

*The 'Roman' Collection of Ordines in Metz,  
Lorsch and Tours*

Texts identified and edited as *ordines romani* appear in various forms and in various contexts. In the definitions presented by Andrieu and Vogel, an *ordo* was conceived as a 'pure' representation of action and gesture, distinct from other elements of the narrative of liturgical ceremonial.<sup>1</sup> For example, in Vogel's influential handbook, they are described thus: 'an *Ordo* is a description of a liturgical action, a directory or guide for the celebrant and his ministers, setting forth in detail the arrangement of the entire ritual procedure and how to carry it out. As descriptive of the actual rite, the *ordines* are the indispensable complement to the Sacramentary'.<sup>2</sup> This counterpart, the Sacramentary or Mass Book, properly contained only prayers and spoken texts, and these were likewise supposed to be fully separable and extricable in their original conception. Yet it is rare to see any *ordo* of which one could say such a thing without qualification. In Andrieu's works, this idea of purity of content is implicitly linked to the purity of Roman origin: that is, his reconstruction of *ordines* that were created and used in Rome, and represented wholly the Roman liturgy before Frankish copyists began to adulterate and alter them. Originally, such *ordines* had been copied individually or in small booklets whose aim was to propagate Roman usages; all surviving manuscripts represented the movement away from this. Again, we might quote Vogel: 'Before they were gathered in Collections, each *Ordo* – which described a single *actio liturgica* or some part thereof – existed completely on its own . . . and were gathered for the first time only in Gaul.'<sup>3</sup> None of these hypothetical original settings of these texts has survived.

The idea that different books classified in the same genre might have different usages, or indeed that different components of the same book

<sup>1</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. II p.xlvi–xlviiii; Martimort, *Les Ordines, les ordinaries et les cérémoniaux*; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp.135–224.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p.135.    <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p.138.

might have been read in different ways, and so help to interpret each other, was not integrated into this understanding of liturgical books, which employed a zero-sum understanding of this category of 'liturgical' (as being for ritual use). Such an understanding, however, is not evidenced in Carolingian attitudes to such books. For the Carolingians, texts we describe as 'liturgical' were comprehensible in various formats, and the *ordines* present this phenomenon particularly plainly. Carolingian manuscripts of the *ordines romani* raise questions concerning modern assumptions about the purpose and nature of the written liturgy, which, when addressed, allow a better understanding of the creative agency of manuscript creators and users, and ultimately the purposes of the *ordines* as copied and shared by them.

A great deal of background lay behind the assumed framings of Vogel and Andrieu. In the twentieth century, the history of liturgy was discussed in a certain way, with a certain background of assumed truths or 'laws' that still remain difficult to fully escape. One might, for example, quote Ellard's formulation that: 'the growth of liturgical ceremonial there operates first of all by that law of evolution where the rudimentary tends to perfection' (i.e. the medieval liturgy is perceived as the evolutionary antecedent to modern practices).<sup>4</sup> Scholars like Andrieu attained a deep acquaintance with the texts and the meaning of liturgy that is difficult to emulate, and were most often liturgical practitioners themselves. But analysing liturgy as a historical source which provides some insight into the mindset of manuscript compilers requires that we sometimes take a different approach from theirs.

In the following treatment, manuscripts of the 'collections' of *ordines* will be examined and, where possible, links to known figures and locations used to help explore the use and reinterpretation of the texts which they contain. Critical and new in Andrieu's study of the *ordines* were the discovery of Collections of the *ordines romani* that circulated in one or more manuscripts. In his editions, these were said to represent deliberate configurations of several *ordines* to a single purpose. Most widely witnessed were two to which Andrieu gave particular significance: Collection A or the 'Roman Collection', and Collection B or the 'Frankish Collection'.

Within the framing of the medieval liturgy and how it was changed, as delineated above, Andrieu's analysis assigned a reconstructed purpose and use to various manuscripts. The first of them, Collection A, he suggested, began life as the definitive attempt to establish purely Roman usages in

<sup>4</sup> Gerald Ellard, *Ordination Anointings in the Western Church Before 1000 AD* (Cambridge, MA, 1933), pp.3–4.

Francia.<sup>5</sup> Only the purest Roman *ordines* were selected for this purpose. Other scholars wondered consequently if Collection A could have been the product of an official 'reform' effort by Pippin III, or even if it was a work of the famous Alcuin of York (735–804).<sup>6</sup> The compilation was dated by Andrieu in around 750, and he inclined to somewhere in modern-day France as the place of compilation. Drawing a specific analogy to the Gregorian Sacramentary that Charlemagne received around 785, he suggested that Frankish churchmen soon found the Collection too specialised in its presentation of specifically Roman liturgical usages. Later copies should rather be interpreted as 'library copies' for study outside a liturgical context, entirely different in their conception from the first few. Collection A is given by Andrieu as:

*Ordo Romanus* 1, the Papal stational Mass.<sup>7</sup> This is, more specifically, the so-called 'long recension' of the text.

*Ordo Romanus* 11, baptismal ritual with preceding scrutinies.<sup>8</sup>

*Ordo Romanus* 27, an *ordo* of Holy Week from Wednesday created by the fusion of pre-existing text *Ordo Romanus* 24 and 26, plus the Vespers for the week after Easter, which include Roman stations.<sup>9</sup>

*Ordo Romanus* 42, the Roman order for depositing relics in a new church.<sup>10</sup>

*Ordo Romanus* 34, the Roman order for ordinations to the grades of the church from acolyte to bishop.<sup>11</sup>

*Ordo Romanus* 13A, an order of the sequence in which the non-Gospel Books of the Bible are to be read in the course of the year.<sup>12</sup>

No manuscript evidence for any of these individual components is known to survive from before the closing decades of the eighth century. Surviving manuscripts also suggest a more gradual process of compilation, with no definitive form of the Collection, and considerable freedom to add additional content.

Significant redating of several manuscripts, as well as more precise localisation of them, permits us to give new context to the Collections and individual manuscripts. This is mostly thanks to the verdicts of Bernhard Bischoff. Along with his *Katalog*, I have consulted his Nachlass in the Bayerische, Staatsbibliothek, ANA 553, in order to better understand

<sup>5</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. I, p.467–470: 'La collection que nous venons de décrire était purement romaine.'

<sup>6</sup> Vogel, 'La réforme liturgique', p.218; Emmanuel Bourque, *Étude sur les sacramentaires romains*, vol. II pt. 2 (Rome, 1958), p.96; Hen, *Royal Patronage*, p.63.

<sup>7</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. II, pp.3–108.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.365–447; Keefe provides a helpful summary in English: Keefe, *Water and the Word*, vol. I, pp.43–44.

<sup>9</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, pp.333–372. <sup>10</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. IV, pp.359–384.

