of more concise and more accessible versions of the Holy Week *ordo* seems to have been a demonstrable response to reading *ordines romani*. Here the compiler took three *ordines* from Collection B, but ignored the Holy Week *ordo* there, OR XXVIII, in favour of his own *ordo*. Paris lat.14008 did something very similar, taking most of Collection B, but giving also OR XXXII. Both, therefore, dialogued selectively with the Collection, taking what they saw as useful and discarding a less useful Holy Week *ordo*. Like OR XXXII, or XXXA from Brussels 10127-10144 or XXXB from the Collection of Saint-Amand, this *ordo* is more concise and more personalised towards a particular locale, in Francia, not Rome. For example, the Holy Week ceremonies unfold in a church *ad sanctum Gregorium*, a church dedicated to a Saint Gregory, unidentified.\(^{943}\) The text makes special mention of the offices (XXXIII, n.1), and there is a *scola*, suggesting a community of either monastic or canonical nature.\(^{944}\) Since the bishop is never mentioned, a monastery may be more likely, only *presbiteri, diaconi* adore the cross for example. Two subdeacons chant the *Sanctus* in Greek (n.5).\(^{945}\) There is a ‘*sepulchrum*’, representing the tomb

---


\(^{944}\) Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.III, p.531: ‘In caena domini ad primam uersus non dicatur, nec ad tertiam, nec ad sextam, nec ad nonam, nec in responsories versus non dicatur, nec ad cursum’.

of Christ, and some unique vocabulary for objects ‘gazofilacium, tapeta et cussinam’ (Andrieu suggests cosimum), some kind of treasury or offertory box, with hangings or coverings. While every other ordo romanus forbids this, candles are carried before the Gospel on Holy Saturday (n.10). But the treatment of baptism, for example, is extremely cursory. The focus is more on the Office, and some on chant (as in other monastic reinterpretations of Holy Week).

The whole manuscript, Paris lat.1248, offers accounts of many rites, in ordo format but also in expositio format. It has the Eglogae de ordine romano, just before OR XXXII, and also a number of expositiones missae attributed to the apostles, and to Saint Peter in particular, as well as Isidore on baptism. These would offer some sort of account of baptism and the mass, allowing a full account, with the ordines romani, of the exact same group of rites which the Collections strove to narrate. Albi 42 does something similar; without any ordo of baptism, it offers instead Theodulf of Orleans’ discussion. Even more suggestive is a very brief, untitled ordo on fol.82 describing the moment of baptism itself:

Haec omnia expleta, fundit chrisma de vasculo in fonte super ipsam aquam in modum crucis et cum manu sua miscitat ipsum chrisma cum aqua. Et spargit per omnem fontem vel super omnem populum., Hoc facto omnis populus qui voluerit accipit benedictionem in vasis suis de ipsa aqua antequam ibi baptizentur parvuli ad spargendum in domibus eorum et vinies et campis et fructibus eorum. Deinde presbiteri aut diaconi etiam si necesse fuerit et accoliti discalciati [blank line-text missing] -diuntur in fontes intro aquam et baptizantur primo masculi deinde feminae sub ac interrogatione. Credis in deum patrem omnipotentem? et reliqua. Et acceptos infantes de parentibus, baptizant eos sub trina.  

---

946 Ibid., p.531: ‘Deinde postent subdiaconi usque ante sepulcrum, cantent greco. Postea ante gazofilacium, tapeta et cussinum, semper subitus’.
947 Ibid., p.532 n.10: ‘Postea ante evangelium cereos duos et turibulos duos’; n.10: ‘En contradiction avec l’ensemble des Ordines...’.
948 Keefe, Water and the Word, vol.II, pp.70-71: ‘But when all this is done, he pours forth oil from the vessel into the font over that water in the shape of a cross, and with his hand mixes the oil with the water. And he sprinkles it over the whole font and over the people. But when this is done, all the people who want, may
Neither Keefe, nor Andrieu mention that this is an almost perfect copy of OR XXVIII, n.71-75, the only thing being abbreviated is the interrogation following *Credis in deum*. Therefore the compiler chose to use the Holy Week *ordo* from his copy of Collection B to offer a small extract on the moment of baptism itself, which was very cursorily covered in OR XXXIII, his own unique *ordo* of Holy Week. Again, this is evidence of very selective and purposeful engagement with the *ordines romani*, to offer complete and satisfactory accounts of key rituals, while discarding pieces that were less useful. The compiler did not need a full account of OR XXVIII’s long and complex Holy Week, but did feel the need to extract a proper narration of baptism from it. Instead of the *ordo de sacris ordinibus*, for ordination itself, there is an interrogation giving two of the so-called ‘Ordinals of Christ’, which fix the clerical hierarchy and give some account of their main duties. This provided some of the same information as the *ordo de sacris ordinibus* did, but is obviously less suited for ritual. Again, this is evidence of our compiler wanting to offer an account of the same rites and ideas as Collection B did, but preferring texts that did so in other ways than the *ordines romani* themselves. The final part of the manuscript has a long devotional section, based on Pseudo-Alcuin’s *De Psalmorum Usu*, prescribing prayers for various situations of personal spiritual need, and litanies of the saints. Even if it was a study book, the manuscript had a devotional function therefore, further dissolving that strict boundary. One might ask if this was therefore a personal handbook for an ecclesiastic person, perhaps one serving the church of Saint Gregory mentioned. Despite OR XXXII’s non-episcopal nature, OR XLI, XLII and XXXVII are all episcopal *ordines*, describing dedications of churches with relic deposition and the Ember Days. For them, the manuscript shows few accept the blessed substance in their own vessels from that water, before the children are baptized, for sprinkling in their houses and fields and orchards. Then the priests and deacons also if there should be necessary and the acolytes, all unclothet...enter into the fonts in the water and there baptize first the male infants and then the female under this interrogation: ‘Do you believe in the Lord God Almighty?’, and so on. And having taken the children from their parents, they baptize them with the triple (immersion)’.

distinctive interpolations of the kind I have discussed; it is very close to the original Collection B, and not the Cologne 138 version of it. Andrieu noticed some similarities to Zurich Car C 102, another version of Collection B transmitted with Amalarius’ writings.952

Like other manuscripts surveyed, it presents the *ordines romani* as narratives of rites for study, dipping into Collection B but not strictly bound to it. The *ordines romani* are almost the corollary of a text like the *eglogae*. Though less overtly expositional, they allowed a study of the text in the abstract just like the *eglogae* allowed a study of the mass *ordo*. Again, this absolutely did not preclude practice being carried out from them, or inspired by them. The addition of the baptism extract might imply that the author wanted to fix this rite properly, which could have been so he might perform it. But the *ordo* might always be read with its symbolic meanings, its *ratio*, in mind. This manuscript again shows that the association of Amalarius with *ordines romani* was a feature from very early in the transmission. But it is not enough, as Andrieu attempts to do, to siphon off such manuscripts as ‘didactic’, without questioning why exactly they chose to position Collection B in the midst of such material, and what this means about how the text was received and read. Perhaps the addition of the whole Collection was inspired by the original presence of *OR I*. St Gallen 446, Bamberg 131 and Paris lat.1248 are all characterised by Keefe as ‘episcopal schoolbooks’.953

Certainly, Bamberg 131 has Haito of Basel’s capitularies, but St Gallen 446, despite carrying Collection B (an episcopal collection), was created in a monastery and remained there. Perhaps to the monk there, Collection B might represent an episcopal liturgy *par excellence*, for studying by an interested monk, with *expositiones* dialoguing with the narratives, or perhaps for the rearing of one who might aim to be a bishop eventually, like Ratold of Verona in Reichenau. But if these manuscripts were teaching such celebrants how to think as they performed (or experienced) the rites they described, the boundary between them and the liturgical text itself is difficult to fix.

---

952 See ‘benediccionem’ in the above quote, just like Zurich Car C 102. OR XXXVII is particularly similar; Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.IV, p.210: ‘Il (Zurich) a quelques affinités avec le Parisianus.1248’.

Ordines Romani always required processing. If, as I have argued, part of their function was always to create a correct mindset for practice, these books are no less engaged in that same key process.

Chapter Conclusion: Amalarius, the Expositiones and the Carolingian Understanding of ‘Correctio’

Amalarius’ aim, as I emphasized above, was to uncover liturgical ‘ratio’, to find the ordered and harmonious reason for liturgical rites. A dossier of texts like Saint Gallen 446, Bamberg 131 or Paris lat.1248 and Albi 42, in the context of the Carolingian interest in the liturgy, would have aided a reader to accomplish the same aim. Notable, and rarely remarked, is the fact that such manuscripts contained multiple, separate expositiones that described different forms of the same rituals and extrapolated from them in different ways. Bamberg 131 has three separate expositions of the Creed, and four of baptism. St Gallen 446 has six different glosses on the Mass, three are simple but three are of significant detail and length, among them the Eglogae itself. Paris lat.1248 has four different expositions of the mass. Obviously the readers of such books were used to scanning multiple explanations of such rituals, and processing their different layers of meaning quite comfortably. Ratio could be found more in the processing of multiple authorities and anonymous writings, in the building up of synthesis, which such manuscripts were self-evidently a tool to facilitate. We have seen multiple examples in the ordines romani of different recensions searched and compared, with variant readings noted and corrected or added. Liturgical texts like the ordines were not read slavishly, but actively. Clearly, within them, readers looked for ‘correctio’, and were not necessarily or wholly satisfied by the claim, real or imagined, to Roman authority, but saw that claim ever within a broader dialogue about what correct liturgy might look like. In Paris lat.1248 the compiler self-evidently preferred to discard some of the most important aspects of Collection B, including most probably OR I itself! He found the expositiones of the mass more suited to his purposes than OR I, and preferred to keep only church dedication and the Ember Day texts. Even

955 For some examples of ‘active reading’, Teeuven ‘Three annotated letter manuscripts’ pp.221-239.
were one to use the ordines as a guide for practice, this far from precludes the notion that they were also a meditation on an ideal, not necessarily followed on every detail, but towards which practice might be oriented. In such a case, the use of Collection B as a personal aide-mémoire or study tool is not necessarily entirely divorced from the cases where the Collection is surrounded by prayers and liturgical material that completes it. Both, in a sense, are offering a more ‘complete’ narrative of the liturgical ceremonies that the Collection describes, the one by offering the deeper meaning behind the acts, the other by filling in the narrative of the ceremony itself.

There is scope here to reflect on what ‘correctness’ or ‘correctio’ meant to the Carolingian readership of these manuscripts based on the evidence presented above. The vocabulary of ‘correction’, while it is briefly suggested in council and canonical texts, is absent from the manuscript tradition of the ordines romani. Furthermore, a vocabulary of correction does rather unhelpfully suggest a teleological movement, where the authors and editors had a clear vision of what they wanted the texts to look like and consistently aimed for it in the same way, as Andrieu’s analysis had supposed, or indeed that such adaptations were guided by dictates handed uncomplicatedly down from above, from Emperor or Pope. If we see the manuscripts of the ordines romani as rather being creations of particular bishops, or of communities like Lorsch, Murbach or Tours, and in each case serving different purposes (or indeed multiple purposes), we find ourselves more within a world of constant dialogue and adaptation, which is, indeed, exactly the kind of world Amalarius appears to survey, and what the manuscripts where expositiones and ordines interact show. If manuscripts meditated on how one understood liturgical actions, allowing different actors in the interact with them in different ways, then a wholesale characterisation of these processes under an umbrella term, particularly one with the unhelpful associations of correction, does not seem to be adequate. Correction might characterise some interactions with the ordines romani (for example the marginal notes in Verona 92 where we can point to another text being used as a model to alter the original), but it does not adequately reflect the range of responses to them. Within a framework of different “encounters” with the ordines as texts, leading to different responses reflected in the ordo romanus
manuscripts, the image of Rome itself (to take an extremely pertinent example) would be something equally personal. Many writers and users of the *ordines romani* used the texts to access and ‘construct’ a vision of the Eternal City which was meaningful to them for the purposes to which they intended to put them. I have suggested that this construction of Rome allowed bishops, and monks, to layer the city over their own liturgical performances, giving any performance a spiritual meaning which was not self-evident from the actions themselves, but required the texts to be read beforehand and reflected upon (by giving the actions as those performed by Popes, or by placing such actions in manuscripts where papal and Roman material was also to be found). It is hard to characterise this as the deliberate inculcation of a ‘correct’ mindset straight-forwardly, or as anything which was directed by a single edict or a single interpretation of such rituals. Therefore while ‘correction’ might serve as a shorthand in some cases for certain interactions with the texts, it is not to be taken as the key to understanding what Amalarius was doing, or what the *ordines romani* represented to their readers, or to the understanding the broader phenomenon of liturgical *expositiones* in general. The gap between *expositio* and *ordo romanus*, when both could be sifted and used to reflect on liturgy without straightforwardly proscribing a single way to perform liturgy or a single interpretation of it, collapses somewhat in such an atmosphere, and this might help to explain why the division between texts as used in liturgy, and texts for the study of liturgy, so firmly maintained by Andrieu, cannot adequately engage with these manuscripts.
Chapter 5: Vienna Cod.Ser.n.2762 and the *Ordines* of Ordination

Bishop Baturich of Regensburg, to whom we owe Munich Clm 14510, may have overseen the creation of yet another liturgical book for his use, which is also called a ‘pontifical’, some decades after that first text was written. This manuscript now falls under the classmark Vienna *Österreichische Nationalbibliothek* Cod. Ser.n.2762. Our knowledge of the text is entirely owing to Franz Unterkircher, who painstakingly reconstructed it from binding sheets and strips found in numerous manuscripts which came from the monastery of Mondsee. Baturich himself acquired the monastery of Mondsee for the bishops of Regensburg in 833 in an exchange with Emma, wife of Louis the German, and, apparently, this manuscript was then taken by his monastery once he no longer needed it.\(^{956}\) There is, perhaps, an analogy with Wolfenbüttel 4175, which came to the monastery of Wissembourg probably from Bernhar who was abbot there as well as Bishop of Worms. The two manuscripts share some similarities, both being quite unique pontifical texts, liturgical books which, in some sense, defy characterisation, but whose singularities must be explained by the visionary creativity of these bishops, whose first priority was to create books that made sense for them, not to aspire to any modern construction of what a pontifical should be. The Vienna manuscript was, as reconstructed by Unterkircher, a two-fold piece. The first half is a *Kollektar* or *Collectarium*, a selection of collects for the Office through the liturgical year, including the feast of Saint Emmeram. The second half is a Pontifical. This comprises ordination rituals, for the ecclesiastical grades and for monks, an *ordo ad ecclesiam benedicendam* (OR XLI), with the accompanying prayers for the consecration of liturgical objects (paten, chalice, *omnia in usum basiicae*, chrism vessel and cross), and a baptismal *ordo*. Ultimately, the ordination ritual is the most interesting for our purposes. These other contents generally parallel a number of ‘pontifical’

---

\(^{956}\) Gamber, ‘Liturgiesgeschichtliche Untersuchung’, Unterkircher (ed.), *Das Kollektar-Pontifikale*, p.39
manuscripts which I have briefly mentioned already. Unterkircher highlights the ample parallels with the Freising and Donaueschingen pontificals edited by Metzger.957

While all are certainly worth study, the ordination ritual is the one with the most pertinence for an investigation into the ordines romani. Unterkircher’s reconstruction indicated that the two-part manuscript reflected Baturich’s two-part responsibility, as bishop of Regensburg (where he performed pontifical functions), and as abbot of Saint-Emmeram (at which he oversaw the Office). 

958 Rasmussen presented some fair criticisms of this reconstruction, but ultimately the manuscript’s unity as reconstructed by Unterkircher is reinforced by a closer look at the ordination ritual. 959 Bischoff recognised the hand of the scribe as a monk of the monastery of Mondsee itself, where the manuscript later ended up.960 The argument followed that the manuscript was written after 833, when the monastery passed under Baturich’s control, and the scribe moved to Saint Emmeram; ultimately this reconstruction may be based on too-strict notion of how tied monks were to their institution, and he could have moved to Saint-Emmeram earlier. The terminus ante quem is Baturich’s death in 847, but Baturich is not actually named in the manuscript, and attribution to him was simply a useful assumption on the part of the editors. As we have seen, monasteries too could use pontificals and Saint-Emmeram might itself have produced the manuscript for its own reasons (but that might still suggest some connection with the bishop of Regensburg given the close connections between monastery and bishop). Generally, the first half of the ninth century more broadly probably remains the safer bet. This may have been between twenty and thirty years after the creation of Munich Clm 14510, Baturich’s first pontifical.961

---

957 Metzger, Zwei Karolingische Pontifikeln.
958 Unterkircher, Das Kollektar-Pontifikale, pp.42-43; Vogel, Medieval Liturgy, p.229.
961 Mentioned by Gamber ‘Liturgiegeschichtliche Untersuchung’, in Unterkircher (ed.) Das Kollektar Pontifikale, p.44; Klaus Gamber, Codices Liturgici Latini Antiquiores, 2nd ed. (Freiburg, 1968), 1550, p.561, suggested Cod.Ser.n2762 was created around 840.
Firstly, this Kollektar-Pontifikale has a few stational indications of its own, mirroring Roman topography. Alongside prayers for the Great Litany, all of the places in Rome that the ceremony unfolded are recorded (San Lorenzo ad Lucinam, San Valentino, the Mulvian Bridge is interpreted as fontem olbium). The vespers of Easter were given stations somewhat like the Wolfenbüttel Vespers, which were accurate to Rome (Tuesday at Saint Andrew’s Oratory, Saturday is at the Basilica of Saint John at the Lateran, as in the Gregorian and not Santa Maria Maggiore as in Wolfenbüttel, and Sunday at SS Cosmas and Damien, the fonts are also mentioned as there). As regards ordination, the Kollektar-Pontifikale also includes a new ordo for the Saturday of the Ember Days, entitled AD XII LECTIONES AGENDAS. The fact that this ordo technically falls within the Kollektar part would support Unterkircher’s conclusion that the double Kollektar-Pontifikale was originally conceived as a unified whole. Among the most interesting features of the text is the directive concerning a procession to take place from the un-named church where the ceremony begins to a church of Saint Peter:

‘Finita oratione, leuantur uexilla sanctae crucis una cum cereostatariis et pergunt omnes in ordine suo cantantes antyphonam de tribulatione usque ad sanctum petrum quo statio fieri debet.’

The text was, however, clearly not written in Rome. The celebrant is a pontifex, rather than the domnus apostolicus, and he has only the subdiaconus and diaconus as his assistants. Furthermore, the benedicite, the chant of the three boys in the furnace, is sung during the service, as it was also in another Frankish ordo romanus for the Ember Days found in Collection B’s OR XXXVII. That, as Andrieu laid out, was not a Roman custom at all. There was, indeed, a constant association of the


963 Unterkircher (ed.), Das Kollektar-Pontifikale, p.92: ‘When the prayer is finished, the banners of the holy cross are lifted at the same time with candles and they all go in their order, singing the antiphon ‘De tribulatione’ up to Saint Peter’s, where the station ought to be’.

964 Unterkircher (ed.), Das Kollektar-Pontifikale, p.92: ‘oratio quinta, sequitur lectio Angelus Domini, quam ipse legit qui benedicite cantat. Interim uero duo cantatur benedicite nullus in ecclesia audeat sedere.’
Ember Saturday with Saint Peter’s, as OR XV and the ordo qualiter show, but the cathedral of Regensburg, where this manuscript was actually written, was itself dedicated to Saint Peter, as it still is. Such a convergence, as well as the fact that the Baturich manuscript is our only source for this particular text, would strongly suggest that the ordo was written in Regensburg, and represents a particular version of the Ember Saturday, designed for Regensburg itself. If so, Regensburg’s bishop for whom the manuscript was probably compiled, perhaps Baturich, also copied the Roman stational system explicitly, and Regensburg was another city where the stational system was drawn along Roman lines, with Saint Peter’s playing a role in the Ember Saturday ritual. The greatest cathedral churches of Francia seem to have all created their own stational churches (Metz is attested particularly early), appropriating Rome’s system but allowing this appropriation to be guided by their own cities’ traditions. The surviving stational lists from Metz records that Saint Peter’s Church there hosted the Ember Days, creating an obvious connection to Rome.