<sup>11</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, pp.534–613. <sup>12</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. II, pp.469–488.

and evaluate the reasoning behind these often very important decisions. The earliest available manuscript of Collection A is now identifiable as BAV, MS Pal.lat.487, which actually contains only *Ordines* 1, 11, 27 and 34, lacking two of the texts, *Ordines* 13A and 42.<sup>13</sup> It was written at Lorsch towards the end of the eighth century, and was often used as the 'best' manuscript for Andrieu's editions because it preserves a text of *Ordo* 1 and the others quite close to what Andrieu had reconstructed as the Roman 'original'. This suggests the importance of Lorsch as the node for the initial distribution of the Collection. The key to this importance is likely to be Lorsch's close links with the bishopric of Metz and notably Chrodegang of Metz, bishop of Metz 742/748 to 766, who took a decisive part in the founding of the monastery in 764.<sup>14</sup> He provided Lorsch with the relics of Nazarius, a Roman martyr, given to him by Pope Paul I, which became central to the monastery's liturgical identity.<sup>15</sup>

Another clue that elements of Collection A perhaps came to Lorsch via Metz and which provides a possible connection with Chrodegang is the manuscript Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 289, specifically the parts fols.1–19, which can be dated around the same period as the Lorsch manuscript, at the end of the eighth century.<sup>16</sup> This fragmentary manuscript gives us a partial text of *Ordo* 1 (nn.36–64), the key text of Collection A, which also opens the Lorsch manuscript. The state of the text of this *ordo* is closest to that of BAV Pal.lat.487. Since the end of the text is lost, and we cannot say what followed, it is quite possible other *ordines* were originally present – perhaps four *ordines* from Collection A, just as in Lorsch? Certainly, directly proceeding *Ordo* 1 in these fragments we find also the Rule of Chrodegang himself for the canonical clergy of his cathedral. Since the manuscript ends before the end of *Ordo* 1, we cannot know if the manuscript originally contained the rest of Collection A, but perhaps this is not unlikely, since the version of the text otherwise can only be found with the other elements of that Collection. Can

<sup>13</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. I, pp.319–321; Bischoff, *Katalog*, vol. III. 6532. p.414; Bernhard Bischoff, *Die Abtei Lorsch im Spiegel ihrer Handschriften* (Munich, 1974), pp.21–22; 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).

<sup>14</sup> Josef Semmler, 'Chrodegang, Bischof von Metz 747–766', in Friedrich Knöpp (ed.), *Die Reichsabtei Lorsch: Festschrift zum Gedenken an ihre Stiftung 764*, vol.I (Darmstadt, 1973), pp.229–245; Marty A. Claussen, *The Reform of the Frankish Church: Chrodegang of Metz and the Regula Canoniorum in the Eighth Century* (Cambridge, 2004).

<sup>15</sup> Paul the Deacon, *Gesta Episcoporum Mettensium*, Georg Heinrich Pertz (ed.), *MGH Scriptores rerum Sangellensium. Annales, chronica historiae aevi Carolini* (Hanover, 1829), p.268. Later Mass Books of the monastery, such as the lavish fragment in Erlangen, UB MS 2000, highlight the martyr's name. This is digitised at: <https://hs-lorsch.bsz-bw.de/cgi-bin/koha/opac-detail.PL?biblionumber=1123>.

<sup>16</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. I, p.90; *CLA*, vol. VII, p.861; Bischoff, *Katalog*, vol. I, p.121: 'Metz (t) VIII/IX Jh. (IX Jh. Anfang).'

we then uncover Chrodegang's role in the transmission of some early *ordines*, and link Lorsch's reception and copying of an early form of Collection A to its connections to the bishopric of Metz?

Of similar age to the Lorsch manuscript are the various fragments of a manuscript probably copied in Murbach monastery and taken to Regensburg, which are found today in Munich, Regensburg and in Sankt-Paul in Lavanttal, of which Andrieu knew only the latter fragment. This book seems to have originally contained only the same four texts as the Lorsch example (pieces survive of characteristic elements of *Ordo* 34 and *Ordo* 27).<sup>17</sup> An abbot of Murbach from 789 was called Simpert, and a bishop of the same name is found in Regensburg from 768 to 791. It is likely that these were the same man, particularly since Charlemagne himself then took over as abbot of Murbach from 792, presumably following the death of Simpert.<sup>18</sup> Clear evidence of the transmission of manuscripts from the Alsatian monastery of Murbach to Regensburg would support an identity of the two, and help to explain our manuscript's provenance.<sup>19</sup> Simpert, through his presence at the court of Charlemagne, was closely associated with the archchancellor and bishop of Metz, Angilram (bishop 777–791), successor to Chrodegang. Furthermore, Simpert of Regensburg went on campaign against the Avars in the company of Charlemagne and Angilram of Metz. Both Simpert and Angilram died during that campaign. Given that the Lorsch manuscript, the Bern fragments and also the Murbach fragments were all copied not in Chrodegang's lifetime but towards the end of the eighth century, Angilram of Metz emerges as another contender for involvement in the initial transmission of Collection A, at least in its original form with just four constituent texts (*Ordines* I, II, 27 and 34), not the six reconstructed by Andrieu.

In addition to his links with Simpert of Murbach and Regensburg, Angilram also had close relations with Lorsch, and consecrated the church

<sup>17</sup> On the Sankt Paul fragment 979 fol.1r–v (now perhaps lost), see *Les Ordines*, vol. I, pp.347–349. The four additional folios, now Munich, BSB, Clm 14659, Clm 14655 and Regensburg, Staatliche Bibliothek, fragm.2, are described and dated in Bernhard Bischoff, *Die Südostdeutschen Schreibschulen und Bibliotheken in der Karolingerzeit*, vol. I, 3rd ed. (Wiesbaden, 1974), pp.197–198 and vol. II (Wiesbaden, 1980), pp.237–238, and Bischoff, *Katalog*, vol. II, 3239, p.261. I have seen all these fragments in person, except that in Sankt Paul.

<sup>18</sup> Simpert of Murbach is sometimes identified as the bishop of Augsburg of the same name (bishop, 778–807), but Charlemagne's acquisition of the abbacy in 792 is less easy to explain had Abbot Simpert still been alive. On Simpert of Augsburg, Wilhelm Volkert and Friedrich Zoepfl, *Die Regesten der Bischöfe und des Domkapitels von Augsburg*, vol. I (Augsburg, 1985), pp.20–29.

<sup>19</sup> A number of other manuscripts with script very similar to our fragments made the same journey: Munich, BSB, Clm 14082 and Clm 14379 and Würzburg, UB M.p.th.o.1 (*CLA*, vol. IX, p.1442); Bischoff, *Die südostdeutschen Schreibschulen*, vol. II, p.241.

there.<sup>20</sup> He was also interested in his predecessor's Rule, a copy of which forms part of the Bern manuscript, which was likely made during his episcopacy, and the text was adapted with Angilram's own additions.<sup>21</sup> There is also some evidence for a Metz connection, and one to Angilram specifically, in a late copy of Collection A, British Library, Add. MS 15222, produced in Besançon during the eleventh century, which undoubtedly goes back to a Metz archetype.<sup>22</sup> It contains the unique copy of an institute issued by Angilram recording how much he paid his clergy for various functions on high feasts, including a stationary system for Lent in Metz described as 'iuxta consuetudinem sedis apostolicae'.<sup>23</sup> It is difficult to explain the text's presence in this manuscript without assuming a Metz exemplar probably before Angilram's own death, from which was copied (either directly or at one or more stages removed) the Besançon manuscript some centuries later. Since a restoration and extension of canonical life was being undertaken in Besançon at this time under Archbishop Hugh of Salins (bishop 1031–1066), and with particular attention to liturgy, a memory of Carolingian Metz's role in the institution of common life, and of Chrodegang and Angilram as founders, probably helps to explain why the Collection was copied there.<sup>24</sup> A connection between Angilram of Metz, canonical life in a cathedral city, Roman stationary usages, and Collection A of the *ordines romani* seems to still have been alive in Besançon in the eleventh century.

The complete Collection A, as Andrieu reconstructed it, had two additional texts however, *Ordines* 13A and 42, which deal with the Matins biblical readings of the liturgical year and with church dedication respectively. Andrieu's own 'best' example of this complete Collection and the first to carry all six *ordines*, Montpellier, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Médecine, MS 412, is from the first quarter of the ninth century, and was written at Tours.<sup>25</sup> The two additional texts which were added to the Collection in this example, *Ordo* 13A at the opening of the Collection and *Ordo* 42 at the closing of it, are notably also witnessed in manuscripts

<sup>20</sup> Otto Gerhard Oexle, 'Die Karolinger und die Stadt des heiligen Arnulf', *Frühmittelalterliche Studien*, 1 (1967), pp.250–364, at p.296.