Unterkircher gave the closest edited text for each piece of the Kollektar-Pontifikal. On ordination, the closest texts were ordines romani edited by Andrieu, as identified by Gamber, but ones that are only otherwise attested in tenth or even eleventh-century manuscripts. He related the brief ordo of Ember Saturday to ordo romanus XXXVIII, also an ordo for the Ember Days, he even says it is inhaltlich identisch. But he was mistaken; in that text, the specific reference to Saint

---


966 Klauser ‘Eine stationsliste’, Arbeiten, p.28: ‘Sabbato in XII lectiones statio ad sanctum petrum infra episcopum’.


968 Unterkircher, pp.91-92; p.91, n.16: ‘essentially identical’.
Peter’s I have highlighted was stripped away, and there are other differences.\footnote{Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, pp.267-268: ‘Deinde pontifex orationem siue unam de his quae scribtae sunt in sabbato siue etiam de cottidinias quam voluerit’ rather than Deinde pontifex dat orationem usque congruam ad hoc at n.3; ‘forensibus ecclesiae’ at n.5; a ‘uexillae sanctae crucis una’ rather than cruces at n.4; ‘dicit pontifex aut subdiaconus scolae ut incipient laetaniam’ rather than innuente pontifex scola imponit laetaniam’ at n.6 etc.} Most notably, the Regensburg ordo does not possess OR XXXVIII nn.11-13, where a brief account of some kind of ordination ritual was to be found, where everyone prostrated themselves on the altar, but the structure of OR XXXVIII makes it plain this was a later insertion (it has a subtitle).\footnote{Ibid., p.269: ‘Post haec celebrabitur consecration sacrorum ordinum ita: Prosternit se pontifex coram altari cum diaconis orans, ceteris consecrandis humilissim post pontificem super tapertia, prostrates orantibusque suppliciter largiotrem consecrationum. Finita uero letania, quam tunc scola imponere debet, prostrato pontifex et ceteris consecrandis, quando dicit Agnus Dei, surgunt et intrant pontifex hoc facto in consecrationem. Ea finita benedictoque incense, diaconus imponit evangelium’.} The Regensburg Pontifical goes straight on to the Gospel and then a mass. The ceremonies of ordination itself were found later on in Baturich’s manuscript. OR XXXVIII, a more generic version of our ordo with this insertion, is found in fourteen manuscripts. All but one of them come from the 11th century or later (the earliest is Lucca 607 of the end of the tenth century), and all were once grouped under the term \textit{Pontifical Romano-Germanique}.\footnote{Elze, Vogel, \textit{Le Pontifical Romano-Germanique}, pp.9-10.} Andrieu makes it plain that he believed OR XXXVIII was created not much earlier than the 950 date he gave the PRG. Here we have proof that it was in Regensburg a century before that.\footnote{Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.III, p.263: ‘rien ne permet de conjecturer qu’il soit de beaucoup antérieur à cet ouvrage’.} It is another Frankish attempt to put into practice a Roman ritual, the Ember Saturday, with Roman notes (a litany, procession to a church of Saint Peter’s, six readings, though none is in Greek), parallel to the rituals we saw as OR XXXVIIA and OR XXXVIIB in the Collection B tradition.

Some folios later, the ordination rite begins. Vienna ser.n.2762 has the two prayer AD CAPILLUM INCIDENDUM and AD CLERICUM FACIENDUM that are often seen accompanying ordination rituals in some examples of Collection B, though in the other Regensburg text, Munich Clm 14510.\footnote{Unterkircher, \textit{Das Kollektor-Pontifikale}, pp.100-101.} Immediately there are some striking changes. The Vienna manuscript, first of all,
removes from the *ordo de sacris ordinibus* the interpolations it gathered and presents them as an opening or prologue of the ordination text. Here are to be found Gregory’s *Capitula*, the extract from Paul and the *ordo qualiter* itself, a second *ordo* for Ember Saturday.\(^{974}\) Some significant additional material was also added. There was originally an example of the *De Officiis VII Graduum* the handy guide to seven grades of the church and their duties (now lost except for the title).\(^{975}\) The capitula of Pope Zosimus ‘*Haec autem in singulis gradibus*’ was also present. It gave the time spent in each grade of the church, often presented with the *ordo de sacris ordinibus* in the Gelasian of the eighth century.\(^{976}\) Only the end of Zosimus’ text from ‘*tamen lege seruata*’, is still present in the manuscript, but what follows is the extract from Pope Leo, quoting from Timothy, ‘*manus cito nemini inposueris*’, that the *ordo de sacris ordinibus* often included, also in Collection B.\(^{977}\) The *CAPITULUM SANCTI GREGORII PAPAE* is the usual text under this title, Gregory’s text from his letter. Again, as in Munich Clm 14510, the two are separated, by the conscientious editor, who realised they were distinct, which other examples of Collection B did not. Before this were three texts under the title *CANON SANCTI GREGORII DE SACRIS ORDINIBUS*, not found in the other examples of the *ordo de sacris ordinibus*.\(^{978}\) These present first that the ordination of priests or deacons must be celebrated with a mass, second that at the ordination of monks the abbot must sing a mass and three prayers over his head, and he must cover his head for seven days, which is compared to a ‘second baptism’, and thirdly that in the ordination of an abbot, the bishop must say a mass and

\(^{974}\) *Ibid.*, pp.102-103 *CAPITULUM SANCTI GREGORII PAPAE* Sicut qui invitatus rennuit, quaesitus refugit sacris est altaribus remouendus, sic qui ultro ambit uel importune se ingerit, procul dubio est repellendus. Nam qui ntitur ad altiore conscedere, quid agit, nisi ut crescendo decrescat, cur non perpendit quod benedictio illi in maledictum convirtitur, quia ad hoc ut fiat hereticus promouetur. ORDO QUALITER IN ROMANA ECCLESIA PRESBITERI DIACONI UEL SUBDIACONI ELEGENDI SUNT CXXXVIII Mensis primi IIIIti VIImi et decimi, sabbatourum die in XII lectiones ad sanctum petrum ubi missae caelebrantur, postquam antiphonam ad introitum dixerint, adnuntiat pontifex in populo dicens ad omnes Auxiliante domino deo et saluatore nostro Iesu Christo elegimus in ordinem diaconi uel suie presbiterii ill. Uel subdiaconi de tituo ill. Si quis autem habet aliquid contra hos viros per deo et propter dominum cum fiducia exeat et dicat. Uerumtamen memor sit communio suae. Hoc expleto ascendant ipsi electi ad sedem pontificis, et benedicet eos a quo uocati sunt et descendunt et stant in ordine suo benedictione perpecta’.  

\(^{975}\) *Ibid.*, p.102 *DE OFFICIIS VII GRADUUM* <...>; Reynolds *De Officiis VII Graduum*, pp.113-151.  

\(^{976}\) Dumas (ed.), *Gellonensis*, p.181.  

\(^{977}\) Unterkircher, *Das Kollektar-Pontifikale*, p.102: ‘Paulus apostolus praecipit timotheo: manus cito nemini inposueris neque communicaueris...’  

\(^{978}\) Unterkircher, *Das Kollektar-Pontifikale*, p.102: ‘The canon of Saint Gregory concerning the sacred orders’.
bless him with two or three of his brothers, and give him shoes and a staff (baculum). These texts are actually extracts from the so-called Penitential of Theodore of Canterbury. These canones had obvious relevance for the ordination rites that follow; not only are priest and deacon ordained in the following pages, but after the ordo de sacris ordinibus immediately follows the ORATIO AD ABBATEM FACIENDUM SIUE ABBATISSAM, which this canon gives as the responsibility of the bishop. Such canons blur the boundaries between liturgical texts and non-liturgical texts, as the Statuta did originally, by presenting what could be interpreted as rubrics for ritual, allowing for rich reinterpretation.

The ordo de sacris ordinibus begins immediately after the ordo qualiter, which represented itself as the Roman practice at Saint Peter’s. It begins with the Psalmist, psalmista id est cantor. Baturich might well have seen in his own other manuscript that Collection B transmitted the psalmist, as did the Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua. There are significant gaps: lector and exorcist are completely lost, but the acolyte has survived. For this acolyte’s rite, Unterkircher identified the closest analogue to be OR XXXV, another of the ordines romani. Andrieu found only a single manuscript, British Library Cod. Add.15222, of around 1000, perhaps from Besançon to which it came early on but certainly transmitting at least one Carolingian text originally from Metz. Bishop Angilram of Metz’s discussion of how much he paid his clergy is uniquely witnessed in this manuscript alone. Otherwise, Add.15222 also contains the whole of Collection A, thus including OR XXXIV, but also has a separate testimony to the ordo de sacris ordinibus (fols.81v-83v), with the

979 Unterkircher, Das Kollektor-Pontifikale, p.102: ‘CANON SANCTI GREGORII DE SACRIS ORDINIBUS. In ordinatione presbiteri vel diaconi oportet episcopus missam cantare. Similiter et greci faciunt quando abbatem eligunt uel abbatissam. In monachi ordinatione Abbas debet missam cantare et tres orationes complere super caput eius et septem dies uel tribus die abbatam infantum absulit, ita et Abbas debet monacho quia secundus baptismo est ut iuxta iudicium patrum et omnia peccata dimittitur, sicut in baptismo presbiter septimo die uel tribus die abbatam infantum absulit, ita et Abbas debet monacho quia secundus baptismo est ut iuxta iudicium patrum et omnia peccata dimittitur, sicut in baptismo. In abbatis ordinatione episcopus debet missam cantare et dare baculum et pedules’.

980 PL XCIX, col.928.

981 Unterkircher, Das Kollektor-Pontifikale, pp.110-112; at p.112: ‘PRAYER FOR MAKING AN ABBOT OR ABBESS’


983 Angilram’s ruling was edited by Andrieu, ‘Règlement d’Angilramne de Metz’.
ordination rituals up to the priest, and here gives rubrics and prayers for the minor orders (including the psalmist) and only the rubrics for the major ones. The manuscript thus has three separate accounts of ordination which overlap significantly: Roman OR XXXIV, the Frankish *ordo de sacris ordinibus*, and OR XXXV (a combination of those two previous). Whether one might term Add.15222 a ‘pontifical’ would be telling. It contains the oaths of obedience made by bishops, abbots and abbesses to the Bishop of Besançon and Sens, so functioned in a way as a repository of episcopal power, as such books could, and indeed this might suggest that the ordination ritual (perhaps OR XXXV) was actually used for some of those rituals. But it transmitted not Collection B, Andrieu’s idea of a *petit pontifical*, but Collection A which was supposedly a difficult prospect for liturgical use and by then about 200 years old, with the addition of OR XXXV, which also described ordination by the *domnus apostolicus* and Pseudo-Gelasius’ decreetal *de recipiendis et non recipiendis* before OR XIII, just as Wolfenbüttel 4175 did, as well as Angilram’s order which has no conceivable liturgical use in 1000. Obviously such a manuscript had multiple functions, including, perhaps, incorporating the liturgical practices of a bishop who might have read it in the history of liturgical functions which encompassed Metz under Angilram, but which focused on the relation of his practices to those of the apostolic Church in Rome (which might explain OR XXXV, which places the usages a Frankish bishop would himself employ amidst Roman ones). In any case, despite this provenance, it was Andrieu’s conviction that OR XXXV, transmitted only here, was originally created in Rome, around the year 900. This is rendered more difficult since the acolyte’s part of the ritual is actually found in a ninth-century Frankish manuscript (and other pieces of it are found in other Frankish manuscripts—but it is beyond my remit to fully review this). In structure, OR XXXV is like the text in the Wolfenbüttel 4175 ordination rite, in that it slots the Gelasian ritual texts into the superstructure of OR XXXIV, the Roman *ordo romanus* of ordination from lector upwards. While OR XXXV was based on OR XXXIV, the text actually *also* presented significant further Roman details, including a rite for

---

the lector that seemed Roman, involving the *domnus apostolicus* (nn.1-5), OR XXXIV did not give a lector’s ritual.985 This was why Andrieu saw OR XXXV as a later, Roman creation. But, certainly, the Roman liturgy arrived in Carolingian Francia not once, but many times, and it is conceivable that OR XXXIV and OR XXXV represent two different interpretations of the Roman rite, the latter a more comprehensive reinterpretation, that each crossed the Alps (at least in the case of the acolyte we seem to see here two contemporary versions co-existing).986 The lector’s ritual has vanished in the Vienna manuscript, so we cannot see if OR XXXV was used here too, but it would seem that it was not, based on the closely related manuscripts discussed below. This suggests that a small extract of Roman ritual was solely employed for the acolyte’s ritual. For the acolyte, the relation to OR XXXV, and not OR XXXIV, is easy to see. In this comparison, I have put in bold the pieces which line up with OR XXXIV, showing how OR XXXV had already added further pieces to this *ordo*, and how Baturich’s text follows it in this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baturich’s <em>Kollektar-Pontifikale</em></th>
<th>OR XXXV, 8-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Tunc uero induunt clericum illum</em> uestimenta officialia et <em>faciant illum uenire</em> ante episcopum, et <em>porrigit ei</em> archidiaconus <em>sacculum super planetam et prosterne se in terra cum ipso et dat ei</em> pontifex <em>orationem hanc:</em></td>
<td><em>Tunc uero induunt clericum illum</em> uestimenta officialia et <em>orarium</em> uel <em>planeta</em> et <em>faciant eum uenire</em> ante domnum apostolicum, et <em>porrigit ei</em> archidiaconus <em>sacculum super planetam et prosterne se in terra cum ipso et dat ei orationem sic:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Intercedente beata et gloriosa semperque sola virgine Maria...</em></td>
<td><em>Et numquam est ausus postea quoquam absque chrysma pergere, ut, ubicumque ad pontificem se iuncxerit et ipse aliquam confirmationem facere uoluerit, semper paratus sit ad ministerium suum explendum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Domine sancte pater omnipotens...</em></td>
<td><em>A nostris episcopis consecratur ita:</em> <em>Domine sancte pater omnipotens...</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Et si ibi ad praesens eum uoluerit ad subdiaconatus ordinem promouere, tollatur ab eo sacculus quem ab archidiacono iam dudum susceperat, et stet in medio apud archidiaconum, et iuret ipso tangente super sancta Christi quattuor</em></td>
<td><em>Et si ad praesens uoluerit eum ad subdiaconatus ordinem promoueri, tollitur ab eo sacculus, quem ab archidiacono iam dudum susceperit, et stat in medium apud archidiaconum et iurat, ipso exigente, super sancta Christi quattuor</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

985 Ibid., pp.33-34.
Both texts possess the ostensible structure of OR XXXIV, but in the places OR XXXV has added in new pieces, Baturich has followed it, adding *vestimenta officialia*, giving the archdeacon a significantly expanded role, and so on. The *Domnus apostolicus* becomes *episcopus* or *pontifex* in the Vienna text, a change which is very familiar, but which witnesses to adaptation for Regensburg, rather than Rome. Two pieces are missing from Vienna ser.n.2762. OR XXXV offers two choices of prayers, that said by the archdeacon ‘*Intercedente beata*’ in Rome, which was the prayer given by OR XXXIV for the acolyte, and the second prayer, said by *episcopis nostris*, which is *Domine sancte pater omnipotens*, the prayer given in the *ordo de sacris ordinibus* and the Gelasion. Andrieu’s idea that OR XXXV was Roman is strained to the limit when the Franks are present as *nostri* here! In any case, the Regensburg scribe does not have the Roman prayer found in OR XXXIV and XXXV *Intercedente beata* and presents one singular option, said by the pontiff, of the Gelasion prayer *Domine sancte pater omnipotens*. Again, this suggests adaptation of the rite to narrate rituals as they would actually unfold in Regensburg. It was clear that the manuscript was following a Roman script (the Gelasion rubric for the acolyte does not form part of this text), and would be clear to anyone who knew these traditions intimately, but the *ordo* is adapted for him to be the one following that script. Also missing from the Regensburg text is the stern warning that the new acolyte must always...

987 Unterkircher, *Das Kollektar-Pontifikale*, pp.103-104 <But then the clerics clothe him> in his official vestments and they should make him come before the bishop, and the archdeacon should vest him in the pouch over his chasuble and he should prostrate himself in the earth with him and the pontiff gives him this prayer: *Domine sancte pater omnipotens* (etc.). And then if he should wish to promote the man to the subdiaconate, the archdeacon should take from him the pouch which he had once given him, and he should stand in the middle with the archdeacon, and he should swear, touching him with the four Gospels of Holy Christ according to the canons’.

988 Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.IV, pp.34-35: ‘But then the clerics clothe him in his official vestments and the stole and the chasuble and they make him come before the Lord Apostolic, and the archdeacon vests him in the pouch over his chasuble and he prostrates himself in the earth with him and the pontiff gives him this prayer: *Intercedente beata et gloriosa semperque sola virgin Maria…* (etc.). And never after should he ever find himself without chrism, so that, when he should be called to the pontiff and he should wish to make some confirmation, that one should always be prepared to perform his ministry. By our bishops, he is consecrated thus: *Domine sancte pater omnipotens* (etc.). And then if he should wish to promote the man to the subdiaconate, the archdeacon takes from him the pouch which he had once given him, and he stands in the middle with the archdeacon, and he swears, as he is demanded, over the four Gospels of Holy Christ concerning the four capital things according to the canons’.
have oil with him. This was probably a later addition in OR XXXV; in any case the fact that the text uses pontifex here and not domnus apostolicus suggests it was a Frankish one. The use of some version of the acolyte’s rite in OR XXXV found here suggests that the Roman ordination rite had passed into Francia at least twice, in the form of OR XXXIV, and in another form, close to OR XXXV. The recension in the British Library manuscript, with additions of Frankish texts like the ‘nostris episcopis’, had made use of an old Roman ritual, it does not reflect practice in Rome later than the ninth century. Andrieu’s conclusions about what ordination looked like in tenth-century Rome are highly suspect, therefore.

The subdeacon is the next ritual, again only partial. Unlike OR XXXV, the Vienna text clearly separates the subdeacon from this, with a title ITEM DE SUBDIACONO. ORDINATIONE SUBDIACONI and then follows the Gelasian rite with the characteristic opening Subdiaconus cum ordinatur and the rubrics that the subdeacon would take the empty chalice and paten from the hand of the bishop, and from the archdeacon the vessels for water and the towel. Then follows the prefatio subdiaconi, found in the Gelasian and not in OR XXXV, which begins Oremus deum ac dominum nostrum. In the midst of this text, the narrative is again cut off by lost pages. The ordination ritual in Vienna ser.n.2762 appear to treat different ordination rites in different ways. The subdeacon ritual from the Gelasian is presented without modification, as is that for the psalmist, but the acolyte was substantially modified by the addition of text from the Roman source. OR XXXV did similarly in the British Library manuscript. For the lector and acolyte, it allowed the Gelasian prayer only in appendix, whereas for the sub-deacon it completely overhauls his source with marked bias towards the Gelasian rubrics. The apparently shared dissatisfaction from both texts with OR XXXIV’s Roman

---

989 Jeffrey, ‘Rome and Jerusalem’, pp.235-236: ‘this variety is due not merely to lapses in Frankish transmission but also to variations and changes made even within the city of Rome itself’.

990 Ellard, Ordination Anointings, p.9.

991 Unterkircher, Das Kollektar-Pontifikale, p.194: ‘Subdiaconus cum ordinatur, quia manus impositionem non accipit, patenam de manu episcopi uacuam similiter et calicem de manu uero archidiaconi accipiat urceolum cum aquamanile ac manutergio. PREFATIO SUBDIACONI Oremus deum ac dominum nostrum frates karissimi, ut super serum suum ill., quem ad subdiaconatus officium uocare dignatus est, infundant benedictionem et gratiam suam, ut in conspectus suu fideliter seruiens, praedestinata sancta praemia consequatur. Per.’
version of the subdeacon’s rite, and their preference for what the Gelasian offered in this case, may help to reveal shared priorities for what a correct and complete ordination rite might look like, even if the details do differ somewhat.

The Vienna manuscript is almost completely missing the rite for the deacon. All that remains is most of a prayer *Domine sancte spei*.992 This prayer is to be seen in the Gelasian tradition.993 There it is entitled *Benedictio sequitur*, one of a pair of extra prayers for the deacon. The first prayer is called *ad consummandum officium diaconatus*, and it is very likely that the Regensburg pontifical had this first prayer as well. These extra prayers significantly elaborate the deacon’s ordination, from three to five prayers, but these are not Roman. For the priest, something different occurs. The rite is that of the Gelasian, where the priest is blessed by the pontiff and those accompanying him join the pontiff in laying hands on him. The language in which it is given is entirely different, however, and choreographs the rite in greater detail beyond the single rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vienna Cod.ser.n.2762, fols.54r-v</th>
<th>Gelasian/Collection B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Post lectionem autem et tractum parato electo qui presbiter ordinandus diaconi more absque orario tamen, et prasentantibus eum atque ducentibus duobus diaconibus usque ad presbiteros. Duo autem presbiteri deducentes ad sedem pontificis, et ipse contra se erigens interrogat si dignus et iustus sit, et illis attestantibus accipiens orarium et casulam inponens ei, eoque inclinato inponet manum super caput eius et omnes presbiteri qui adsunt pariter cum eo, et ille dans orationem super eum.</em> 994</td>
<td><em>Presbyter cum ordinatur episcopo eum benedicente et manum super caput eius tenente etiam omnes presbiteri qui presentes sunt manus suas iuxta manum episcopi super caput illius teneant</em>995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


994 Unterkircher (ed.) *Das Kollektar Pontifikale*, p.105: ‘But after the reading and the tractus, when the elected, who will be ordained priest, prepared as a deacon but by custom without the stole, and when two deacons have presented him to the priests. But as two priests lead him to the pontiff’s seat and raise him before it, he (the pontiff) should ask him if he is worthy and just, and those who are standing, receiving the stole and chasuble, place them on him. When he has inclined himself, the pontiff puts his hand over his head and all the priests who are with him together with him do the same and the pontiff gives prayer over him.’