<sup>21</sup> Jerome Bertram (ed.), *The Chrodegang Rules* (Aldershot, 2005), pp.39, 67.

<sup>22</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. I, pp.142–144; Westwell, 'Content and Ideological Construction', pp.233–251; I have examined this manuscript in person.

<sup>23</sup> Michel Andrieu, 'Règlement d'Angilramne de Metz (768–793) fixant les honoraires de quelques fonctions liturgiques', *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 10 (1930), pp.349–369; see Chapter 3.

<sup>24</sup> Maurice Ray, *Les Diocèses de Besançon et de Saint-Claude* (Paris, 1977), pp.30–32.

<sup>25</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. I, pp.467–468; Bischoff, *Katalog*, vol. II, n.2873, p.209: 'Tours, [IX. Jh., 1./2. Viertel].'

that are independent of the same Collection, indicating differing provenance. *Ordo* 42 can also be found in Albi, Bibliothèque Municipale, MS 42, which has some connection to Reims.<sup>26</sup> Though Albi 42 also included *Ordo* 1 (fols.60r–68r), it has a form of that text that has some independence from Collection A, perhaps representing an earlier version.<sup>27</sup> It also contains *Ordines* 24 and 26, the principal sources for Collection A's *Ordo* 27 but not that text itself. Despite its late date, Albi 42 therefore gives the impression of being a copy of an older archetype, a possibility that we will subsequently explore. But in this case, it indicates availability of *Ordo* 42 in France independently of Collection A.

*Ordo* 13A appears in a number of other manuscripts besides those containing Collection A, of which ninth- and tenth-century examples include: Douai, BM, MS 14; Vercelli, Archivio Capitolare, MS 183; St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 225; Reims, BM, MS 1; Munich, BSB, Clm 6398 and 14470; Rouen, BM, MS 26; and BAV, MS Vat.lat.6018.<sup>28</sup> In some of these cases, *Ordo* 13A was added on spare folios of manuscripts of various kinds.<sup>29</sup> The St Gallen and Vercelli examples are the oldest, and date to the end of the eighth century, which demonstrates that this *ordo* already existed before its incorporation in the Collection.<sup>30</sup> They both include the *ordo* among patristic extracts, which suggests an understanding of the text as an authoritative one among the 'Fathers'.<sup>31</sup> However Reims 1, Douai 14 and BAV Vat.lat.6018 are the only three of these manuscripts to include a particular textual addition (*Ordo* 13A, nn.3–5) that is also found in manuscripts of Collection A which contain that *Ordo*, such as

<sup>26</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. I, pp.32–34, 487; Bischoff, *Katalog*, vol. I, n.24 p.11: 'Nördliches Frankreich (Reimser Umkreis?)'. A Reims connection and evidence of *terminus post quem* are also found in the copy of the 852 Capitulary of Hincmar of Reims and a letter of the monk Almannus of the monastery of Hautvillers in that diocese. I have examined this manuscript in person.

<sup>27</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. II, pp.21–22: 'des traditions antérieures à l'établissement des deux collections A (Coll. Romaine) et B (Coll. Gallicanisée)'.  
<sup>28</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. II, p.470.

<sup>29</sup> In Munich, BSB, Clm 6398, following the text of Priscian's *Institutiones Grammaticae*; in Reims 1 added after the Book of Kings. In BAV Vat.lat.6018 it was added on the final folio, fol.129r–v, of a manuscript containing the Chronicle of Isidore and the *Decretum Gelasianum De libris recipiendis ac non recipiendis*, for which see *Les Ordines*, vol. I, p.304; digitised at: [https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Vat.lat.6018/0191](https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.6018/0191).

<sup>30</sup> On St Gallen 225: *Les Ordines*, vol. I, p.330; Gustav Scherrer, *Verzeichnis der Handschriften der Stiftsbibliothek von St. Gallen* (Halle, 1875), pp.80–81; digitised at: [www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/csg/0225](http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/csg/0225); on Vercelli 183: *Les Ordines*, vol. I, p.367.

<sup>31</sup> In Vercelli 183, it follows directly the text of *De institutione divinarum litterarum* of Cassiodorus. It is also among patristic sermons and homilies at fol.73r–74r in Munich, BSB, Clm 14470, a ninth-century manuscript from Saint-Emmeram in Regensburg (digitised at: [www.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/view/bsb00022361?page=1](http://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/view/bsb00022361?page=1)). The text is found in a similar setting in Rouen 26 (from Jumièges): *Les Ordines*, vol. I, p.324.

Montpellier 412. Douai 14 is closest to Collection A in other details.<sup>32</sup> Two of these manuscripts come from Reims. Both are biblical: Reims 1 is part of the Bible presented by Archbishop Hincmar (845–822) to the Cathedral, and Douai 14 is an Old Testament manuscript, located to Reims by Bischoff.<sup>33</sup> Therefore, the circulation of *Ordo* 13A, like *Ordo* 42, in Northern France can be securely established, as well as its presence in numerous centres elsewhere. When combined with the evidence of *Ordo* 42's presence in Northern France, it was probably in this region that Collection A, having come from Metz, was enhanced with these two additional *ordines*.

Our earliest known copy of the full Collection is Montpellier, Faculté de Medecine, MS 412, copied at the abbey of St Martin, Tours, in the Loire valley. The only other ninth-century manuscript with the same full collection is Copenhagen, Kongelige Bibliotek, MS Gl. kgl. 3443, dating to the boundary between the ninth and tenth century, locatable to France.<sup>34</sup> This rather late manuscript is, in fact, the only one which carries Andrieu's Collection A apparently without the addition of any other *ordines* (leaves are now missing, the final item ending partway through *Ordo* 13A). Such evidence is not at all conducive to regarding the accomplishment of Collection A as already completed by the year 750, as Andrieu did.<sup>35</sup> We should probably therefore trace Collection A's creation on the basis of the surviving manuscripts, uncovering an initial collection of four distinct *ordines* towards the end of the eighth century in Metz, and an enhancement of this with two additional *ordines* around the beginning of the ninth, possibly in Northern France. The second, enhanced version also came to form the source for Collection B, probably redacted in Alemannia or Northern Italy, as we will see.

So, we come to the key question: did the compilers and copyists of the Collection A see themselves as copying a 'Roman collection', and were they selecting specifically and purely Roman *ordines* for the role, as Andrieu assumed? In the original collection, as transmitted in the Lorsch and Murbach manuscripts, which I attributed to Angilram of Metz, none of the four *ordines* were actually composed by Romans.

*Ordo* 1 has long been held to be a Roman document, but no knowledge of the text can be demonstrated in Rome. The assertion of Roman origin has tended to go together with the assumption of an early date for the text,

<sup>32</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. II, p.471.    <sup>33</sup> Bischoff, *Katalog*, vol. I, p.223: 'Reims, IX Jh., 3. Viertel.'

<sup>34</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. I, pp.114–116; Bischoff, *Katalog*, vol. I, p.412: 'Etwa Ostfrankreich.'