995 Dumas (ed.), *Gellonensis*, 2529, p.388: ‘Now when the priest is ordained, the bishop blesses him and holds a hand over his head, while all the priests who are present should hold their hands next to the hand of the bishop over his head.’
Two features that separate this text from the Gelasian are the vesting of the new priest in the *orarium* and *casulum* and his brief interrogation by the pontiff. The first rite is also often found in the Gelasian Sacramentaries of the eighth century, by the inclusion of a prayer *HIC UESTIS EI CASULA* and so was an attested part of the Frankish ritual. It is also seen in OR XXXVII, the Ember Day ritual of Collection B.\(^{996}\) Either it was composed in Regensburg, or, more likely as we will see, it was found in another source, undeniably Frankish, perhaps from Salzburg, to which the episcopal ordination following it is linked. In any case, it further expands the breadth of what different methods and sources this Regensburg text was prepared to use for the different stages of the ordination sequence. OR XXXV, in whatever form it was used for the acolyte rite, is no longer used for the priest. With such a breadth of creativity in this sequence, we can only suppose that the texts’ composition was entirely guided by the taste of the compiler or bishop overseeing it, perhaps Baturich, for what was ‘correct’ (or the taste of another bishop from whose manuscript our own was copied), with no single emphasis proving overpowering in every case. In any case, though the *ordo* itself is more developed, the prayers that follow, *BENEDICTIO, ORATIO* and *CONSECRATIO* are all familiar from the Gelasian ordination sequence, and equally as it was found in the previous Regensburg pontifical, Munich 14510. Again, unfortunately, the text cuts off with a lost page halfway through the *consecratio*, so if the text followed Munich Clm 14510 with the Gelasian prayers afterwards remains unknown from this manuscript alone (though not completely unknowable, as we shall see).

After the missing page, the Vienna text starts up again at a point fairly early on in the episcopal ordination. Again, this is entirely different from any episcopal ordination encountered before. However, as Unterkircher correctly identifies it, the text is immediately very similar to OR XXXVB, found only in the *Alessandrina* Pontifical Andrieu dated to the year 1000 or immediately

\(^{996}\) Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.IV, p.237: ‘revestit eos...si vero presbiteros orarios et planetas’.
after it, Rome Biblioteca Alessandrina 173.\textsuperscript{997} Andrieu was keen to see this manuscript as an example of the Pontifical Romano-Germanique, with every piece of its content taken from that tradition, the sole exception being the episcopal ordination, OR XXXVB. As Parkes and others note, it is curious that a text like Alessandrina 173, written within 50 years of the hypothetical Mainz exemplar from 950, should nevertheless be only an incomplete and imperfect representation of the genre, supposedly perfectly copied in the 12\textsuperscript{th} century Monte Cassino manuscript to which Andrieu pointed as the best example of the PRG.\textsuperscript{998} Andrieu located Alessandrina 173 to Italy, not far from Rome and suggested it belonged to one of the bishops of the suburbican sees. OR XXXVB spreads the ordination rite over two days, Saturday vespers (nn.1-8) and Sunday (nn.9-52). The Saturday ritual is lost from Vienna ser.n.2762.

In the Sunday rite, the Vienna text opens part of the way through. Alessandrina 173 opens with the text: ‘Dominica vero die progreditur domnus apostolicus cum electo et clero et cuncto populo ad ecclesiam’ (OR XXXVB, n.101), which appears to also come from OR XXXV (or perhaps more likely directly from a shared Roman source).\textsuperscript{999} But from there on out, the text no longer follows OR XXXV and in fact came from the Gallican interrogations, which were recorded for the very first time in Baturich’s pontifical.\textsuperscript{1000} Andrieu did recognise that this lengthy interrogation of the bishop’s morals, faith and intentions, including his chastity, charity, humility, patience, his willingness to assent to key Christian doctrine such as the Trinity (in language more exacting and precise than the Creed), the resurrection, and anathematizing all heresy, was primarily a ‘Gallican’ tradition.\textsuperscript{1001} Andrieu called it the Gallican Examinatio; the notion of such an examination, and pieces of the finished product do go back to the Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua, a part of it which did not pass into the Gelasian but remained distinct.\textsuperscript{1002} The Statuta is referred to directly in Alessandrina 173.

\textsuperscript{997} Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.IV, pp.79-110.
\textsuperscript{998} Parkes, Making of Liturgy, p.98
\textsuperscript{1000} Andrieu ‘Le sacré épiscopal’, pp.31-34: ‘Hincmar (writing in 845) serait ainsi le premier à en signaler l’existence’.
\textsuperscript{1001} Andrieu, Les Ordines, vol.IV, p.61.
\textsuperscript{1002} Andrieu, ‘Le sacre épiscopal’, pp.29-34.
under the title *canone Cartaginensi*, as Hincmar does as well.\textsuperscript{1003} Confusion of the revered *Statuta* with actually authoritative, if somewhat lesser known, councils can reveal the complexities of ‘authoritative tradition’ where canonical authority is retroactively read into the texts pre-emptively deemed useful and correct. This reference to the *Statuta* as a Carthaginian canon occurs in the opening statement, ‘*Antiqua sanctorum patrum institutio docet*’ (OR XXXVB, n.12).\textsuperscript{1004} It is in the middle of this opening statement that the Vienna *Kollektar-Pontifikale* begins the surviving narrative of the episcopal ordination from ‘*trinitatis et interrogatur de diversis causis*’ and so on.\textsuperscript{1005} From there on out the two texts are nearly identical for the length of this examination, though *Alessandrina* 173 offers three extra questions. In fact, the Vienna manuscript presents our earliest full record of the Gallican episcopal interrogation.

The conclusion of the interrogation again proves the concordance with the *Alessandrina* 173 text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baturich’s <em>Kollektar-Pontifikale</em></th>
<th>OR XXXVB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Haec tibi fides augeatur a domino ad ueram et aeternam beatitudinem dilectissime frater in Christo. Responsent omnes: AMEN.</em></td>
<td><em>Tunc dicatur ei: Hec tibi fides augeatur a domino ad ueram et eternam beatitudinem, dilectissime frater in Christo. Resp. Amen. Hec sollicita...</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ita quoque examinatus et plene instructus cum consensu clericorum et laicorum ac conuentu totius provinciae episcoporum maximeque metropolitani uel auctoritate aut praesentia ordinetur</em></td>
<td><em>Ita quoque examinatus et plene instructus, cum consensu clericorum et laicorum ac conuentu totius provinciae episcoporum maximeque metropolitani uel auctoritate aut praesentia ordinetur. Nullis detur inuitus episcopus, nisi cleri, plebis, ordinis consensus et desiderium requiratur.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{1005} Unterkircher, *Kollektar-Pontifikale*, pp.105-110.

\textsuperscript{1006} Unterkircher, *Kollektar-Pontifikale*, pp.107-108: ‘These things to you should be increased by the Lord to the true and eternal beatitude, oh most beloved brother in Christ. EVERYONE RESPONDS AMEN. But when he has been examined and fully instructed with the consensus of the clerics and laypeople and the consent of the whole province of bishops and with the great authority and in the presence of the Metropolitan, let him be ordained.’

\textsuperscript{1007} Andrieu, *Les Ordines*, vol.IV, p.15: ‘Then he says to him 'These things to you should be increased by the Lord to true and eternal beatitude, oh most beloved brother in Christ. They respond. Amen....But when he has been examined and clearly instructed with the consensus of the clerics and the laypeople and the consent of the whole province of bishops, by the great authority and in the presence of the Metropolitan, let him be
Here, the words in bold actually come from the *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua*, but were not in the Gelasian Sacramentary. This reinforces the idea that the *Statuta*, under the guise of the canons of Carthage, directly influenced the ritual for the bishop found here, itself a melange created by a process of combination and transformation.

Once the interrogation was completed, the actual ceremony of the ordination began. Here OR XXXVB, nn.16-52 essentially leaves the Vienna ser.n.2762 text and becomes significantly more elaborated. The pieces added to *Alessandrina* 173 (unction of head and hands, blessing of the bishops’s clothes, handing him a ring and staff), were quite natural elaborations of the episcopal rite, and were in fact almost all practiced in the ninth century, as Hincmar of Rheims recorded them, but they were not written down yet in the Regensburg example, if they were also used in Bavaria. But the Vienna manuscript did continue with a rich and self-contained *ordo*, which certainly contributed to Vogel and Elze’s *Pontifical Romano-Germanique*.


ordained. The bishop should be given no invitation, if the consensus and desire of the orders, either clergy or people, is lacking’.


Unterkircher, *Das Kollektar-Pontifikale*, p.108: ‘When the Bishop is ordained, first shall process the lord metropolitan with the rest of the clerics to the church, where he wished this ordination to happen. But, coming before the altar, as soon as he wishes, he signals to the first of the canons and at once he begins introit Benedictit te hodie deus, with the psalm Deus deorum dominus and the Gloria in fullness. But when they have
Manuscripts including Lucca 607 transmit this text, but elaborate the surrounding ritual significantly, in a similar fashion to *Alessandrina* 173, with the extra rituals and a far lengthier ceremony, but it is clear the Regensburg text was one of the ‘building blocks’, as it was itself built from the Gelasian rubric. The text opens with that formula that sounds very familiar from the Gelasian text, but the Gelasian had only offered a single rubric for the very climax of the rite, the holding of the Gospel book over the head of the ordinand, as well as the prayers to surround it. That ritual does come in its proper place here, some time later, as well:

Finita letania, eleuat ipsum electum domnus metropolitanus, et ponit caput eius super altare, et duo episcopi ponant et teneant euangelium super uerticem eius. Reliqui ergo omnes qui adsunt episcopi manus super caput eius ponant et domnus metropolitanus infundens benedictionem super eum dicens lenta uoce: DOMINUS UOBISCUM...

This part of the episcopal ordination is, thus, a new *ordo*, fleshing out the simple rubric of the Gelasian text which was found in Collection B manuscripts (such as Baturich’s own, Munich Clm 14510) into a complete narrative of the bishop’s ordination by a metropolitan archbishop, just as his priest’s ordination offered a more complete apparatus around the Gelasian rubric. Three prayers are offered in the course of the rite, all given in full: ‘*Adesto supplicationibus*, ‘*Propitiare domine*’...
supplicationibus’, ‘Deus honorum omnium’. All Collection B manuscript as well as the Gelasian of the eighth century possess these prayers (OR XXXVB includes them too-nn.25-29), they were a part of the Gregorian Sacramentary’s ordination of the bishop.

The final part of the ceremony was also unique:


The Pontifical Romano-Germanique differs here. But where provision is made for a mass to follow the ordination, the mass prayers are a SECRETa prayer Haec hostia domine, the INFRA CANONEM prayer Hanc igitur oblationem and the AD COMMUNIONEM prayer Haec nos communio. These three mass prayers are the same as those in Collection B, again the Gregorian prayers which Verona XCII and Cologne 138 retained. This divides this Pontifical from the earlier example firmly linked to Baturich, Munich Clm.14510, whose episcopal ordination mass has two
distinctive prayers from the Gelasian tradition: **SECRETＡ Suscipe domine munera** and **POST COMMUNIONEM Plenum quaesumus domine** and the AD **COMMUNIONEM** under the Gelasian title **INFRACTIONE**. This difference may, in fact, be because this text was taken up from another diocese: **Salzburg**.

The episcopal ordination is a narrative of a metropolitan’s liturgical act. ¹⁰¹⁷ **Regensburg** was not a metropolitan see. Strictly, **Baturich** himself, or his successors, would never have performed the rite of episcopal ordination which his manuscript offered. **Salzburg** was the metropolitan see of **Bavaria**. ¹⁰¹⁸ There is a possibility, that the episcopal ordination was, in fact, the practice of **Salzburg**, copied into a **Regensburg Pontifical**. The **Alessandrina** 173 pontifical, despite being Italian, preserves a usage where the bishop swore service to **Salzburg**’s metropolitan, one of three questions missing from the interrogation in the Vienna manuscript, but making it clear that Salzburg was where this text had originated. ¹⁰¹⁹ As I argued above, regarding the **ordo romanus qualiter concilium agatur**, simply because a text was a metropolitan’s, does not mean a bishop had no use for it. ¹⁰²⁰ In a pontifical, the bishop’s ritual could inform about what episcopacy was, or it simply was regarded as ‘correct’ to keep the episcopal ordination so that the ritual was a complete account of all the grades, as Collection B’s manuscripts (none from a metropolitan) also kept record of it. We can safely assume that some form of this ritual, with the long episcopal interrogation, did happen in metropolitan sees, even in places and times when they were not yet written down in liturgical manuscripts. One certainly sees evidence of them, for example, in Hincmar’s 845 letter to **Adventius of Metz**. ¹⁰²¹ Hincmar makes it very plain that he practised something like the ceremonies Baturich’s

---


¹⁰²⁰ Ut supra, pp.107-108.

¹⁰²¹ Andrieu, ‘Le sacre épiscopal’, pp.22-73; the letter is found in PL CXXVI, cols.186-188, from a now-lost manuscript at Liège.
text offered, with an interrogation on Saturday, and a rite on Sunday, including the holding of the book over the head of the ordinand, the anointing of his hands, and a mass to follow. Some details differ, for example the Regensburg account of ordination explains that the celebrant would not say the *Kyrie eleison* but Hincmar explicitly suggests that he did.¹⁰²² Hincmar’s letter suggests that he simply performed the *ordo* from memory, with the prayers to be found on the *rotula* or scroll he sent to Adventius with his letter. Not every see wrote down texts at the same rate; Salzburg may have been the first we can see to codify the process and this rite was saved in the Vienna manuscript, centuries before any testimony of it survives elsewhere. That rite then passed into Italy.

It is very clear that Carolingian Bavaria was very closely linked to Italy (as we saw in Collection B), and, in Italy, one other manuscript preserved some testimony to Baturich’s original.¹⁰²³ Rome Biblioteca Nazionale 2096 (*Sessorianus* 52), which I have discussed as an eleventh-century copy of Collection B which came to Nonantola before the thirteenth century, presents the exact same deacon, priest and bishop’s ordination as Vienna ser.n.2762, which it has added to its *ordo de sacris ordinibus* which is otherwise more or less the same as Collection B.¹⁰²⁴ Sessorianus 52 has the same set of canons and commentary as were supplied by the Vienna manuscript as well¹⁰²⁵ Andrieu himself pointed out in the notes to his commentary on *Sessorianus* 52 that this particular manuscript offered neither the oaths to the Pope and the successors of Saint Peter, nor the oath to a metropolitan, which was that of Salzburg in the *Alessandrina* 173 manuscript.¹⁰²⁶ These were also

not found in the Vienna manuscript. The Sessorianus manuscript also preserves the same episcopal ordination as this manuscript.\textsuperscript{1027} Again the style has been elevated, as this manuscript does throughout Collection B, but the rite described is similar (except the celebrant is now \textit{domnus apostolicus}-does this mean a change has been made towards Roman use?). Andrieu published this (the \textit{ordo} without the \textit{examinatio}) as OR XXXVA, recognising that it was a late copy of an early example, though he thought it was a tenth-century Roman exemplar.\textsuperscript{1028} We now see that it was a ninth-century Bavarian one; OR XXXVA continues to be close to Vienna ser.n.2762, even where the PRG divides, and is similarly non-elaborated. Sessorianus 52’s priestly ordination also shows how the Vienna manuscript continued, where there is now a loss of pages. The fact that Sessorianus 52 perfectly accords with Baturich’s other manuscript, Munich Clm 14510, is further evidence that the relationship was very close. Again the Sessorianus has a more stylised Latin idiom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vienna Cod. Ser.n.2762, fols.54r-v\textsuperscript{1029}</th>
<th>Rome, Biblioteca Nazionale MS 2762 (Sessorianus 52) fols.128r-128v</th>
<th>Munich Clm 14510 fols.70r-71v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORDO AD PRESBITERORUM ORDINANDUM</td>
<td>ORDO PRESBITERII</td>
<td>ORDINATIO PRESBITERII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post lectionum autem...ille dans orationem super eum.</td>
<td>Post lectionum et tractatum parato electo qui presbiter ordinandus...adstantibus profaturque dicens</td>
<td>Presbiter cum ordinatur episcopo...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM BENEDICTIO Oremus diletissimi deum patrum omnipotem. Ut super hunc\textbackslash os/ famulum\textbackslash os/...</td>
<td>PREFATIO PRESBITERII Oremus, diletissimi Deum patrem omnipotentem</td>
<td>ITEM BENEDICTIO Oremus diletissimi deum patrum omnipotem. Ut super hunc\textbackslash os/ famulum\textbackslash os/ suum\textbackslash os/...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQUITUR ORATIO Exaudi nos dominus deus noster et super hunc\textbackslash os/ famulum\textbackslash os/...</td>
<td>ORATIO EIOUSDEM Exaudi nos, quaesumus, Domine, Deus noster, et super hunc famulum tuum.</td>
<td>SEQUITUR ORATIO Exaudi nos dominus deus noster et super hunc\textbackslash os/ famulum\textbackslash os/ benedictionem...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSECRATIO Domine sanctae pater omnipotens aeterne deus honorum auctor et distributor omnium</td>
<td>CONSECRATIO Domine sancte pater omnipotens, aeternae deus honorum auctor et distributor</td>
<td>Domine sanctae pater omnipotens aeterne deus honorum auctor et distributor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1027} Gullotta, \textit{Cataloghi}, p.431.

\textsuperscript{1028} Andrieu, \textit{Les Ordines}, vol.IV, pp.61-75, p.69: ‘l’exemplaire même du Sessorianus 52 n’est qu’une copie, postérieure de plus d’un siècle à la redaction de l’Ordo XXXVA et peut-être séparée par un assez grand nombre d’intermédiaires’.

\textsuperscript{1029} Unterkircher, \textit{Das Kollektar-Pontifikale}, p.105.
For the priest, therefore, it would seem that the Vienna manuscript preserved older usages of Regensburg, including the consecration of hands and the Gelasian prayers, the Consumatio and second Benedictio. This is finally, and definitively, proven by the fact that the manuscript called a Pontifical-Sacramentary, and attributed to Bishop Wolfgang of Regensburg (Verona Biblioteca Capitolare, LXXXVI), a successor of Baturich, which was written 993/994 and came to Italy, has the same forms of ordination as those discussed above.¹⁰³⁰ It includes the psalmist, it has the extract from OR XXXV in the Acolyte’s ritual, has two Gelasian prayers following the priest’s ritual and that of the deacon, its episcopal ordination has the same interrogation from OR XXXVB (without the vow of obedience to the metropolitan), and the ceremony continues rather like OR XXXVA. Thus, we can confidently fully reconstruct the Vienna manuscript’s ordination ritual from these several manuscripts. For each grade there seem to have been made different choices and allowed for

¹⁰³⁰ Klaus Gamber and Sieghild Rehle (eds), Das Sakramentar-Pontifikale des Bischofs Wolfgang von Regensburg (Regensburg, 1985), pp.268-282. Wolfgang’s Sacramentary shows signs of how the ritual developed in Regensburg. It adds, for example, an anointing of oil to the bishop’s head during the course of the consecration and specifies how the priest would be interrogated.
different demands. Yet, by the eleventh century, Baturich’s manuscript, or more likely antecedents of it (including one from Salzburg) and offshoots of it were still feeding into Italian ordination practices. OR XXXVIII of the Ember Saturday, too, is first attested after Baturich in an Italian manuscript, Lucca Biblioteca Capitolare 607, at the end of the tenth century, then in the host of later manuscripts placed under the PRG label. If it was Bavarian, Carolingian texts copied in Italy which contributed heavily to the PRG traditions, Cologne 138’s influence on those same traditions (as I discussed) is no surprise.\textsuperscript{1031} Cologne 138 was probably Veronese, but its \textit{ordo romanus qualiter concilium agatur} had the same link to Salzburg! A way into a reassessment of the \textit{Pontifical Romano-Germanique} manuscripts in turn has begun to be laid here.