<sup>35</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. I, pp.468–470.



around 750. This latter assumption is perilous, since the text cannot be evidenced in any way so early. However, even those who maintain Roman origin for the 'long recension' of *Ordo I* concede the 'short recension', found in one manuscript, to be Frankish.<sup>36</sup> But if we accept Andrieu's argument that the 'long recension' is based on the 'short', as I do, and that the 'short recension' was known in Francia and used before the 'long recension' was known there, the Frankish origin of the latter can likely also be assumed.<sup>37</sup> The precise origin of this text, however, is less important for this study, which is focused on the purpose or purposes for which manuscript copies were made. However, in Chapter 4, I will present additional evidence against Andrieu's belief that *Ordo I* constitutes an accurate representation of Roman liturgical practice, namely a blatant error in the discussion of the *immixtio* in the text, for which the 'short recension' presents a more accurate description of Roman practice than the 'long'. The more it becomes clear that the Romans did not record texts such as *Ordo I*, and that the *ordines romani* are Frankish documents, the more the evidence is weighed to the probability that *Ordo I* was a Frankish document too. To this effect, I will also argue below that *Ordo II*, the baptismal text and another key element of Collection A, was not a Roman text at all, but was almost entirely written by Franks to begin to fill in very sparse rubrics in the Sacramentary.<sup>38</sup>

Of the four texts in the Lorsch manuscript, *Ordo 34* has the strongest claim to be a Roman document, but this too becomes more problematic upon closer examination. This text describes the ordinations of the clerical orders from acolyte to subdeacon. The terminology and procedures are accurate for practice at Rome: all are undertaken by the *domnus apostolicus* (the Pope) and the episcopal ordination takes place in the 'aulam beati Petri apostoli' (*Ordo 34*, n.18). Nevertheless, in one key intervention, the text includes the note (*Ordo 34* n.16) that the women called *ancilla dei sacrata* in Rome are called nuns by the Franks ('quae a Francis nonnata dicitur').<sup>39</sup> This indicates that a Frankish audience was also in mind. This part of the *ordo* also cites, it seems, the true Roman wording of the interrogation *quattuor capitulis secundum canones* (four things the bishop

<sup>36</sup> John Romano, 'The Fates of Liturgies: Towards a History of the First Roman Ordo', *Antiphon*, 11 (2007), pp.43–77.

<sup>37</sup> Peter Jeffrey's forthcoming new edition of *Ordo I* will argue for a Frankish origin for both recensions (as reported orally in his presentation at Leeds International Medieval Congress 2020).

<sup>38</sup> See Chapter 4; Antoine Chavasse, *Le sacramentaire gélasien (Vaticanus Reginensis 316): Sacramentaire presbyteral en usage dans les titres romains au VIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Tournai, 1957), pp.166–168.

<sup>39</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, p.607.

must not have done), but also interprets the complex vocabulary and Greek terms which the Romans seem to have used for them, again it would seem for a non-Roman (and presumably Frankish) audience.<sup>40</sup>

Andrieu assumed that the text had been redacted by a cleric in the Lateran Basilica in Rome, but the intervention directly addressed to Franks makes it more likely that a foreign cleric present in Rome, who observed ordinations, carefully recorded the text for a Frankish audience, with much the same care as we see in *Ordo* 1. This suggestion should not be dismissed simply because, as Andrieu has put it, the ordination rites were not directly applicable in the Frankish realms, for it is evident that the Franks were interested in the rites they themselves could not do (as we shall see in the Frankish manuscript witnesses to *Ordines* 1 and 26 below).<sup>41</sup> Andrieu also adduced as evidence in support of his argument that Pope Hadrian I had cited 'toute au long notre document' ('quoted our document throughout'), in a letter to Charlemagne of 790–791.<sup>42</sup> However, although Hadrian's description accords in general with *Ordo* 34 and secures its general accuracy in describing Roman practice, he did not directly cite the text at all, nor indicate its availability in Rome. He spoke only in very general terms of his interrogation of the newly elected bishop, without citing any of the details of the ritual surrounding it which are described in *Ordo* 34.<sup>43</sup> This corresponds generally with the interrogation by the Pope on the *quattuor capitula* described by *Ordo* 34, n.16.<sup>44</sup> In fact, the only one of the questions to the bishop that Hadrian quoted directly (perhaps from memory) – 'Vide ne aliquam promissionem cuiquem aut dationem fecisses, quia simonicum et contra canones est?' – is not found in *Ordo* 34's narrative of the interrogation.<sup>45</sup> Hadrian's citation supports in a broad way the general accuracy of *Ordo* 34, but not the availability of the text itself to him, and thus its assumed redaction in the Lateran. *Ordo* 34 could thus also most likely be a work of a Frankish pilgrim who had observed papal ceremony closely.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*: "Tunc dominus apostolicus praecipit sacellario vel nomenclatori, ut eum ad archidiaconum dirigat et eum inquirat de quattuor capitulis secundum canones, id est: arsenoquita, quod est masculo; pro ancilla Dei sacrata, quae a Francis nonnata dicitur; pro IIII pedes et pro muliero viro alio coniuncta; aut si coniugem habuit ex alio viro, quod a Grecis dicitur deuterogamia."

<sup>41</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, pp.594–595, and n.4: 'où beaucoup de ses prescriptions eussent été inapplicables'.

<sup>42</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, p.539; letter at *MGH Epp.* III [Karol. aevi, t. 1], p.634.

<sup>43</sup> *MGH Epp.* III (Karol. aevi I), p.634: 'enucleatius eum de singulis indagantes capitulis, singillatim orthodoxae fidei atque divinatorum voluminum interrogamus habere peritiam'.

<sup>44</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, p.604.

<sup>45</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. IV, pp.81–82: 'Do you swear that you have not made any promise or gift to them, for that is simony and against the canons?' A similar question can be found uniquely in *Ordo* 35B, a later redaction, in an eleventh-century manuscript: Rome, Biblioteca Universitaria Alessandrina, MS 173.

<sup>46</sup> Andrieu found it also in a manuscript he identified as ninth-century, Cambrai, BM, MS 465, fols.51v–53r: *Les Ordines*, vol. III, p.536, n.1, but Bischoff reports this as part of an eleventh-century addition to that manuscript: Bischoff, *Katalog*, vol. I, p.175.

The next *ordo* in the collection, *Ordo* 27, is the product of the merging and adaptation of the pre-existing *Ordo* 24 and *Ordo* 26, themselves found in three Frankish manuscripts important for the pre-history of the *ordines* prior to Collection A: Albi 42 already mentioned, also Brussels, Bibliothèque royale, MS 10127–10144 and St Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 614. *Ordo* 24 deals with the Day Office of Holy Week, and *Ordo* 26 with the Night Office. The Brussels manuscript is the oldest of these, and secures the existence of these two sources for *Ordo* 27 probably before the end of the eighth century.<sup>47</sup> But, as we will see, the other two manuscripts were probably copied from exemplars that were just as old. *Ordo* 24 describes the Day Office of Holy Week, from the Wednesday before Maundy Thursday through to Easter, while *Ordo* 26 describes the Night Office. But, unlike other *ordines* (and just like *Ordo* 11), the main narrative of *Ordo* 24 evidently does not take place in Rome. The celebrant is a pontifex, and he is clearly distinct from the Pope: at *Ordo* 24, n.28, the pontiff prays for the 'apostolicus' (the Pope) on Good Friday, whereas the priests name their bishop.<sup>48</sup> The ceremonies unfold in various churches, but no Roman names were given to them: for example in *Ordo* 24, n.22: 'in ecclesia statuta infra urbem, non tamen in maiore ecclesia'.<sup>49</sup> None of Rome's exotic personnel appear, only *notarii* and the *secundus* and *magister scolae* (there is no equivalent to this latter position in Rome in *Ordo* 1). Finally, the fact that everyone communicates on Good Friday (*Ordo* 24, n.38: 'Et communicant omnes cum silentio') directly contradicts what Amalarius of Metz learned from the Roman clergy concerning the papal celebration in Rome, where no one communicated on that day at all.<sup>50</sup>

In contrast, *Ordo* 26 does describe a specifically Roman, papal usage, but presents it as differentiated from the normal usages and rather exotic. Rome was evidently viewed as foreign to the presumed reader: for example, in the first part, the Sunday before Holy Week is that 'which the apostolic see calls *mediana*'.<sup>51</sup> During the Easter Vigil, the text details that other cities

<sup>47</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. I, pp.91–96; *CLA*, vol. X, p.1548: 's. VIII–IX'.