Each grade of the ordination ritual was selected from a range of possibilities. The subdeacon and deacon were Old Gelasian, the psalmist was from the \textit{Statuta} or Collection B, the acolyte had pieces from a Roman source, OR XXXV, with a Gelasian prayer text attached, the priest had an entirely new \textit{ordo} which was more comprehensive than the Gelasian rubric, with Old Gelasian prayers, and the bishop would seem to have been taken from Salzburg, with Gregorian prayers. If Baturich was responsible, the production of a new \textit{Kollektar-Pontifikale} for him may have been occasioned by developments in the 840s. In 843 Regensburg increased in importance after the Treaty of Verdun, and became Louis the German’s capital. In 845, fourteen Bohemian princes came to Regensburg to be baptized.\textsuperscript{1032} These events may have inaugurated the production of a new pontifical, more definitive than the Collection B texts, before Baturich’s death in 847. For the rest of the pontifical (the consecration of the church, blessing pieces) there are commonalities with the other, later Pontifical manuscripts from Alemmania, and those treated by Rasmussen. But for the ordination ritual, this manuscript’s compilers made the choice to go to the \textit{ordines romani}. These texts gave him something the Sacramentary could not. With the stations noted in his \textit{Kollektar}, and

\textsuperscript{1031} Ut supra pp.106-107.
\textsuperscript{1032} Annals of Fulda, MGH SRG, VII, p.35, this was canonically dubious since in took place ‘\textit{in octavis theophaniae}’.
the references to Pope Gregory, these *ordines romani* allowed them access to the world of Rome that his *ordo* for Ember Saturday shows he brought to Regensburg with some form of a stational system modelled on the Pope's own.
Conclusion

In the early ninth century, Theotroch, a deacon, wrote from Fulda to his friend the priest Ootbert, who was also a monk in the Abbey of Lorsch. Half of Theotroch’s letter is written onto a spare sheet at the front of BAV Palat.lat.1341, a computational manuscript from Lorsch, in the second half of the ninth century, but the other half (originally on the end sheet) has been lost. Theotroch is perhaps the same man who became Abbot of Lorsch, 863-875; his name and Ootbert both appear in the Confraternitas Augiensis as brothers of Lorsch. Theotroch opened his letter by noting that what deacons actually did during the Mass appeared to vary hugely, from place to place, in monasteries but also in small towns. For ‘those who wished to know the truth’, Theotroch presented to Ootbert a narrative of the mass as it was performed in Fulda, as a ‘maiorum exempla’. This was a Mass in the general vein of OR I but differing from it also, from the gathering of the deacons at the ringing of the bell (clocca again), who would number seven, five, three or one (as in Amalarius), and their procession into the church, through to the introit, the reading of lessons, chant of the Kyrie and Gloria, and the offertory. The rest of the Mass was lost. It follows no single ordo romanus in every detail. In some, there are resonances of Amalarius, in the movement of candles during the introit from a row across the altar to a line facing east (Collection B also


1036 Palazzo, ‘Lettre du diacre Theotrochus’, p.219: ‘Quoniam in multis locis non solum in monasteriis etiam in parvis civitatisbus ordo diaconorum, partim propter incuriam praelatorum partim per inopiam ministrantium, in caelebiratione missae diversus esse videtur, placuit mihi uobis per stili seriem intimare, quemadmodum in monasterio Fulda agatur idem ordo…Majorum sane exampla cum bona et utilia videntur, laudana et exequenda sunt, mala vere penitus exstirpanda’.
recommended this), and in the fact that the deacon who read would only ascend to the first level of the *ambo*.\textsuperscript{1037} There are also commonalities with a Frankish Mass *ordo*, OR IV, adapted from *OR I* for the Collection of Saint-Amand. The priest washes his hands before the Mass, a Frankish custom, that was there performed by the *pontifex*.\textsuperscript{1038} In keeping with Theotroch’s focus on the deacon, some responsibilities are given to the deacon which most *ordines romani* gave exclusively to the pontiff: of signalling the cantor and of giving the kiss of peace.\textsuperscript{1039} In OR IV, it was said that the deacon might perform these exact functions if the pontiff was not present.\textsuperscript{1040} Again, the *ostiarius* and *cantor* have an actual role in the Mass, against Barrow’s assertion that they were ‘dead letters’.\textsuperscript{1041} The *subdiaconus regionarius* is present, as he was in Amalarius, despite the fact that this grade stemmed from the Roman regions. In Haussling’s interpretation, this reflects a deeper ‘quotation’ of Rome’s Mass by Fulda, actually taking on the role of those performing the Mass in Rome (as the bishops did in the stational liturgy).\textsuperscript{1042} These seem to be common to Frankish adaptations of the Mass *ordo*. They were part of an unspoken apparatus that some practitioners would slot into place around *OR I* before it was actually performed, even if they were not always written. Theotroch even acknowledged that because Lorsch did not have as many priests as Fulda did (Fulda did have a high proportion of priests) variation on this account was acceptable:

\textsuperscript{1037} Palazzo, ‘Lettre du diacre Theotrochus’, p.220: ‘Qui vero caereos tenent stant ab utraque regione in choro...et cum dicitur <<Kyrie eleyson>> statuunt candelas hinc et inde tres, mediam autem unam, et iterum cum subdiaconus accredit ad legendum, veniet unus eorum et sistit omnes in ordinem orientem versus. Sane subdiaconus cum leget ascendant primum gradum ambonis, cantor vero alleluia vel gradalis minime, sed juxta stantes psallunt’.

\textsuperscript{1038} Palazzo, ‘Lettre du diacre Theotrochus’, p.220: ‘et allatur ei aqua ut manus lavat’

\textsuperscript{1039} \textit{Ibid.}, p.220: ‘Paululum superius diaconis progressis tunc...et iterum coepto introitu post dictum versum erigentes se dat osulum pacis regionarius diacono ad dexteram sui stanti, inde ad sinistram et sic omnibus his alternatim, et tunc annuit cantori, ut dicat ‘Gloria Patri’.


‘because here in Fulda the ordo is made most appropriate by the ministering of priests with all decorum, but they among us are not so many, I will take care to touch them only briefly for this reason’.  

But Theotroch’s discussion of why Fulda’s ordo missae was exemplary is perhaps the most significant feature of the letter. He says:

placuit mihi vobis per stili seriem intimare, quemadmodum in monasterio Fulda agatur idem ordo, ubi ordinabiliter et cum sufficientia ritualque Romano eadem officia peraguntur ut quod adhuc usque erratum in hoc constat apud nos inscienter, deinceps manente monitione conscriptio non sit necesse, aliter quam ordo postulat in quantum facultas ministrorum suppedit, extra ordinem rectum devagari.  

This text presented the ‘right ordo’ to Ootbert. Certainly, it was regarded as ritualque romano. Though the adaptations I outlined above were not, in fact, Roman, in essence the text was still regarded as such. But Fulda’s practices were exemplary also because they were ordinabiliter et cum sufficientia; regarded properly, they simply made sense to Theotroch. They had a ratio behind them, as Amalarius would have put it. If one had more or fewer deacons, that also did not matter. It made the ordo no less Roman or orderly. In Theotroch’s trio of ordinabiliter et cum sufficientia ritualque romano are to be found all the dynamics I have considered in this thesis.

---

1044 ibid., p.219: ‘I am pleased to inform you through a movement of my pen, how in the monastery of Fulda this order [of deacons] acts, where in an orderly manner and with sufficiency and to the Roman rite the same office is undertaken, so that though up until now this error endures among us unknowingly, thereafter with the warning of this document remaining it should not be necessary, other than what the ordo requires in how large a capacity of ministers it supposes, to stray from the right ordo’.  
1045 Häußling, Mönchskonvent, p.179: ‘Die sporadischen Einzelheiten, die als ordo vel consuetudo sanctae sedis Romanae ecclesiae eingeschärft worden, können nicht als das Wesen der römischen Liturgie angesehen werden’; Baldovin, The Urban Character, p.249: ‘imitating the city of Rome was strategically more important than tactical assimilation of various liturgical elements’. 
Using the *ordines romani* as a base, I have examined some sixteen manuscripts from the Carolingian period, most of which have been almost entirely neglected since the writings of Andrieu. A liturgical ‘text type’, the *ordo romanus*, saw itself reinvented again and again in the course of the ninth century, either by significant interventions in the texts themselves, or simply by the careful association of the texts with others, liturgical and non-liturgical alike. Beginning from the manuscripts, the Carolingian liturgical achievement can be seen as a far more collaborative effort. The individuals involved had their own ideas, resources and principles at stake, their own vision of what an account of ‘correct’ liturgy would mean in a book they could actually use. What gave rise to their manuscripts was these individuals’ queries and searches, the problems they encountered and the answers they posited.\textsuperscript{1046} Some, like Baturich or Bernhar of Worms, seem to have been astoundingly precocious and creative and they each intervened in the narrative of the *ordines romani*. For each of them, significant gestures towards Rome, such as the notes and appendices in Bernhar’s Pontifical, and the *diligentiae* ritual in Baturich’s Munich Clm 14510, could be placed in the manuscripts which also added Frankish usages to the *ordines*, such as the episcopal blessing and the benediction of the Paschal Candle in Frankish style. Amalarius of Metz, too, selectively and carefully cited Roman norms, alongside a rich liturgical tradition, marked by practices which were not cited in an *ordo romanus* we can point to, but which Amalarius knew well by experience, as the practice of Metz, or perhaps Trier.\textsuperscript{1047} What is supremely telling is the absence of any manuscript exclusively devoted to *ordines romani* which were undoubtedly Roman.

Collection A, deemed the ‘Roman Collection’, by Andrieu, was already compiled for a Frankish audience. *OR I* has misled here. The Vespers added to OR XXVII were forced awkwardly into a new form to allow for a station on the Thursday after Easter. It may even be that OR XI, as Aubert believed, created, for its symbolic resonances, a sevenfold scrutiny sequence which Rome never

\textsuperscript{1046} Hen, *Royal Patronage*, p.85: ‘reception of Roman practice was a matter of adaptation through a slow process of criticism and experimentation’.

practised. If so, that sevenfold scrutiny would have had to have been created extremely early, to have marked all these disparate ordo manuscripts, and Aubert certainly did not prove that Rome never knew it. But in any case, no manuscript presents Collection A without also adding a Frankish ordo to accompany it, OR XXIX in Palat.lat.487, OR XV in Montpellier 412, or the Frankish ordo of Maundy Thursday in Murbach. These are not the actions of compilers interested in representing the Roman rite in all its purity. Even Albi 42, which has the original Holy Week ordinones, OR XXIV and OR XXVI, with only OR I and OR XLII (of unquestioned Roman provenance), is not ultimately or singularly ‘Roman’. After all, it contrasts these texts not with Roman expositions of Roman ordinones, but with Theodulf’s discussion of baptism (instead of OR XI), and Almannus’ commentary on a Frankish ritual of church dedication.