<sup>48</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, p.293: 'Presbiteri uero ecclesiarum, sive de urbe seu de suburbanis, vadunt per ecclesias, ut hoc ordine cuncta ad vesperum faciant, hoc tantum mutantes, ut, ubi pontifex meminit apostolicum, ipsi nomen episcopum suum.'

<sup>49</sup> 'in the church chosen for this purpose, within the city, but not however in the main church (cathedral).'

<sup>50</sup> *Liber Officialis* I.15.1, Hanssens (ed.), *Opera omnia*, vol. II, p.107: 'In superius memorato libro, inveni scriptum ut duo presbiteri offerant post salutationem crucis corpus Domini, quod pridie reservatum fuit, et calicem cum vino non consecrato, quod tunc consecratur et inde communicet populus. De qua observatione interrogavi Romanum archidiaconum, et ille respondit "In ea statione ubi apostolicus salutatur crucis, nemo ibi communicat".'

<sup>51</sup> *Ordo* 26, n.1.

beyond Rome ('forensibus civitatibus') undertook the blessing of the Easter candle as usual (the blessing is not described, but a pointer to the Sacramentary is given), but that 'the catholic church within the city of Rome' did not do this.<sup>52</sup> Instead, the archdeacon of the papal church made the *agnus dei* from blessed wax to be distributed to the people on the Octave of Easter.<sup>53</sup> This description conveys the flavour of one of the 'travel records'; it was, according to the very wording of the text, not a practice to be imitated, but one to be read and wondered about.

Three mentions of the use of a Sacramentary in the two *ordines* (a Sacramentary which was specifically not the Roman Gregorian but rather the Gelasian) – *Ordo* 24, n.2: 'in Sacramentorum continetur'; *Ordo* 24, n.23: 'ordine quod in Sacramentorum continetur'; *Ordo* 26, n.5: 'ordine quod in Sacramentorum continetur'; and the specific note that a prayer 'pro rege Francorum' (*Ordo* 24, n.3) would be said on the Wednesday of Holy Week – would incline one to believe the two texts were describing a particular Frankish ceremony of Holy Week, with the interlude of the Roman practice of the *Agnus Dei* on Holy Saturday in *Ordo* 26 as a clearly indicated digression. Was the setting, in fact, Metz? Andrieu admitted the possibility, at least, that *Ordines* 24 and 26 had been redacted by Frankish observers of the Roman liturgy, but still preferred to argue for a Roman origin by proposing that these were created for the churches 'suffragen' to Rome, still partaking of the Roman liturgy, and that they described truly papal ceremonies.<sup>54</sup> However, this statement relies on Chavasse's theory that the Old Gelasian Sacramentary was originally compiled for use in the liturgies celebrated by a priest in one of Rome's titular churches, thus ingeniously explaining divergences from what we know of papal practice by hypothesising a distinctive 'presbyterial' Rite in Rome.<sup>55</sup> These theories have been strongly criticised, and it does not seem that the Old Gelasian can really be located to the titular churches of Rome at all, or seen as a presbyterial counterpart to the Gregorian's papal liturgy.<sup>56</sup> Further discussion on the origin of *Ordo* 24 and *Ordo* 26 as part of a set of *ordines* that can be specifically linked to Chrodegang of Metz, and which includes the 'short recension' of *Ordo* I (as witnessed, for example, by St Gallen 614),

<sup>52</sup> *Ordo* 26, n.6: 'Et hic ordo cerei benedicendi in forensibus civitatibus agitur. Nam in catholica ecclesia infra civitatem romanam non sic benedicitur.'

<sup>53</sup> *Ordo* 26, nn.7–8. <sup>54</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, pp.281–283.

<sup>55</sup> Chavasse, *Le sacramentaire gélisien*; Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy*, pp.64–70.

<sup>56</sup> C. Coeburgh, 'Le sacramentaire gélisien ancien', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 7 (1961), pp.46–88; Matthieu Smyth, *La liturgie oubliée: la prière eucharistique en Gaule antique et dans l'Occident non romain* (Paris, 2003), pp.129–32.

will be detailed below. For now, we should note that the Holy Week *ordo* in Collection A, *Ordo* 27, combines two *ordines* that were not clearly of Roman manufacture, and made little claim to be describing Roman usages at all. Their combination was not done with much finesse.<sup>57</sup> Very little was added, except a formula for chrismation, which was specifically by an *episcopus*.<sup>58</sup> This combination of the *ordines*, at least, clearly took place within the Frankish kingdoms, as even Andrieu acknowledged.<sup>59</sup>

There was a third source for *Ordo* 27. *Ordo* 27, nn.67–94 was a different kind of text, a description of paschal Vespers for the week after Easter (entitled 'Ad vespervas die pasche sanctum') which originated in neither *Ordo* 24 nor 26. This was of immediately different character to the preceding texts. Roman personnel like the *parafonistis infantibus* appear at *Ordo* 27, n.70 and the *notario vicedomni* at *Ordo* 27, n.28. Quite particular Roman placenames are also a feature: at *Ordo* 27, n.76 'Ad sanctum Iohannem ad Vestem', or *Ordo* 27, n.77 'ad sanctum Andream ad Crucem', both oratories in the Lateran Baptistery, as well as the Lateran itself (*Ordo* 27, n.80, n.83).<sup>60</sup> A number of the chants are even delivered in Greek (singing in Greek took place within the liturgy in Rome, and was imitated in Frankish cities, as at Metz).<sup>61</sup> Andrieu was clear, this part, at least, was a 'true *ordo romanus*', that is, one that was redacted in Rome and able to tell us how the paschal Vespers really unfolded in Rome.<sup>62</sup> However, Van Dijk demonstrated plainly that the text in *Ordo* 27 is not, as Andrieu said, the accurate record of Rome's own ceremonies on these days.<sup>63</sup> In fact these texts are a clumsy Frankish adjustment of a more accurate Roman original text that survived elsewhere, given in the important *ordo romanus* manuscript, Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, MS Weissenburgenses 91 (examined below) but perhaps originally transmitted in the Antiphoner, since pieces resembling it do certainly survive in the Antiphoner of Compiègne, a Carolingian copy of a Roman chant book.<sup>64</sup> The fact that this piece could be taken by Franks

<sup>57</sup> Laid out in *Les Ordines*, vol. III, pp.339–341.

<sup>58</sup> *Ordo* 27, n.65: 'Episcopus debet dicere, quando mittit chrisma in frontibus infantium: *In nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti. Pax tecum. Respondit: Et cum spiritu tuo.*'

<sup>59</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, p.341.

<sup>60</sup> *Le Liber Pontificalis: Texte Introduction et Commentaire*, Louis Duchesne (ed.) (Paris, 1886), vol. I, p.242: 'Hic fecit oraturia III in baptisterio basilicae Constantinianae, sancti Iohannis Baptistae et sancti Iohannis evangelistae et sanctae Crucis.'

<sup>61</sup> *Ordo* 30B, n.41; *Ordo* 28, Appendix, n.4; Andrieu, 'Règlement d'Angilramne de Metz', p.353.

<sup>62</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, pp.342–343: 'sans aucun doute un véritable *Ordo romanus*'.

<sup>63</sup> Van Dijk, 'The Medieval Easter Vespers', pp.261–363.

<sup>64</sup> Wolfenbüttel Weissenburgenses 91, fols.69r–71r with unique title: 'QUALITER VESPERA DIE SANCTUM PASCHAE DICENDA SUNT'; Antiphoner of Compiègne: Paris BnF lat.17436 (fol.58r–v): 'INCIPIT ORDO AD VESPERES.'

from a Roman chant book adds to the range of sources of *ordines* and undermines Andrieu's conception of the texts as wholesale independent inventions in Rome. Rather, the forms the *ordines* take in Collection A are in many cases Frankish reinterpretations, constituting a new format invented principally for Frankish consumption. Before it was copied into Collection A, this text of the Easter Vespers had been clumsily adjusted in order to make space for a stational service on the Thursday of the week after Easter (nn.78–91). Having a stational service on the Thursday was a more recent innovation in Rome which the Roman Sacramentaries available to the Franks displayed but which the original text, representing an earlier stage of the Roman liturgy, did not.<sup>65</sup> As those like him were accustomed to do, the Frankish author 'borrowed' texts in order to fill out a stational ceremony which they knew occurred in Rome.

If we suggest a role for Angilram of Metz in the transmission of this initial Collection A, it is not at all clear that Angilram had intended to gather a purely 'Roman Collection'. *Ordines* 11 and 27 actually described, for the most part, Frankish usages and could be replicated in a Frankish cathedral like Metz without any difficulty. *Ordo* 1 and 34 described Roman usages, but both were observations by Frankish observers, and not truly Roman texts, in the sense Andrieu had conceived. A dynamic contrast between Roman and Frankish liturgies was thus a part of the *ordo romanus* tradition from the earliest gathering of the texts. The reader was clearly supposed to read this collection with a mind to what he might find useful and what he could or should not.

The final addition of *Ordo* 13A and 34 to a second enhancement of Angilram's original collection did strengthen the ties of the Collection to Rome. *Ordo* 13A is perhaps the only one of the *ordines* that can uncomplicatedly be attributed to Rome itself, and it very likely accurately describes the practice of the clergy of St Peter's, probably only within or after the reign of Pope Zacharias (741–752).<sup>66</sup> The Roman text is notably not concerned at all with the things Franks were interested in, in the *ordines* we know they wrote, which is to say topography, movement, gestures and arrangement of clergy. It is simply a list of readings. *Ordo* 42 is also entitled specifically as a Roman usage: 'In nomine Dei summi ordo quomodo in

<sup>65</sup> Michel Andrieu, 'Les messes des jeudis de carême et les anciens sacramentaires', *Revue des sciences religieuses*, 9 (1929), pp.343–375; Van Dijk, 'The Medieval Easter Vespers', pp.353–354.

<sup>66</sup> Peter Jeffrey, 'The Early Liturgy of Saint Peter's and the Roman Liturgical Year', in Rosamond McKitterick, John Osborne, Carol M. Richardson and Joanna Story (eds.), *Old Saint Peter's, Rome* (Cambridge, 2013), pp.157–176, at pp.167–176.

sancta romana ecclesiae reliquiae conduntur.<sup>67</sup> Here the church was dedicated simply by the deposition of relics. In this case, there is nothing that would argue against Roman origin: the prayers and antiphons listed as part of the ceremony all belong to the Roman Gregorian Sacramentary and the Roman Antiphoner of Compiègne.<sup>68</sup>

The impression gained of a complex relation to Roman practice is strengthened when we examine anew the manuscript copies of Collection A. None of the manuscripts show plainly that the copyists of the collection prized only the Roman *ordines*. Instead, the three earliest manuscripts each carry an additional *ordo* from outside what Andrieu defined as his Collection A, all of Frankish manufacture. In the case of BAV Pal.lat.487 and the Murbach/Regensburg fragments, a second, alternative Holy Week *ordo* was added to the manuscript not long after it was copied.

In Lorsch, the manuscript of what was probably Angilram's collection (BAV Pal.lat.487) had an extra folio at the end, and this was used, a few decades after the manuscript had originally been written, to begin a new text, which was completed with the addition of a new quire (fols.25r–30v).<sup>69</sup> This text is a reworking of *Ordo 27* as a new text, edited by Andrieu as *Ordo 29*. In substance, this is a repetition of many of the same rituals but it now takes place in a Frankish monastery rather than an urban setting.<sup>70</sup> A simple 'presbiter' undertakes the prayers on Wednesday and Friday.<sup>71</sup> We can tell that the Lorsch reworker of the text wished to emphasise two particular aspects. One was the Eucharistic customs on Maundy Thursday (*Ordo 29*, nn.24–26):

Sacerdos vero, cum frerit Sancta, mittat unam partem in calice et ex alia communicet ; porro tertiam altare dimittat et confirmetur a diacono de calice. Et illo tantummodo die, postquam confirmaverit sacerdotem, ponat calicem super altare et accipiat de manu subdiaconi patena maiore mittetque in eam de Sancta oblatas integras et ponat iuxta calicem, in sinistro latere, et duo subdiaconi veniant, unus cum patena et alius cum calice utrisque vacuis, et tollat diaconus de maiore patena ex oblatas, quantum sufficere possit ad communicandum populum, et de calice similiter et mittat in patenam et calicem quae subdiaconi tenent in manibus. Et statim illud quod remanet super altare cooperietur a duobus diaconibus utrumque sindone munda et de illa alia iuxta altare facit confractionem et post

<sup>67</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. IV, p.397: 'In the name of God the Most High an Order how relics are interred in the Holy Roman Church.'

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, p.393.

<sup>69</sup> Bischoff, *Die Abtei Lorsch*, p.22: 'von fol.24r an in jüngerem Stil, saec IXI, fortgesetzt'.

<sup>70</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, pp.429–446.

<sup>71</sup> *Ordo 29*, n.4: 'Et presbiter dicat . . . deinde reliquias per ordinem.'

confractionem redeant ad sacerdotem et communicent ipsi et reliqui per ordinem. Et, data oratione post communionem, diaconus non dicat: *Ite missa est*, sed ipsa oratione finiantur universa.<sup>72</sup>

The other was the gradual extinguishing of lights on each of the days, or the *Tenebrae* ceremony (*Ordo* 29, n.12).<sup>73</sup> Both these aspects were highly symbolic and theatrical, and demonstrate what are clearly non-Roman embellishments. The Vespers portion of *Ordo* 27 (with the Roman place names and characters) is also entirely absent. On the one hand, then, we have a clear reworking of *Ordo* 27 to make it less Roman and more reflective of Frankish customs and peculiarities. This was, in general, how we might imagine Holy Week really unfolded in the monastery of Lorsch itself. At the end of the text, however, is an extract from what appears to be a longer letter, in which a person reports that they consulted Pope Hadrian himself about some specifics of the Holy Week Ceremony, specifically aspects on which *Ordo* 27 was unclear or silent:

And we consulted therefore the Lord Apostolic Hadrian according to your orders, if on the Paschal Saturday we should genuflect when the readings are recited. And he responded that we should by all means do that. And when we said: And how are the priests and ministers and clerics able to prostrate themselves on the ground while wearing their stole and chasuble? He indicated that the priests, ministers and clerics need not wear their stoles and chasubles at this point, not until the 'new light' is introduced for the blessing of the candle. We then asked at what time on the Pentecost Saturday we should go in for the reading of the office, and he said to us that the sixth hour should be suitable.<sup>74</sup>

<sup>72</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, p.441: 'But the priest, when he has broken the Host, places one part in the chalice and from the other communicates; but the third part he leaves on the altar and he is confirmed by the deacon from the chalice. And on the same day, after the priest has been confirmed, (the deacon) places the chalice on the altar and takes from the hand of the subdeacon the great paten and places the complete holy offerings upon it and he places it by the chalice, on the left side. Two subdeacons come, one with a paten, and the other with a chalice, both being empty, and the deacon takes from the great paten the Hosts, that will suffice to communicate the people, and (wine) from the chalice similarly, and he puts these in the paten and chalice which the subdeacons hold. And at once that which remains on the altar is covered by two deacons with a clean linen, and after the confraction they return to the priest and he communicates them and the rest in their order. And when the prayer after communion is given, the deacon does not say *Ite missa est*, but this prayer finishes the whole ceremony.' It was then used on Good Friday, *Ordo* 29, n.27: 'The offering which remained on the altar should stay covered, but serves on the next day according to custom.'