Given that no single text sufficed for every need, Amalarius’ quest for ratio is deeply illuminating. As we have seen, ratio was not found in a single text, but in a dialogue between them, and included the careful negotiation of tradition, authority and the drama of sacred history. It makes far more sense to see each of our manuscripts as engaged in that same quest. No manuscript could represent ratio in every aspect, yet the Carolingians were still invested in clear and precise copying (hence the fact that Wolfenbüttel 4175’s ritual of Holy Week repeats itself or that Collection B has two rituals for Ember Saturday). It was clear that, in practice, Carolingians were just as capable as we are at looking from an ordo romanus to a Sacramentary and noticing that each one had different rubrics for the same rite. To them, being ‘correct’ did not mean adhering exclusively to one tradition, one text, but engaging with all the complexities of a liturgy that had deep meaning to them. This could mean combining, correcting or completing. It was not one pattern of actions, or one script for the prayers to be said, which embodied liturgical correctio or ratio, but more a certain way of thinking about liturgy. The ordinones romani informed and were in dialogue with this pattern of thinking.
The reason for this was that the Carolingians were committed to finding meaning in liturgical performance. The strict separation of liturgical books for use and those for study, which marked Andrieu’s analysis so crudely, and which persists in some modern studies, does not allow for these nuances, but to the Carolingians it seemed self-evident that a book taught you how to think about liturgy, and which authorities you should consult, at the same time as it told you how to do it. While I have not drawn much from Walahfrid Strabo in the course of this thesis, he and Amalarius were engaged in the same basic quest, though they went about it in very different ways.\textsuperscript{1048} Walahfrid tried to find historical precedent for the liturgy he saw around him, which he admitted openly was extremely diverse, Amalarius gave it a story in another sense - the divine history of creation.\textsuperscript{1049} But one cannot underplay the essentially pastoral function of both of their works. Certainly, these were highly intellectual treatises, but Amalarius did not write pointless extravagances. In his reference to the bishop’s rubric of the Gelasian ritual, he admits that, while he saw no reason in ancient authority, apostolic tradition or canonical authority for this rite, it was quite acceptable to perform it, because it told you something important about what it meant to be a bishop:

\begin{quote}
Nevertheless, placing the Gospels over the head can admonish those holding it to request that the Lord strengthen the same Gospel in the candidate’s heart, or to admonish him who is consecrated to remember that he is now under the yoke of the Gospel to a greater extent than he was.\textsuperscript{1050}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{1048} Some have seen Walahfrid as a reaction to Amalarius: Harting-Correa (ed.), \textit{Libellus de exordiis}, pp.16-17; Collins, \textit{The Carolingian Debate}, pp.60-61.

\textsuperscript{1049} See introduction, Harting-Correa (ed.), \textit{Libellus de exordiis}, pp.1-36, also Walahfrid’s own introduction, pp.48-49: ‘non solum qualiter debeat fieri, verum etiam quomodo singular mystice debeant vel possint intelligi diligenti examination discussa’.

He had exactly the same perspective on theunction of hands. It was important because it signified a change in state, and was also a moral exortation to the priest himself.\footnote{Amalarius LO II, 13, 1, Hanssens, \textit{Opera Omnia}, vol.II, p.227: ‘Our bishops maintain this custom; they anoint the hands of the priest with oil. It is clear why they do this-so their hands may be clean for offering sacrifice to God and generous in other offices of piety’; Knibbs, \textit{On the Liturgy}, p.429.} I also highlighted his treatment of the Chrism Mass, where he presented both Sacramentary and Roman \textit{ordo} side by side, as if they were alternatives that interpreted each other. Interpreting the Sacramentary’s rubric he comments that: ‘When it is offered for the people, through the blessing of the priests it becomes a sacrament. This ministration shows that earthly ministration should be present for spiritual ministration.’\footnote{Amalarius LO I, 12, 25, Hanssens, \textit{Opera Omnia}, vol.II, p.75: ‘Quando a populis offertur, simplex liquor est; per benedictionem sacerdotum transfertur in sacramentum. Haec administration signifcat debere adesse erranam administrationem spiritali’ Knibbs, \textit{On the Liturgy}, p.121.} This is a fairly bald argument for the necessity of priests. Amalarius was fundamentally interested in telling people why they did the liturgical rituals they did. His intended audience were people like Ratold of Verona, Bernhar of Worms or Baturich of Regensburg. After all, he dedicated his \textit{Liber Officialis} to Louis the Pious.\footnote{Collins, \textit{The Carolingian Debate}, p.43; Hanssens, \textit{Opera Omnia}, vol.II, p.19.} He was also read in the great monasteries. Among those with whom he corresponded were Peter of Nonantola and Hildemar of Corbie. These were the same people through whose hands the \textit{ordines romani} passed, the same centres in which they were copied. There has been increased interest in recent years in priests’ manuals, representing the outworking at the lowest level of the Carolingian movement, including some liturgical education, simple baptism rites and explanations, parsing the Creed and so on.\footnote{Yitzhak Hen ‘The Knowledge of Canon Law among Rural Priests: The Evidence of Two Manuscripts from around 800’, \textit{Journal of Theological Studies}, 50 (1999), pp.117-134; Susan Keefe, \textit{Water and the Word}; Carine van Rhijn ‘The Local Church, Priests’ handbooks and Pastoral Care in the Carolingian Period’, \textit{Chiese locali e chiese regionali nell’alto Medioevo}, Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi Sull’Alto Medioevo, 61 (2014), pp.689-709; Carine van Rhijn ‘Manuscripts for local priests and the Carolingian reforms’, Steffen Patzold, Carine van Rhijn (eds), \textit{Men in the Middle: Local Priests in Early Medieval Europe} (Berlin, 2016), pp.177-198; Carine van Rhijn ‘Carolingian Local Correctio’, pp.162-180.} Such manuscripts do not carry \textit{ordines romani}. The \textit{ordines romani} seem to have been part of a ‘higher’ liturgical discussion, one which no doubt set the tone for what happened below, but which seems to have been exclusive to a court-favoured few, highly educated and nurtured in monasteries like Reichenau or cathedral schools like Verona. These people were trained in exegesis: seeing
connections and finding deeper meaning were simple habit to them. But the diversity Keefe and others surveyed at the level of the handbooks and guides, is replicated even at the level of these bishops and great monasteries. Closeness to the centre of power, even to the shaping of the very decrees and edicts traditionally seen as demanding uniformity, has not made that supposed uniformity any more real.

The *ordines romani* are as much a Carolingian phenomenon as Amalarius is. There is no manuscript testimony to them before the end of the eighth century when Carolingian prestige was already at its height. Almost at the dawn of the ninth, they are already being placed in complex and immediately personalised Collections, notably in B and Wolfenbüttel 4175. These Collections marked the development of liturgical manuscripts for centuries. Their interest as sources for the Roman liturgy has acted as a smoke screen. Amalarius found that that the Romans did not write *ordines romani*; it is far more likely that most, if not all, these great meditations on the Roman liturgy were written by Franks themselves from the beginning. Perhaps visitors to Rome would query the Roman staff and observe their ceremonials, then return with summaries of what they learned in *ordo* format, as the Franks demonstrably did. Anything that is transmitted of Rome in these texts is there because the Franks found it meaningful. If *ratio* was already a negotiation, sufficient attention to Roman patterns of practice was one of the priorities through which it could be sketched. While recent scholarship has speculated that ‘Roman liturgy’ did not actually have a concrete resonance, that it meant a correct or orthodox liturgy, the *ordines romani* do not support this reading. The notes of stational churches, the Greek *CREDO*, the faithfully recorded excursus on Rome’s seven regions, Wolfenbüttel 4175’s apparatus, not to mention the names of Popes Hadrian, Clement, Gelasius, Gregory, Sylvester which attached to the *ordines romani* in one way or other, all attest to
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1056 Richard Sullivan, ‘The Carolingian age: Reflections on its place in the history of the Middle Ages’, *Speculum* 64 (1989), p.293: ‘there is little consensus on what was ‘Roman’ in the liturgical world of the eighth and ninth centuries’; Gittos, ‘Researching the History of Rites’, p.24: ‘labelling of liturgies as Gallican, Roman and of Sarum use seems to have been intended as a synonym for orthodox’; against this also Jeffrey, ‘Rome and Jerusalem’, p.236, n.108.
the attempt by these higher clergy and monks (some of whom, like Amalarius or Bernhar actually knew Rome itself), to hold to the pattern of Rome’s sanctity. This was not the ‘Roman liturgy’ as Catholics in the twentieth century understood it, or an empty truism. It was a real attempt to participate in Rome’s topography and history.\footnote{McKitterick, ‘Perceptions carolingiennes’, p.88.}

Therefore to ask if \textit{ordo romanus} as a term applies to a particular text, is to miss the point. The \textit{ordo romanus} was not really found in a single text, in isolation; it was always part of a wider dialogue in a complete manuscript which attempted to lay out a rational and ordered account of liturgical functions. It is much more helpful, for example, to speak of \textit{ordo romanus} manuscripts, rather than this or that \textit{ordo romanus}, as certain medieval library catalogues do. This is also how OR XLI, which began life in the Gelasian Sacramentary, could be extracted from the Sacramentary (with its accompanying blessings for chalice, paten and chrism vessel), and be placed in Collection B and, in a separate initiative, in Wolfenbüttel 4175. Whether or not it was an \textit{ordo romanus} while it was in the Sacramentary does not really matter; what matters is that it was recognised as having something to say about \textit{ratio} and thus entered into a manuscript with \textit{OR I} and became part of the \textit{ordo romanus} dialogue. The same applied to the \textit{ordo de sacris ordinibus}, which had already, even in the Sacramentary itself, begun to participate in this dialogue by acquiring the \textit{ordo qualiter romana sedis} and the words of Gregory and Leo. Amid this rich ambiguity, confusion and debate could arise; Amalarius was unclear what time the Ember Days were in Rome, for example, but it did not fundamentally derail his quest for \textit{ratio} within them when he found that the \textit{ordines romani} were not used in the Church of Rome. Even the most Roman of the \textit{ordines romani} were never received as the final word, the trumpet call to uniformity, just as the Gregorian Sacramentary was never received in that way. Each text required processing; this fell to high ecclesiastical officials, Amalarius, Benedict of Aniane, Bernhar of Worms, Baturich of Regensburg, and to places possessing great resources and reserves of authoritative knowledge such as the monastic \textit{scriptoria}, Lorsch, Fulda,
Reichenau, Murbach and Nonantola. This network, highly linked, constantly communicating, and revolving around the imperial centre, never sought a single answer that would apply across the Empire. The power of the Carolingian reception of Roman liturgy was to make Rome real in Regensburg, Worms, Metz, or even in Nonantola or Lorsch. But these places were never swallowed up in Rome, for their bishops and monks did not surrender to the thoughtless replication of Roman liturgical texts. Bernhar himself, or Baturich, or Ratold and Pacificus, as well as the host of anonymous scribes and practitioners, played as large a role in the *ordo romanus* phenomenon as did the Church of Rome itself. A Roman text was not, to them, the authoritative end to all speculation and experimentation, but a start for it; an *ordo romanus* was, in the end, simply a proposition from which liturgy could be constructed.

---

1058 Claussen, *Reform of the Frankish Church*, p.45.
1059 McKitterick, *Frankish Church*, p.208: ‘The enduring successes of the Carolingian achievement therefore can be attributed to the varying activities, in their similarity and diversity, of individual bishops, priests and monks’. 
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