<sup>73</sup> On the *Tenebrae*, see Edmund Bishop, *Liturgica Historica* (Oxford, 1918), p.159; Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, pp.248–249.

<sup>74</sup> Appendix in Pal.lat.487, fol.30v, beginning: 'Et interrogavimus nihilominus domnum apostolicum Adrianum, secundum mandata vestra'; *Les Ordines*, vol. III, p.446.



The two answers of Pope Hadrian about Holy Week were actually incorporated into the preceding *Ordo* 29.<sup>75</sup> Bischoff's dating of the manuscript means that the Pope consulted must have been Pope Hadrian I (d.795), and not Hadrian II (867–872) or III (884–885), as Andrieu had assumed.<sup>76</sup> *Ordo* 29 shows the same complex adaptations of the *ordo* to diverse Frankish sensibilities. On the one hand, they pruned back Roman details and added new elaborations to the ceremony, which probably had a long history in Francia. On the other hand, the Pope was still an ultimate arbiter and judge in matters of liturgical confusion. The question of who wrote this letter remains unanswered. Presumably it was a Frank who travelled to Rome and who was a cleric of sufficient standing to be admitted to Pope Hadrian's presence, but on the other hand, they were clearly tasked to ask about these liturgical matters by a superior (their abbot or Bishop Angilram of Metz?). The addition of *Ordo* 29 was accompanied in the Lorsch manuscript by a theological extract from Alcuin of York's *De fide Trinitate*, the summary 'profession of faith' entitled *Credimus sanctae trinitatis* which would later be recited in a liturgical setting.<sup>77</sup> Was Alcuin also a possible recipient of the letter about Pope Hadrian?

The Lorsch manuscript, today BAV Pal.lat.487, was available to a copyist before the end of the ninth century, and he or she makes it plain that *Ordo* 29 and the note about Pope Hadrian were of highest interest, and, not necessarily, the descriptions of 'pure' Roman liturgical practice, which was reconstructed by Andrieu as Collection A's principal interest. The copy is now in St Petersburg's Russian National Library, and has been dismembered as three physical units: Q. V. I, n° 34, Q. V. I, n° 56 and Q. V. II, n° 5.<sup>78</sup> The original manuscript may have been from Cambrai, although soon after its production it was in Corbie.<sup>79</sup> Even though they had access to BAV Pal.lat.487, the copyists did not simply copy Collection A from the Lorsch exemplar. The

<sup>75</sup> At *Ordo* 29, n.46: 'Qua perfecta, dicat sacerdos : *Oremus* ; et diaconus : *Flectamus genua*. Et orent quousque diaconus dicat : *Levate*. Et surgant et sacerdos det orationem *Deus qui mirabiliter creasti hominem*', and at *Ordo* 29, n.47: 'Expletis lectionibus, regrediantur foras, praecedentibus cum duobus notariis cereos tenentes, et induantur sacerdotes et diaconi et ministri et ceteri clerici dalmaticis et stolis et omni ornamento.'

<sup>76</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, p.430.

<sup>77</sup> BAV Pal.lat.487, fol.24r–v; Alcuin of York, *De fide Sanctae Trinitatis et de incarnatione Christi*, in *Quaestiones de Sancta Trinitate*, Erik Knibbs and E. Ann Matter (eds.), CCCM 249 (Turnhout, 2012), p.XIV; the *Credimus* is edited at pp.143–147.

<sup>78</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. I, pp.348–351; Antonio Staerk, *Les Manuscrits Latins du Ve au xiiiè siècle conservés à la Bibliothèque Impériale de Saint-Petersbourg*, vol. I (St Petersburg, 1910; repr. Hildesheim, 1976), pp.174–213; Hubert Mordek, *Bibliotheca capitularium regum Francorum manuscripta* (Munich, 1995), pp.689–702.

<sup>79</sup> Bischoff, *Katalog*, vol. II, p.84: 'wohl Nodostfrankreich, ca.IX Ende'; a Calendar of Corbie was added in the tenth century; Staerk, *Les Manuscrits Latins*, pp.196–200.

manuscript they produced began with *Ordo* 11, followed by Theodulf of Orleans' letter to Bishop John (dating from c.812), a commentary on a ritual of baptism that describes a somewhat *different* rite of baptism.<sup>80</sup> Three diverse Frankish commentaries on the Mass follow, including the popular *Dominus Uobiscum* on the Canon of the Mass.<sup>81</sup> But there is no sign here of several key texts of Collection A: *Ordo* 1, 27 and 34. A component of Collection A in other manuscripts but not in BAV Pal.lat.487, *Ordo* 13A (the annual cycle of biblical books read in the Night Office), is found in the Corbie manuscript. But the Holy Week *Ordo* unique to the Lorsch manuscript, *Ordo* 29, was inserted into the body of this text at the relevant place in the year, and this copy includes the note about Pope Hadrian.<sup>82</sup> Here it appears as the only narrative of Holy Week available. In this case, it seems the Lorsch manuscript was consulted, and the most interesting element was our *Ordo* 29, a narrative of Holy Week as it unfolded in Lorsch. The 'completing' and filling in of *ordines* with spoken elements was elsewhere used by Andrieu as a sign that a book was intended for liturgical use, and this manuscript is also notable in this regard, having the full texts of the prayers and homilies for *Ordo* 11 taken directly from the Gelasian Sacramentary and inserted into the body of the *ordo*.<sup>83</sup> But this addition also exists here with commentaries and *expositiones* that contrast with and complement the *ordines*, offering different versions of the rites the *ordines* describe.

Our other closely related manuscript, the Regensburg fragments, also acquired another account from Holy Week, specifically about Maundy Thursday, in another hand, celebrated by a mere *presbyter* and lector, and perhaps revealing a hint of the customs of St Emmeram, where the manuscript had probably come by then (note the Old High German term *clocca* also used in *Ordo* 29, n.8, though there the bells did not sound at all).<sup>84</sup>

### **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. Pre tertium psalmum omnes pariter dicant versum. Illa 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*

<sup>80</sup> Edited in Keefe, *Water and the Word*, vol. II, pp.279–321 with discussion in vol. I, pp.62–65.

<sup>81</sup> *Dominus Uobiscum*, Hanssens (ed.), *Opera omnia*, vol. I, pp.283–336; discussed at pp.110–114.

<sup>82</sup> Staerk, *Les Manuscrits Latins*, pp.201–205. <sup>83</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. II, p.370.

<sup>84</sup> *Ordo* 29, n.8: 'Et postea non sonetur clocca usque in sabbato ad missam'; Rudolf Grosse (ed.), *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, vol. IV G–J (Berlin, 1986), p.310.

*adiutorium* sed antefonas. matutina finita non dicatur *kyrie leyson* nec prebiter orationes. nihilque aliud. nisi tantum inclinant esse. Vadunt.<sup>85</sup>

While agreeing with the preceding *Ordo* 27 in some respects (*Ordo* 27, n.2 reports that the chant *Deus in adiutorium* is not said, nor the Gloria, but only the antiphon), in others it actually contradicts it (*Ordo* 27, n.5: 'Lumen autem ecclesiae ab initio cantus nocturnae incoatur extingui'). The monks of St Emmeram may not have agreed with all the customs presented in the Murbach manuscript that came their way, and indicated here their differences from them. In the same way as the Lorsch text, this *Ordo* therefore provided an alternative to the Collection A ceremonies, and indicated that 'Frankish custom' was not itself uniform between communities like Lorsch and St Emmeram. Readers were apparently not surprised by this, and expected to read these *ordines* with a critical eye, comparing the narratives closely.

The same is clearly true for our first manuscript with the complete Collection A, Montpellier 412, from Tours, in which the Collection is presented only after a first non-Roman *ordo*, *Ordo* 15. This was the original disposition of the manuscript, the 'additional' *ordo* not being an addition, in this case. The new text, *Ordo* 15, is a set of *ordines* and regulations strung through along the liturgical year, and itself contains elements both Roman, including Roman church names, and Frankish, such as baptism at Epiphany, forbidden in Rome.<sup>86</sup> The interest of this text is that it still declares itself to be 'according to how the holy apostolic Roman church celebrates', but it is clearly of Frankish design and manufacture.<sup>87</sup> Andrieu had the text written as a group with the rest of the *ordines* in another early manuscript, the Collection found in St Gallen 349, but that sequence of texts seems rather to have different audiences, and certain details suggest that *Ordo* 15 in fact originated at Tours, where Montpellier 412 was written.<sup>88</sup>

<sup>85</sup> Munich Clm 14659, fol.2\*r: 'An Order for the Night Office of Maundy Thursday. At first, the bell is rung a little. *Deus in adiutorium meum* is not said nor is *venite* sung, but just the antiphon *zelus domus tuae*. At no psalm should the Gloria be said. But the end of the psalm is not to be drawn out. Before the third psalm everyone should say the verse together. On that night the light is not extinguished. The lector asks for a blessing, but he makes an end from the reading itself [i.e. the usual versicle and response at the end of the reading, "Tu autem domine, miserere nobis", is not said]. The homilies for this day are read, but not lamentions. Then at Matins do not say *deus in adiutorium* but just the antiphons. At the end of Matins, do not say *kyrie eleison*, nor should the priest say prayers and nothing else, just that they are to be inclined. Then they leave.'

<sup>86</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. III, pp.45–125; Montpellier contains *Ordo* 15, nn.1–85.

<sup>87</sup> *Ordo* 15, tit.: 'QUALITER A SANCTA ATQUE APOSTOLICA ROMANA ECCLESIA CELEBRATUR.'

<sup>88</sup> On the Collection in St Gallen 349, see *Les Ordines*, vol. III, pp.3–21: '*Les Ordines* XV–XVI, XVIII–XIX sont du même auteur'; Arthur Westwell, 'Ordering the Church in the *Ordines Romani*', in Rutger Kramer, Emilie Kurdziel and Graeme Ward (eds.), *Categorising the Church: Monastic Communities and Canonical Clergy in the Carolingian World (780–840)* (Turnhout, 2022), pp.425–445.

Another early manuscript to which a partial copy of *Ordo* 15 was added was also in Tours, The Hague, Museum Meermannno-Westreanum, MS 10. B.4.<sup>89</sup> The *ordo* makes provision for celebration in a community called a *monasterium* in an urban setting, in which a bishop would be also present. Such a setting was the ambiguous position of the Basilica of St Martin at the time Alcuin of York was abbot there (796–804), and when the first copies of *Ordo* 15 begin to appear.<sup>90</sup> This is not to argue for Alcuin's role in the creation of the *ordo* (the level of Latinity is much below him), but the text does probably present something of the liturgy at Tours at the time he arrived there.

Like *Ordo* 29, *Ordo* 15 covered similar ground to the Collection of *ordines* that follow it in the Montpellier manuscript, including an extensive narrative of a pontifical Mass which is clearly a simplified version of *Ordo* 1, and a narrative of baptism which accounts for similar rituals as *Ordo* 11.<sup>91</sup> Alternative versions of the same rituals are also displayed side by side for consultation and comparison.

But Montpellier 412 also has its *ordines* and Collection A following after the text of Augustine of Hippo's *Enchiridion*, and nothing would suggest this was not the original disposition of the manuscript.<sup>92</sup> It was therefore also possible to place this collection in a book along with a resolutely non-liturgical patristic work, as well as the Collection of St Amand, copied on spare leaves of a manuscript of another work of Augustine, the *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, Paris, BnF, MS lat.974.<sup>93</sup> We know of another book that placed a Roman order of the Mass with the same text, one that was in St Gallen in 1446, but which is not today identifiable.<sup>94</sup>

Some later manuscripts hint at other iterations of Collection A. Paris, BnF, MS lat.2399 is also an eleventh-century manuscript, but certain features of the palaeography suggested to Andrieu and Wilmart that it

<sup>89</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. I, pp.140–142; also Wilhelm Levison, 'Handschriften des Museum Meermannno – Westreanum im Haag', *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 38 (1913), pp.513–518; *CLA*, vol. X, p.39.

<sup>90</sup> Jean Chelini, 'Alcuin, Charlemagne et Saint-Martin de Tours', *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France*, 144 (1961), pp.19–50.

<sup>91</sup> *Ordo* 15, nn.12–65, 85–120.

<sup>92</sup> Augustine of Hippo, *Enchiridion ad Laurentium*, Ernest Evans (ed.), in M. P. J. Van den Hout, E. Evans, J. Bauer, R. Vander Plaetse, S. D. Ruegg, M. V. O'Reilly, R. Vander Plaetse, and C. Beukers (eds.), *De fide rerum invisibilium. Enchiridion ad Laurentium de fide et spe et caritate. De catechizandis rudibus. Sermo ad catechumenos de symbolo. Sermo de disciplina christiana. De utilitate ieiunii. Sermo de excidio urbis Romae. De haeresibus*, CCSL 46 (Turnhout, 1969).

<sup>93</sup> Augustine of Hippo, *De gratia et libero arbitrio ad Valentinum*, A. Goldbacher (ed.), *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, 57 (Vienna, 1911), pp.380–396.

<sup>94</sup> *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz*, Paul Lehmann (ed.), vol. I (Munich, 1918), p.106: 'Epistole Augustini ad Valentinum monachum et e contrario; eciam [sic] Ordo ecclesiasticus Romane ecclesiae, quomodo missa celebratur.'

was copied from a ninth-century exemplar.<sup>95</sup> If so, that exemplar offered only the basic parts of the Collection, *Ordo* I, II and 27, and these texts were here sandwiched between two contrasting Carolingian commentaries which dealt with liturgical matters, Amalarius' *Liber Officiis* and Hrabanus Maurus' *De institutione clericorum*.<sup>96</sup>

Andrieu assumed more consistency in both the function and form of the Collection than these manuscripts would suggest. Clearly, Collection A was accomplished in steps and stages, and a significant proportion of the manuscripts do not display the full set. This was a fluid set of texts that could easily be adapted, and indeed encouraged the contrasting of the components with alternatives, often adapted or entirely non-Roman ones. The *ordines* were not therefore seen as definitive accounts of a ceremony but admitted the possibility of the reader's contrast and comparison. Andrieu's understanding of 'Collection A' as having a single ideological function does not bear the scrutiny of manuscripts. Furthermore, the majority of the *ordines* in the Collection can be identified as significantly interpolated or written by the Franks, not the pure Roman texts they were supposed to be in Andrieu's reconstruction.

The idea that pure Roman texts needed to be preserved and made sense only among others of the utmost purity does not seem to be one that animated Frankish recipients of that tradition. The creation of Collection A already associated Roman and Frankish texts which were allowed to interpret each other. Individual manuscript copyists continued to enrich and deepen this relation by adding new texts.

<sup>95</sup> *Les Ordines*, vol. I, p.269, 469.

<sup>96</sup> Hrabanus Maurus, *De institutione clericorum*, D. Zimpel (ed.), 2 vols. (Turnhout, 2006).